

**NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES PROJECT (NASP-II):
A NATIONAL SURVEY OF MANAGERS IN STATE HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES**

Sanjay K. Pandey, PhD

Rutgers University
Department of Public Policy and Administration
401 Cooper Street
Camden, NJ 08102-1521

Phone: 856-225-6359, EXT. 23

FAX: 856-225-6559

E-Mail: skpandey@camden.rutgers.edu

Version 2: May 2003

NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES PROJECT (NASP-II): A NATIONAL SURVEY OF MANAGERS IN STATE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NASP – A BRIEF HISTORY

NASP-I & NASP-II – COMMON THEMES & NEW DIRECTIONS

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

SAMPLE DESIGN

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

NASP-II CONSTRUCT MAP

NASP-II CODEBOOK

NASP-II DATA POLICY

NASP-II Database Listing of Contents Procedure

**NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE STUDIES PROJECT – A NATIONAL SURVEY OF
MANAGERS IN STATE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES**

**Principal Investigator &
Survey Director: Sanjay K. Pandey, Ph.D.**
Survey Manager: Sarah Operario

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded in part by the *Center for State Health Policy* and the *Forum for Policy Research and Public Service* at Rutgers University. I am grateful to Joel Cantor, James Dunn, David Frankford, James Garnett, Richard Harris, Russell Harrison for their support of and belief in the significance of this project. I thank Sandra Hill and Sandra Cheesman for outstanding administrative support.

I want to record my deep appreciation to Sarah Operario, Survey Manager for the project. Sarah worked on the project while pursuing her MPA at Rutgers University. She contributed to the project in numerous ways, including shouldering primary responsibility for survey administration. Sarah's dedication, imagination, and perseverance have been key to the success of this project.

I want to thank Sheela Tiwary for creating a data management system for capturing data collected with the survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was developed over a period of nearly three months with review and input from several public management scholars. For continued involvement and contributions during the questionnaire development phase, I am grateful to Barry Bozeman, James Garnett, Don Moynihan, Patrick Scott, Sheela Tiwary and Eric Welch. For occasional contributions during this period, I want to thank Alok Baveja, Stuart Bretschneider, David Coursey, Patrice Mareschal and Kurt Thurmaier.

NASP – A BRIEF HISTORY

Like many other significant contributions to the field of public management (e.g. the initiation of National Public Management Research Conference), NASP is Barry Bozeman's brainchild. The project grew out of a 1992 doctoral seminar Bozeman taught at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. The data collected by the project (referred to as NASP-I hereafter) have been used in two dissertations and over 20 peer-reviewed publications in leading public administration journals – a ROI that gives true meaning to the much used phrase "doing more with less". Under Bozeman's leadership seminar participants designed a survey questionnaire, which was later administered to a sample of public and private managers in New York. The survey questionnaire administered in New York, with some modifications, provided the basis for further data collection at two more sites – David Coursey led the NASP effort in Florida and Dennis Wittmer led the NASP effort in Colorado. Over the years NASP has become more than a database and papers based on the database – it has become an intellectual community that engages some of the best minds on advancing empirical research on public management. A partial list of publications using the NASP data is provided below:

Bozeman, B. and Kingsley, G. (1998) "Risk culture in public and private organizations." *Public Administration Review*. 58(2), pp. 109-118.

Bozeman, B. and Rainey, H. (1998) "Organizational rules and the bureaucratic personality," *American Journal of Political Science*. 42(1), pp. 163-189.

Pandey, S. and Scott, P. (2002) "Red Tape: A Review and Assessment of Concepts and Measures." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4), pp. 553-580.

Pandey, S. and Kingsley, G. (2000) "Examining Red Tape in Public and Private Organizations: Alternative Explanations from a Social Psychological Model," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), pp. 779-799.

Rainey, H., Pandey, S., and Bozeman, B. (1995) "Research Note: Public and private managers' perceptions of red tape," *Public Administration Review*, 55(6), pp. 567-574.

Wittmer, D. and Coursey, D. (1996) "Ethical work climates: comparing top managers in public and private organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(4), 559-572.

NASP-I AND NASP-II – COMMON THEMES AND NEW DIRECTIONS

A principal goal of the NASP project, that remains unaltered in NASP-II, is collecting data for furtherance of empirical knowledge on public management. NASP-II, like NASP-I, includes questions on a range of subjects relevant to public management. The range of questions covered in NASP-II includes themes such as organization culture, communication, organizational rules and procedures, policy environment, public service motivation, decision-making, and information systems. While NASP-I focused on advancing comparative empirical knowledge about public and private organizations, NASP-II seeks to characterize and study the impact of policy/political context on public management.

A key input in design and development of the NASP-II survey questionnaire was PI's emerging interest in state health policy, a fact reflected in many ways. The NASP-II sample design was distinct in two ways: a) it had a national focus; and b) it was restricted to state health and human service agencies only. Finally, the data collection methodology for NASP-II tried to emulate as closely as possible the tailored design method (TDM) protocol elaborated by Don Dillman (Dillman, 1999).

While the data are rich enough to permit a variety of analyses, the NASP data may be used for the following purposes:

1. Testing public management theories and propositions on a variety of themes;
2. Examining variation across states and assessing the issues at the interface of federalism and public management;
3. Conducting studies regarding the impact of policy/political context on agency management and policy development.

NASP-II SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

Based on project objectives, a draft instrument with six different sections was created in June 2002. The PI wrote up the first draft of five sections (with questions on administrative communication contributed by James Garnett) and Eric Welch crafted the section on Information Systems. Questions in the first draft of NASP-II survey instrument came from three different sources, namely, the NASP-I survey instrument,

questions adapted from the literature and questions written specifically for NASP-II. New questions (those adapted from the literature and newly written ones) form the larger share of the NASP-II survey instrument. In keeping with best practice in survey research, every attempt was made to find extant questionnaire items with known psychometric properties for operationalizing study constructs. Nonetheless, it was necessary to either adapt extant scales for the study or write items anew.

The draft instrument was sent for peer review to more than fifteen experts on public management and survey methodology with a request to respond within two weeks in June 2002. The reviewers were provided information about the survey objectives, constructs of interest to the study and a “construct map” that related constructs to specific questions. By the end of June 2002, nearly seven had responded with extensive suggestions and several others requested additional time to review the NASP-II draft survey questionnaire.

With the suggestions received in the first round of reviews, a second draft version was created and circulated in July 2002 to those members of the review panel who were willing and able to provide a second round of reviews. These reviews continued to come in till mid-August by which time eleven of the reviewers had provided feedback on draft versions of the NASP-II questionnaire. These suggestions were assessed for usefulness and incorporated after which time the survey instrument was finalized. The final survey questionnaire was formatted and printed according to TDM guidelines (Dillman, 1999), resulting in a 12-page, 41-question survey instrument requiring 220 variables to store the resultant data in a database.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The theoretical population of interest for this study is comprised of managers engaged in information management activities, working in state-level primary health and human service agencies. Primary health and human service agencies were identified according to the definition used by American Public Human Services Association (APHSA, formerly APWA) and include agencies housing programs related to Medicaid, TANF, and child welfare. Information management was broadly defined to include a range of key managerial roles such as the top program administrator, managers of information

system applications, managers in-charge of evaluation and research, and managers dealing with public information and communication.

The sampling frame was developed with the aid of the most widely used directory of human service agency managers, namely the APHSA directory (APHSA, 2001). Application of study criteria resulted in a sampling frame made of 570 managers from the fifty states and Washington, D.C. Given the small size of the sampling frame, a decision was made to administer the survey to the entire sampling frame (i.e. conduct a census).

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Rutgers University. Every effort, within reason, was made to encourage managers in the sampling frame to complete the survey. However, with each contact respondents were advised about the voluntary nature of the study and informed that while the researchers greatly appreciated participation in the study, managers could choose not to participate in the study. No follow-up efforts were directed at managers indicating a wish not to participate in the study.

As with most survey research projects, minimizing non-response, both to the survey and to specific questionnaire items, was a primary goal in the survey administration. Dillman's (1999) comprehensive TDM approach to maximizing the response rate made up of the following elements was employed in the study:

- 1) A questionnaire with well-designed content;
- 2) Survey questionnaire formatted in accordance with latest advances in cognitive research;
- 3) Multiple personalized contacts, each contact accompanied with a carefully crafted message to encourage the respondent to complete the survey questionnaire;
- 4) Use of real stamps on return envelopes;
- 5) Use of features such as pre-notice letter, fax message, phone call at key points in the survey administration; and
- 6) Use of special delivery (combination of 2-day delivery by Airborne Express and Priority Mail service of US Postal Service)

The data collection phase of the study began in fall of 2002 and concluded in winter of 2003. First, respondents were sent a pre-notice letter informing them about the study and requesting their cooperation in completing a questionnaire to be mailed later. Approximately a week after the initial alert letter, the survey questionnaire was mailed to the respondents. The cover letter accompanying the survey questionnaire outlined the study objectives, indicated the voluntary nature of the study, requested participation and provided contact details of the project director for further informational needs and clarifications. About ten days later a combination thank you/reminder postcard was sent to all respondents, thanking those who had responded and encouraging those who had not to respond as soon as they possibly could. Nearly a month after the mailing of this postcard, a new cover letter and replacement survey were sent to non-respondents. The cover letter emphasized the fact that it was important for everyone to respond (unless for some reason or other the respondent chose not to respond). In order to make sure that the respondents were aware of the second mailing, concomitantly with the mailing we faxed the cover letter that went with the second mailing to the non-respondents clearly indicating that the letter and a replacement survey were in the mail. The final step in survey administration took place about two months later when non-respondents were sent a new cover letter and a second replacement survey with a request to complete the survey. This final mailing pointed out that this was the last opportunity for the respondents to complete the survey questionnaire and used a combination of two-day delivery by an express carrier and United States Postal Service Priority Mail.

Also, based on information cumulated during this period, the size of the sampling frame was reduced from 570 to 518. It should be noted that APHSA directory is the best available source of information on the sampling frame. Despite the best efforts by APHSA directory to provide current and up-to-date information, the information in the directory at publication time is a year old. The survey was administered several months after the publication of the directory. This was reflected in the principal reason for deletion from the sampling frame -- managers having left the organization before survey administration efforts. Other reasons for deletion from the

sampling frame were retirement and death. By the time survey administration concluded in winter of 2003, a total of 274 responses were received. Thus, the response rate for the study was 53%.

References

American Public Human Services Association (2001) *Public Human Services Directory 2001-2002*. Washington, DC: American Public Human Services Association.

Dillman, D. A. (1999) *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method, 2nd Ed.*, New York: John Wiley.

NASP-II CONSTRUCT MAP

Note:

1. Specific questionnaire items are derived from and used, with modification if necessary, from the following sources: a) NASP-I survey questionnaire; b) Public domain items from the extant literature; and c) Newly written items.
 2. Variable names try to use a mnemonic scheme based on the concept/construct name – use this map in concert with the codebook.
-

Question 1: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Question 2: OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION, ROLE AMBIGUITY, ROLE CONFLICT, RISK CULTURE, PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, SELF EFFICACY

Question 3 & 4:
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMUNICATION STYLE

Question 5: REINVENTION /NPM REFORM MEASURES

Question 6: GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURE

Question 7: TECHNOLOGY ROUTINENESS, CENTRALIZATION, GOAL AMBIGUITY, TASK SPECIALIZATION

Question 8: RED TAPE SCALES for PERSONNEL, COMMUNICATION, PROCUREMENT, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, BUDGETARY DOMAINS

Question 9-15:

NASP-I measures on GLOBAL RED TAPE, HIERARCHY, FORMALIZATION,
NUMBER OF RULES, ADMINISTRATIVE DELAYS
NEW MEASURES on SOURCE OF RED TAPE (Q12) and IMPACT of RED
TAPE (Q14)

Question 16:

JOB INVOLVEMENT (as Central Life Interest) and ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT (Normative and Continuance)

QUESTION 17:

EXTRINSIC & INTRINSIC MOTIVATION

Question 18:

PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION

Question 19 & 20:

POLICY CONTEXT / POLITICAL INFLUENCE

Question 21:

PROFESSIONALIZATION

Question 22, 23, 24:

DECISIONMAKING

Question 25-30: PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES ON INTERNET & INTRANET

Question 31 onwards – DEMOGRAPHICS

NASP-II CODEBOOK

VARIABLES on NASP-II DATABASE; NOT IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

WAVE -- Response Wave (1,2,3)
DAYS -- Days since first mailing of the survey
AGE -- Age of Respondent
STATE -- State
AGENCY -- Agency
JOBTYPE --

DUMMY Coding based on Question #22 (DECDX)

DECBCUT Budget Cut (n=60)
<decision refers to budget cut or shortfall>

DECCC Cost Containment (n= 83)
<subsumes budget cut – broader categorization>

DECHR Personnel (n= 41)
<decision refers to personnel / HR issue>

DECCOM Communication (n=57)
<decision refers to communication, internal or external>

DECPROC Procurement (n=39)
<decision refers to procurement>

DECIS Information Systems (n=42)
<decision refers to information systems>

DECPROG Program Design (n=122)
<decision refers to program design>

DECREORG Reorganization (n=51)
<decision refers to reorganization>

I. Work Environment

1. In this question, several descriptions of agency culture are provided. Please note that these statements provide simple descriptions only – there are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with how accurately each statement portrays your organization:

(Mark one box in each row)

My agency is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.

						GRPCULT1, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	13.1%	52.2%	16.8%	14.2%	3.6%	

My agency is a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.

						DEVCULT1, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.0%	24.5%	25.6%	30.6%	11.3%	

My agency is a very formalized and structured place. Bureaucratic procedures generally govern what people do

						BURCULT1, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	17.5%	42.3%	17.5%	19.7%	3.3%	

My agency is very production oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People aren't very personally involved.

						RATCULT1, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	4.4%	23.7%	23.0%	42.3%	6.6%	

The glue that holds my agency together is loyalty and tradition. Commitment to this agency runs high.

						GRPCULT2, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.9%	34.7%	25.6%	22.6%	7.3%	

The glue that holds my agency together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first.

						DEVCULT2, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.4%	24.8%	25.9%	31.8%	9.1%	

The glue that holds my agency together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth running agency is important here.

					BURCULT2, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.9%	43.2%	22.7%	20.9%	3.3%	

The glue that holds my agency together is the emphasis on task and goal accomplishment. A production orientation is commonly shared.

					RATCULT2, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.4%	55.3%	22.3%	12.1%	1.8%	

My agency emphasizes human resources. High cohesion and morale in the agency are important.

					GRPCULT2, n=274	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.5%	28.8%	26.3%	28.5%	6.9%	

My agency emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges is important.

					DEVCULT3, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	7.3%	35.2%	22.7%	28.9%	5.9%	

My agency emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important.

					BURCULT3, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.8%	43.2%	26.7%	17.6%	3.7%	

My agency emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Measurable goals are important.

					RATCULT3, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	12.8%	41.4%	19.4%	21.6%	4.8%	

2. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements: (Mark one box in each row)

In general, I like working here.

					JSAT1, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	48.7%	42.5%	5.1%	2.2%	1.5%	

My job has clear, planned goals and objectives.

					ROLEAMB1, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	26.4%	44.7%	9.2%	16.1%	3.7%	

I sometimes receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

					ROLECON1, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	19.4%	42.9%	13.2%	18.7%	5.9%	

I feel certain about how much authority I have.

					ROLEAMB2, n=272	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	30.2%	44.5%	8.5%	14.0%	3.0%	

I know exactly what is expected of me.

					ROLEAMB3, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	25.6%	45.1%	10.3%	15.4%	3.7%	

Most employees in this organization are not afraid to take risks.

					RISK1, n=274	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	4.0%	22.3%	20.4%	42.3%	11.0%	

I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

					ROLECON2, n=273	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.0%	37.7%	20.5%	21.3%	9.5%	

In general, I don't like my job.

					JSAT2, n=271	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	0.4%	2.2%	5.9%	25.1%	66.4%	

I sometimes have to bend a rule or a policy in order to carry out an assignment.

					ROLECON3, n=274	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	10.6%	47.8%	17.2%	13.9%	10.6%	

Top management exerts strong control over this organization.

					RISK4, n=272	
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	16.2%	36.8%	19.9%	23.2%	4.0%	

The only time I hear about my performance is when something goes wrong.

						FEEDBK1, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.6%	17.9%	16.8%	33.6%	25.2%	

Top management in this organization is not afraid to take risks.

						RISK2, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	14.7%	39.2%	17.2%	20.9%	8.1%	

I can successfully perform any task assigned to me on my current job.

						SELFEFF1, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	41.5%	43.8%	7.4%	7.0%	0.4%	

I receive useful evaluations of my strengths and weaknesses at work.

						FEEDBK2, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	7.3%	33.2%	23.0%	28.1%	8.4%	

Compared to my colleagues, I am less willing to take risky decisions.

						RISK3, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	0.7%	4.7%	11.7%	47.5%	35.4%	

I can complete the work that is expected of me.

						SELFEFF2, n=274
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	42.3%	44.2%	5.8%	6.6%	1.1%	

All in all, I am satisfied with my job.

						JSAT3, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	43.2%	44.7%	7.0%	4.4%	0.7%	

3. Of the following statements, please choose the one that most accurately describes your agency's communication with external publics: (Mark one box)

EXTCOMM, N=271				
	<i>one way</i>	<i>one way</i>	<i>some listening</i>	<i>two way</i>
	<i>promote & sell</i>	<i>inform</i>	<i>to influence</i>	<i>with listening</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Percent	4.1%	15.0%	29.9%	50.6%

4. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements regarding internal communication in your agency:

(Mark one box in each row).

Downward communication of task performance directives and instructions is adequate.

						INTCOMM1, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	7.7%	49.1%	13.2%	24.5%	5.5%	

Downward communication about the agency's strategic direction is adequate.

						INTCOMM2, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.4%	44.3%	12.8%	23.1%	8.4%	

Downward communication about feedback on work performance is adequate.

						INTCOMM3, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.6%	36.3%	24.2%	26.4%	6.6%	

Upward communication about problems that need attention is adequate.

						INTCOMM4, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.0%	45.8%	17.2%	22.0%	4.0%	

Lateral communication giving emotional support to peers is adequate.

						INTCOMM5, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	12.8%	48.0%	22.3%	13.6%	3.3%	

5. From time to time, state agencies undertake to change the way they do things. Please indicate the extent to which your agency has implemented each of the following over the last four years: (Mark one box in each row).

Note: Missing values likely "No changes considered".

Training programs to improve client or customer service

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	3.7%	10.4%	7.8%	57.3%	20.8%	REINV1, N= 269

Quality improvement programs to encourage team problem solving and to empower employees

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	13.8%	15.7%	11.2%	46.6%	12.7%	REINV2, N= 268

Benchmarks for measuring program outcomes or results

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	5.2%	9.0%	15.7%	50.0%	19.4 %	REINV3, N= 268

Strategic planning that produces clear agency mission statements

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	6.0%	7.1%	14.9%	43.7%	28.4%	REINV4, N= 268

Systems for measuring client or customer satisfaction

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	7.8%	16.8%	16.8%	41.4%	17.2%	REINV5, N= 268

Simplification and relaxation of human resource (personnel) rules

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	47.2%	19.1%	10.1%	20.6%	3.0%	REINV6, N= 267

Increasing manager's discretion to transfer funds or carry over year-end funds

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	73.4%	12.2%	5.3%	7.3%	1.5%	REINV7, N= 262

Privatization of major programs

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	38.1%	31.7%	7.6%	14.7%	7.9%	REINV8, N= 265

Reduction in the number of levels in the agency hierarchy

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	49.1%	16.7%	8.0%	19.4%	6.8%	REINV9, N= 263

Decentralization of decision making to lower organizational levels

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	38.0%	20.2%	6.5%	30.4%	4.9%	REINV10, N= 263

Greater discretion in procurement of goods and supplies

No changes consid.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Chg fully implem.
Percent	56.3%	12.2%	3.4%	22.8%	5.3%	REINV11, N= 263

6. On an overall basis, please rate the effectiveness of your agency in accomplishing its core mission - on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 signifying not effective at all and 10 signifying extremely effective:

(Please enter a number between 0 and 10).

Mean= 7.2	S.D.=1.5	ORGEFF, N=264
------------------	-----------------	----------------------

II. Organizational Rules & Procedures

7. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements: (Mark one box in each row).

People here do the same job in the same way every day.

TROUT1, N=271					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.1%	43.2%	37.3%	11.4%	

There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.

CENTRAL1, N=272					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.9%	29.0%	44.9%	16.2%	

This organization's mission is clear to almost everyone who works here.

GOALAM1, N=271					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	22.1%	48.0%	23.6%	6.3%	

One thing people like around here is the variety of work.

TROUT2, N=272					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	16.9%	55.2%	24.3%	3.7%	

In general, a person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged in this agency.

CENTRAL2, N=273					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.6%	36.6%	44.0%	4.8%	

It is easy to explain the goals of this organization to outsiders.

GOALAM2, N=273					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	26.0%	46.9%	20.5%	6.6%	

Most jobs have something new happening everyday.

TROUT3, N=273					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	15.8%	49.5%	30.4%	4.4%	

Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.

CENTRAL3, N=272					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.3%	17.3%	46.3%	30.2%	

Work tasks are highly specialized in this organization.

TASKSP1, N=271					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	15.9%	49.5%	31.0%	3.7%	

This organization has clearly defined goals.

GOALAM3, N=273					
Strongly agree	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	29.3%	55.0%	12.1%	3.7%	

8. The following statements pertain to flexibility of different systems and procedures in your organization. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. (Mark one box in each row).

Even if a manager is a poor performer, formal rules make it hard to remove him or her from the organization.

HRRT1, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	32.3%	45.1%	7.3%	11.7%	3.7%	

The rules governing promotion make it hard for a good manager to move up faster than a poor one.

HRRT2, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	18.0%	31.9%	12.8%	27.1%	10.3%	

The formal pay structures and rules make it hard to reward a good manager with higher pay here.

HRRT3, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	55.7%	31.5%	3.7%	7.0%	2.2%	

The personnel rules and procedures that govern my organization make it easy for superiors to reward subordinates for good performance.

HRRT4, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	3.7%	12.8%	8.4%	34.4%	40.7%	

Top managers in this agency are allowed to communicate freely with reporters.

COMRT1, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	12.1%	20.2%	10.6%	26.7%	30.4%	

Communication within my agency is restricted by policies and procedures.

COMRT2, n=273						
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.4%	27.5%	13.2%	37.0%	11.0%	

Communication with other government agencies is restricted by policies and procedures.

						COMRT3, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	5.5%	19.8%	13.9%	39.2%	21.6%	

The rules and procedures governing purchasing/procurement in my organization make it easy for managers to purchase goods and services.

						PROCRT1, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	1.5%	16.1%	17.2%	35.2%	30.0%	

Due to standard procedures, procurement is based more on the vendor's ability to comply with rules than on the quality of goods and services.

						PROCRT2, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.6%	34.7%	26.2%	22.5%	7.0%	

The rules governing procurement make it hard to expedite purchase of goods and services for a critical project.

						PROCRT3, n=271
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	29.5%	36.5%	12.9%	15.5%	5.5%	

Rules and procedures on preparation of information system reports ensure that managers receive timely information.

						ISRT1, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.6%	33.1%	20.2%	32.7%	7.4%	

Procedural requirements for information system requests make it difficult for managers to obtain relevant information.

						ISRT2, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.2%	31.1%	17.6%	34.4%	7.7%	

There is very little overlap in different reports produced by the agency information systems.

						ISRT3, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	4.4%	23.5%	20.6%	39.7%	11.8%	

Budgetary rules and procedures limit manager's ability to reprogram funds in accordance with agency mission.

						BUDRT1, n=273
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	27.5%	47.6%	11.4%	11.4%	2.2%	

Budgeting policies and procedures are effective in ensuring that agency funds are used for intended purposes only.

						BUDRT2, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	24.6%	47.8%	14.0%	10.7%	2.9%	

The budgeting rules and procedures limit manager's ability to deal with unexpected program/project cost overruns.

						BUDRT3, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	21.0%	46.3%	15.4%	16.2%	1.1%	

9. If red tape is defined as burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's performance, please assess the level of red tape in your organization: (Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying no red tape and 10 signifying the highest level of red tape)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
6.4	2.0	REDLEVEL, N=272

10. Please assess the extent of hierarchical authority in your organization:

(Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying few layers of authority and 10 signifying the many layers of authority)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
6.0	2.2	LEVELS, N=272

11. Please assess the extent of record keeping in your organization:

Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying few records kept and 10 signifying a great many records kept.

Mean	Std. Dev.	
8.1	1.8	RECORDS, N=273

12. Of the red tape that your organization faces, approximately what percentage comes from each of the following sources: (Your best estimate will do; Percentages should add up to 100).

Federal sources

Mean	Std. Dev.	
46.2	19.1	FEDRT, N=268

State Sources outside of your agency

Mean	Std. Dev.	
32.9	14.1	STATERT, N=268

Sources within your agency

Mean	Std. Dev.	
21.3	13.9	AGENCYRT, N=265

13. Generally speaking, would you say that your organization has:

(Mark one box).

	Too many	Too few	About right	
	1	-1	0	
Percent	57.9%	2.2%	39.9%	NUMRULE, N=271

14. On average, in your assessment what is the negative impact of red tape your organization faces, on each of the groups listed below: (Mark one box in each row).

Clients or citizens served

						RTIMPCT1, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	21.1%	33.8%	38.2%	13.6%	2.2%	

Managers in the agency

						RTIMPCT2, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	15.1%	42.3%	34.6%	7.7%	0.4%	

Non-managerial employees of this agency

						RTIMPCT3, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.0%	32.7%	37.1%	16.9%	2.2%	

Managers in other agencies

						RTIMPCT4, n=272
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	4.8%	20.6%	43.0%	26.8%	4.8%	

Contractors and vendors

						RTIMPCT5, n=270
Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.1%	42.6%	34.8%	10.0%	1.5%	

15. For each of the following activities, please indicate how much time (*in weeks*) is typically required between the time a request is made and the actual approval of the request. (Write NA, for "not applicable," if particular activity not undertaken in your agency):

Hiring a full-time employee

Mean	Std. Dev.	
9.5	8.0	DELAY1, N= 266

Firing a full-time employee

Mean	Std. Dev.	
29.3	39.1	DELAY2, N= 239

Reorganizing an organizational unit

Mean	Std. Dev.	
19.9	25.5	DELAY3, N= 255

*Buying low cost goods or services
(Between \$1,000 and \$10,000)*

Mean	Std. Dev.	
3.5	3.4	DELAY4, N= 255

*Buying high cost goods or services
(over \$10,000)*

Mean	Std. Dev.	
9.6	8.2	DELAY5, N= 251

Contracting out projects (over \$50,000)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
18.1	16.0	DELAY6, N= 250

III. Public Service Environment and Related Issues

16. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

(Circle one number in each row of numbers)

The most important things I do are involved with my job.

								JCLI1, N=271
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	14.4%	24.7%	20.7%	16.2%	12.2%	7.4%	4.4%	

This organization deserves my loyalty.

								COMMIT1, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	28.6%	31.1%	17.2%	13.9%	5.9%	1.5%	1.8%	

I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.

								COMMIT2, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	14.3%	30.8%	23.8%	12.5%	9.2%	5.5%	4.0%	

I owe a great deal to my organization.

								COMMIT3, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	10.6%	23.4%	27.0%	20.5%	7.7%	7.3%	3.3%	

I enjoy my work more than anything else I do.

								JCLI2, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	1.8%	13.2%	25.0%	20.5%	19.0%	10.6%	9.9%	

It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

								COMMIT4, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	12.1%	16.9%	21.6%	14.3%	15.0%	12.8%	7.3%	

Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

								COMMIT5, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	8.4%	12.8%	16.9%	16.5%	17.2%	17.6%	10.6%	

I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

								COMMIT6, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	6.6%	11.7%	12.8%	15.0%	13.2%	18.7%	22.0%	

The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.

								JCLI3, N=273
Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	2.2%	6.6%	13.9%	23.1%	18.7%	18.0%	17.6%	

17. Please indicate how important you personally consider each of the following aspects of your job: (Circle one number in each row)

Job Security

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	2.9%	8.1%	15.4%	37.7%	35.9%	JOBSEC, N= 273

High Income

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	1.1%	9.2%	27.2%	45.2%	17.3%	INCOME, N=272

Good opportunities for advancement

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	8.5%	13.7%	25.1%	34.0%	18.8%	PROMOT, N=271

Freedom to adopt your own approach to job

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	0.4%	2.9%	10.6%	39.9%	46.2%	FREEDOM, N=273

Opportunities to learn new skills through training

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	4.0%	8.4%	24.2%	33.7%	29.7%	LEARNTRG, N= 273

Opportunities to help others

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	0.4%	3.3%	8.8%	36.6%	50.9%	HELPOTH, N=273

Opportunities to be useful to society

Not important	1	2	3	4	5	Important
Percent	0.4%	4.0%	6.6%	32.6%	56.4%	HELPSOC, N=273

18. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding public service or politics:

(Mark one box in each row).

Politics is a dirty word.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	6.6%	26.7%	23.1%	28.6%	15.0%	PSM1, N=273

I consider public service my civic duty.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	25.4%	37.1%	23.5%	10.3%	3.7%	PSM2, N=272

I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	30.8%	54.6%	11.0%	2.6%	1.1%	PSM3, N=273

The give and take of public policy making does not appeal to me.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	3.3%	17.6%	16.9%	44.7%	17.6%	PSM4, N=273

I unselfishly contribute to my community.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	10.7%	42.7%	33.8%	10.7%	2.2%	PSM5, N=272

Meaningful public service is very important to me.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	31.5%	52.4%	11.7%	3.3%	1.1%	PSM6, N=273

I don't care much for politicians.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	12.1%	27.1%	26.7%	24.9	9.2%	PSM7, N=273

It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.8%	44.3%	23.1%	19.4%	4.4%	PSM8, N=273

I am often reminded by daily events how dependent we are on one another.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	33.7%	53.5%	11.0%	1.8%	0.0%	PSM9, N=273

The underprivileged bring their problems on themselves.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	0.4%	5.1%	12.5%	45.8%	36.3%	PSM10, N=273

I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	3.3%	20.3%	18.5%	40.2%	17.7%	PSM11, N=271

19. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (Mark one box in each row).

Most elected officials in our state trust the agency.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	8.1%	39.9%	15.4%	29.7%	7.1%	POLSUP1, N=273

Most elected officials are very critical of the agency.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	7.3%	28.2%	18.0%	37.4%	9.2%	POLSUP2, N=273

Most elected officials believe that the agency is competent.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	11.8%	45.8%	19.1%	20.9%	2.6%	POLSUP3, N=273

Most elected officials believe that the agency is effective.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	9.5%	44.7%	23.1%	21.3%	1.5%	POLSUP4, N=273

Our agency can provide services the public needs.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	63.7%	31.5%	2.6%	1.8%	0.4%	CUSTORI1, N=273

Our agency can satisfy public needs.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	32.2%	48.0%	7.3%	9.2%	3.3%	CUSTORI2, N=273

Our agency can provide high quality of public service.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	43.2%	50.6%	4.4%	1.5%	0.4%	CUSTORI3, N=273

Our agency can reduce criticism from citizens and clients.

Strongly agree	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Strongly disagree
Percent	20.2%	57.5%	14.7%	7.0%	0.7%	CUSTORI4, N=273

20. The following questions deal with how much influence different institutions or individuals exert over your agency. (Please circle a number in each row).

President

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	5.5%	22.1%	29.8%	25.0%	17.6%	POLINF1, N=272

U.S. Congress

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	0.7%	4.8%	22.4%	36.4%	35.7%	POLINF2, N=272

Federal Courts

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	2.9 %	13.2%	27.6%	34.9%	21.3%	POLINF3, N=272

Federal Agencies

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	0.0%	0.7%	6.3%	33.6%	59.4%	POLINF4, N=271

Governor

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	0.4%	1.1%	6.6%	22.8%	69.1%	POLINF5, N=272

State Legislature

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	0.7%	1.8%	4.8%	19.9%	72.8%	POLINF6, N=272

State Courts

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	3.7%	8.8%	25.4%	40.1%	22.1%	POLINF7, N=272

Business Groups

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	8.5%	28.3%	37.9%	22.1%	3.3%	POLINF8, N=272

Client Groups

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	1.1%	8.5%	33.8%	46.3%	10.3%	POLINF9, N=272

Agency Head

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	0.4%	0.4%	5.9%	22.9%	70.5%	POLINF10, N=271

Public Opinion

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	1.5%	5.5%	35.1%	47.6%	10.3%	POLINF11, N=271

Media

No influence	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Great influence
Percent	1.1%	10.7%	39.5%	36.2%	12.6%	POLINF12, N=271

21. Are you member of a professional society (e.g. ASPA, APHSA, APHA, AMA, ANA etc.)? (Mark one box).

	No	Yes	PROF1, N= 274
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	50.4%	49.6%	

(Mark all that apply to the primary Professional Societies you belong to)

I attended most meetings of the professional society in the last 2 years.

	No	Yes	PROF2, N= 274
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	67.9%	30.1%	

I am an officeholder in the professional society.

	No	Yes	PROF3, N= 274
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	86.9%	13.1%	

I have made presentations at recent professional society meetings.

	No	Yes	PROF4, N= 274
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	76.6%	23.4%	

IV. Decision Making

22. Think of the important decisions that your organization has made over the past year. Briefly describe the last major decision that you participated in: (decdx)

23. Please provide the following information regarding this decision:

Number of agency employees, including yourself, contributing to the decision

Mean	Std. Dev.	
16.7	13.9	DECINT, N=244

Number of outside groups or individuals contributing to the decision

Mean	Std. Dev.	
16.5	40.8	DECEXT, N=232

Time elapsed between issue identification and decision

Mean	Std. Dev.	
7.0	8.6	DECTIME, N=243

Level of Red tape faced in the decision: (Please enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying no red tape and 10 signifying the highest level of red tape).

Mean	Std. Dev.	
5.6	2.8	DECRT, N=243

Were the information and analysis needs adequately met? (Mark one box).

	Not at all	Largely met	Somewhat unmet	Completely met	
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Percent	1.2%	7.4%	49.8%	41.6%	DECINF, N=243

Number of interruptions in the decision process: (Mark one box).

	None	Few	Many	Too many	
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Percent	5.0%	49.6%	39.7%	5.8%	DECINTRP, N=242

Please rate the importance of the following in the decision process (**Circle a number in each row**)

Cost Effectiveness

Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	42.5%	26.3%	14.6%	6.5%	2.8%	3.2%	4.1%	DECCRIT1, N=247

Fairness

Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	23.1%	25.9%	21.5%	13.4%	7.3%	4.1%	4.9%	DECCRIT2, N=247

Technical feasibility

Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	30.1%	31.3%	17.9%	10.6%	4.5%	2.9%	2.9%	DECCRIT3, N=246

Usefulness

Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	43.9%	32.9%	12.9%	4.5%	2.9%	2.4%	1.2%	DECCRIT4, N=246

Support from agency leadership

Important	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Not important
Percent	51.8%	29.6%	10.1%	4.9%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%	DECCRIT5, N=247

24. Please think about the characteristics of the major decision you described. Each of the following rows presents a characteristic with two phrases, each describing an extreme polarity of the characteristic. (Circle a number between the two phrases for each characteristic of the decision)

	<i>Reflects Self</i>								<i>Reflects Situation</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	1.3%	3.9%	9.9%	7.3%	16.7%	8.2%	19.7%	15.9%	16.7%	CDS2, N=233

	<i>Managable by you</i>								<i>Not Managable by you</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	3.4%	15.3%	19.5%	14.0%	15.3%	7.2%	10.2%	7.6%	7.6%	CDS2, N=236

	<i>Permanent</i>								<i>Temporary</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	13.7%	18.9%	18.0%	8.6%	19.7%	8.6%	7.3%	3.0%	2.2%	CDS3, N=237

	<i>You can regulate</i>								<i>You cannot</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	5.5%	12.3%	17.0%	12.8%	19.2%	8.5%	9.8%	7.2%	7.7%	CDS4, N=235

	<i>Others have control</i>								<i>Others have no control</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	5.6%	16.2%	22.2%	12.4%	24.4%	7.7%	6.8%	3.0%	1.7%	CDS5, N=234

	<i>Inside of you</i>								<i>Outside of you</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	0.9%	3.4%	10.3%	7.3%	23.6%	10.3%	14.2%	15.0%	15.0%	CDS6, N=233

	<i>Stable over time</i>								<i>Variable over time</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	3.4%	11.2%	17.6%	9.9%	17.6%	8.6%	14.2%	11.2%	6.4%	CDS7, N=233

	<i>Under power of others</i>								<i>Not under others' power</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	9.8%	15.7%	25.1%	14.9%	17.5%	6.8%	6.4%	3.4%	0.4%	CDS8, N=235

	<i>Something about you</i>								<i>Something about others</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	0.4%	2.2%	5.7%	7.9%	24.1%	9.7%	21.5%	16.2%	12.3%	CDS9, N=228

	<i>Over which you have power</i>								<i>Over which you have no power</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	2.6%	7.8%	15.1%	19.8%	20.7%	11.6%	8.6%	9.5%	4.3%	CDS10, N=232

	<i>Un-changeable</i>								<i>Change-able</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	1.7%	3.0%	4.7%	5.6%	22.3%	14.2%	24.9%	15.0%	8.6%	CDS11, N=233

	<i>Others can regulate</i>								<i>Others cannot regulate</i>	
	(9)	(8)	(7)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Percent	5.6%	16.3%	18.0%	19.7%	22.8%	5.2%	6.9%	3.9%	1.7%	CDS12, N=233

V. Information Systems

25. When did your agency first develop and post a public web site?

(Your best estimate will do) SKIP to 28 if agency has no public web site

	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Years ago	4.3	2.0	WEBSITE, N=260

26. How helpful has your agency's web site been in improving your organization's ability to do the following activities? (Circle a number for each row)

Providing citizens opportunities to comment or question agency policies & decisions

							WEBHELP1, N=263	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	10.7%	17.1%	14.1%	17.5%	18.3%	13.7%	8.8%	

Providing information on agency policies & decisions to external groups

							WEBHELP2, N=263	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	1.9%	5.7%	10.7%	13.7%	18.3%	28.1%	21.7%	

Improving the quality and timeliness of services to clients

							WEBHELP3, N=264	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	12.1%	18.9%	20.8%	15.9%	17.4%	8.7%	6.1%	

Involving stakeholders in decision-making processes

							WEBHELP4, N=263	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	15.2%	20.5%	18.6%	20.5%	17.1%	6.1%	1.9%	

Coordinating activities with other agencies

							WEBHELP5, N=264	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	16.7%	23.9%	17.1%	20.1%	14.8%	5.0%	2.7%	

Sharing information with other agencies

							WEBHELP6, N=264	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	3.0%	5.7%	10.6%	13.3%	26.9%	22.4%	18.2%	

Improving cost effectiveness of agency work

							WEBHELP7, N=264	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	14.4%	17.8%	11.0%	20.8%	17.1%	9.5%	9.5%	

Streamlining operational procedures

							WEBHELP8, N=262	
Not at all	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	A great deal
Percent	15.7%	24.4%	11.1%	18.0%	15.7%	7.6%	7.6%	

27. Compared with similar agencies, how advanced is your agency in developing internet-based solutions: (Mark one box in each row)

Placing citizen services (transactions) on the internet

Far behind	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Far ahead
Percent	17.9%	32.1%	17.9%	26.3%	5.7%	TECHRNK1, N=262

Provision of information to citizens on the internet

Far behind	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Far ahead
Percent	3.4%	15.2%	35.6%	37.9%	8.0%	TECHRNK2, N=264

Interactive communication with citizens using the internet

Far behind	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Far ahead
Percent	16.7%	31.9%	27.0%	20.2%	4.2%	TECHRNK3, N=263

Procurement of agency supplies using the internet

Far behind	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Far ahead
Percent	22.4%	29.8%	32.9%	11.0%	3.9%	TECHRNK4, N=255

Contracting for agency services using the internet

Far behind	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Far ahead
Percent	26.0%	29.1%	29.5%	12.6%	2.8%	TECHRNK5, N=264

28. Does your agency have an intranet?

Note: Intranet is a private internal network, that functions just like the internet, except that external parties can not access its contents. (Mark one box)

If No, SKIP to 31

	No	Yes	INTRANET, N=268
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	13.4%	86.6%	

Approximately what percent of employees have intranet access? (In percent)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
91.5	17.8	INTRAPCT, N=212

Please rate the extent to which employees rely on the intranet to perform their job:
(Enter a number between 1 and 7 with 1= Low and 7= High)

							INTRAUSE, N=205	
Low	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	High
Percent	9.8%	16.6%	19.5%	9.3%	19.5%	12.2%	13.2%	

29. To what extent has the intranet changed things for the better or worse for your organization in the following areas: (Mark one box in each row)

The ability of your organization to do its work well

Much Better	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Much Worse
Percent	15.1%	62.3%	21.6%	1.01%	0%	INTRA1, N=229

The level of coordination among individuals in your organization

Much Better	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Much Worse
Percent	19.7%	52.0%	28.4%	0.0%	0%	INTRA2, N=229

The level of coordination among different units of your organization

Much Better	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Much Worse
Percent	16.7%	50.9%	32.0%	0.4%	0%	INTRA3, N=228

The ability of your organization to be cost effective

Much Better	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Much Worse
Percent	12.3%	41.0%	44.5%	2.2%	0%	INTRA4, N=227

The ability of your organization to serve clients

Much Better	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Much Worse
Percent	13.2%	48.5%	37.0%	1.3%	0%	INTRA5, N=227

30. How would you rate the information available on the intranet on the following dimensions: (Circle a number in each row)

Accuracy of Information

Low	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	High
Percent	1.3%	4.9%	15.5%	50.4%	27.8%	INFRAT1, N=226

Availability of Information

Low	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	High
Percent	1.8%	6.6%	25.6%	41.0%	25.1%	INFRAT2, N=227

Accessibility of information (e.g. in easy-to-retrieve formats)

Low	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	High
Percent	2.2%	8.8%	20.7%	49.5%	23.8%	INFRAT3, N=227

Timeliness of information

Low	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	High
Percent	3.5%	9.3%	28.2%	44.9%	14.1%	INFRAT4, N=227

VI. Demographics

31. Please provide the following details: (Your best estimate will do):

Total number of employees in your agency:

Mean	Std. Dev.	
6028	6150	*FULLEMP, N=274

Total number of managerial employees:

Mean	Std. Dev.	
362	632	*MGREMP, N=263

Number of employees reporting directly to you:

Mean	Std. Dev.	
42.3	154.9	SPAN, N=264

Number of programs operated by your agency:

Mean	Std. Dev.	
45.3	93.6	*PROGRAMS, N=266

Your agency's total budget this year, from all sources:

Mean	Std. Dev.	
3436	4146	*TOTBUD, N=272

32. Please indicate the percentage of total budget spent on contracts for goods and services with each of the following: (Note: Percentages should add up to 100; Your best estimate will do.) * Question phrasing may have made it hard to answer this question.

private organizations

Mean	Std. Dev.	
39.4	27.6	CONPCT1, N=167

govt. organizations

Mean	Std. Dev.	
33.7	27.3	CONPCT2, N=164

non-profit organizations

Mean	Std. Dev.	
26.2	22.6	CONPCT3, N=163

33. Which of the following programs does your agency operate: (Mark all that apply)

Medicaid (FFS)

	No	Yes	
	(0)	(1)	
Frequency	62	212	*FFSMA, N= 274
Percent	22.6	77.4%	

Medicaid (Managed Care)

	No	Yes	
	(0)	(1)	
Frequency	61	213	*MCMA, N= 274
Percent	22.3%	77.7%	

SCHIP

	No	Yes	
	(0)	(1)	
Frequency	77	197	*SCHIP, N= 274
Percent	28.1%	71.9%	

TANF

	No	Yes	
	(0)	(1)	
Frequency	55	219	*TANF, N= 274
Percent	20.1%	79.9%	

Public Health

	No	Yes	
	(0)	(1)	
Frequency	188	86	*PUBHLTH, N= 274
Percent	68.6%	31.4%	

Other
(Specify)

(othprb)
(othname)

34. In what year were you born:

AGE defined as (2002-birthx)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
49.9	7.6	BIRTHX, N= 266

**35. How many years have you worked for this organization:
(In yrs)**

Mean	Std. Dev.	
15.4	10.7	ORGTIMEX, N=268

36. How many years have you been in your present position:
(In yrs)

Mean	Std. Dev.	
5.2	4.5	JOBTIMEX, N=269

37. Please indicate the number of years of experience you have in each of the following settings: (Your best estimate will do): (In years)

Public

Mean	Std. Dev.	
21.0	9.8	EXPPUB, N=269

Non-Profit

Mean	Std. Dev.	
1.5	3.7	EXPNP, N=269

Private

Mean	Std. Dev.	
5.1	7.2	EXPPR, N=194

38. Are you male or female? (Mark one box)

	Male	Female	
	(0)	(1)	
Percent	53.4 %	46.6%	GENDER, N=268

39. Which of the following best describes your highest educational level:
(Mark one box)

	Some college	Bachelor's	MPA (or Public Affairs, Public Policy)	Other Graduate Degree (Specify)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Percent	9.0%	40.7%	16.8%	33.6%	EDUC, N=268

Specify "other" graduate degree

(degname)

40. Do you consider yourself to be: (Mark one box)

	Hispanic	Black	White	Asian	Other (Specify)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	RACE, N=267
Percent	4.5%	6.0%	85.8%	2.3%	1.5%	

Specify "other" race?

(racname)

41. Which of the following categories best describes your income from the agency during the last year: (Mark one box)

	< \$50K	\$50-75K	\$75-100K	\$100-150K	\$150K +	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Percent	12.6%	41.8%	35.4%	10.3%	0%	INCOME2, N=263

**Data Policy
For
The National Administrative Studies Project (NASP-II):
A National Survey of Managers in State Health and Human
Service Agencies**

The use of data compiled under this project (referred to as NASP-II) is subject to conditions set forth in this policy statement. First, and foremost, all users of the data have an affirmative obligation to safeguard the confidentiality of survey respondents. Obviously, this means that the data should be stored in well-secured media and environments such that unauthorized persons do not have access to it. This affirmative obligation also requires researchers to abide by the following guidelines (Use of NASP-II data is viewed as unconditional acceptance to abide by these guidelines):

1. NASP-II data may be used only for performing statistical analyses at an aggregate level.
2. Researchers should make no attempt to identify individual respondent(s). Furthermore, any inadvertent discovery in this regard should be reported immediately to the Project Director.
3. No attempt should be made to link NASP-II dataset with other dataset(s) containing individually identifiable information on human subjects.

Policy on Academic Use(s) of the Data:

Academic use of the data is defined as use of NASP-II data to produce journal articles, conference papers, books, and book chapters. In keeping with the project goal of advancing empirical research on public management and health policy and facilitating development of cumulative knowledge in those fields, the NASP-II data will be made public domain following two periods of

exclusive use (PEU).

During PEU-I, the Project Director and collaborating researchers will use the data. This will be followed by a PEU-II during which data may be made available to select researchers. Public management and health policy researchers must contact and obtain written authorization from the Project Director to use the data during PEU-II. During PEU-II, preference will be given to scholars who have been associated with prior NASP activities.

Data use, during PEU-I and PEU-II, is subject to following conditions:

1. In order to coordinate efforts in an optimal manner, avoid duplication and maintain an institutional history of NASP, researchers are asked to consult with the Project Director when initiating new projects that make use of NASP-II data.
2. Data is made available for individual use only and researchers are prohibited from distributing (either for free or selling) the database to a third party.
3. Computer files on NASP-II data and related documentation are provided on an “as is” basis and no warranties are made. Users are encouraged to use virus detection and elimination software prior to using NASP-II files. The user as a condition of receiving and using NASP-II files agrees to hold harmless the NASP-II project and Project Director for any perceived or real consequent damage.
4. Due acknowledgments of study sponsors and project administration should be made in all products based on NASP-II data. At a minimum the following suggested language needs to be incorporated as part of authors’ note: **“Data analyzed in this paper were collected under the auspices of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP-II), a project partially funded by the Center for State Health Policy and the Forum for Policy Research and Public Service at Rutgers University. Sanjay K. Pandey, Ph.D., of the**

Department of Public Policy and Administration at Rutgers University, is the Principal Investigator and Project Director for NASP-II. Opinions expressed in the paper are not necessarily shared by the NASP-II project leadership and / or Rutgers University.”

NASP-II Database Listing of Contents Procedure

NOTE: The database has 70+ variables that are not part of the survey questionnaire.

Data Set Name: NASP2.NASPV202	Observations: 274
Member Type: DATA	Variables: 290
Engine: V8	Indexes: 0
Created: 21:14 Monday, May 5, 2003	Observation Length: 2744
Last Modified: 21:14 Monday, May 5, 2003	Deleted Observations: 0
Protection:	Compressed: NO
Data Set Type:	Sorted: NO
Label: Version 2.02 NASP-II w/ Q22 Decision Coded	

-----Alphabetic List of Variables and Attributes-----

#	Variable	Type	Len	Pos	Label
61	ADJHR	Num	8	456	correct hr scores for each state, adjusted to exclude questions answered with a zero
287	AGE	Num	8	680	
290	AGENCY	Char	56	1817	
147	AGENCYRT	Num	8	560	Q12c - %red tape from within agency
275	BIRTHX	Num	6	2719	Q34 - year of birth
32	BLACK	Num	8	224	percentage of pop census 2000
139	BUDRT1	Num	6	2005	Q8n - budgetary red tape
140	BUDRT2	Num	6	2011	Q8o - budgetary red tape
141	BUDRT3	Num	6	2017	Q8p - budgetary red tape
71	BURCULT1	Num	4	712	Q1c - bureaucratic culture (IP Model)
75	BURCULT2	Num	4	728	Q1g - bureaucratic culture (IP Model)
79	BURCULT3	Num	4	744	Q1k - bureaucratic culture (IP Model)
45	BUS2	Num	8	328	business entrepreneurship measure from King
30	CAPAC00	Num	8	208	2000 overall state capacity grades from the GPP 1=F 12=A
29	CAPAC98	Num	8	200	1998 overall state capacity grades from the GPP 1=F 12=A
52	CASELD96	Num	8	384	tanf caseload jan 96 from book of states 2002
54	CASERED	Num	8	400	caseload reductions between jan 1996 and sept 2001
53	CASLD01	Num	8	392	tanf caseload sept 01 from book of states 2002
223	CDS1	Num	6	2425	Q24a - CDS-II scale: you vs. situation
224	CDS2	Num	6	2431	Q24b - CDS-II scale: manageable by you vs. not
225	CDS3	Num	6	2437	Q24c - CDS-II scale: perm vs. temp
226	CDS4	Num	6	2443	Q24d - CDS-II scale: can vs. cannot regulate
227	CDS5	Num	6	2449	Q24e - CDS-II: others have control vs. not
228	CDS6	Num	6	2455	Q24f - CDS-II: inside vs. outside of you
229	CDS7	Num	6	2461	Q24g - CDS-II: stable vs. variable over time
230	CDS8	Num	6	2467	Q24h - CDS-II: under others power vs. not
231	CDS9	Num	6	2473	Q24i - CDS-II: you vs. others
232	CDS10	Num	6	2479	Q24j - CDS-II: under your power vs. not
233	CDS11	Num	6	2485	Q24k - CDS-II: unchangeable vs. changable
234	CDS12	Num	6	2491	Q24l - CDS-II: others can

				vs. cannot regulate
117	CENTRAL1	Num	6	1873 Q7b - centralization
120	CENTRAL2	Num	6	1891 Q7e - centralization
123	CENTRAL3	Num	6	1909 Q7h - centralization
15	CITIDEO1	Num	8	88 citizen ideology by state 1999 et al
161	COMMIT1	Num	6	2065 Q16b - normative org. commitment
162	COMMIT2	Num	6	2071 Q16c - normative org. commitment
163	COMMIT3	Num	6	2077 Q16d - normative org. commitment
165	COMMIT4	Num	6	2089 Q16f - Continuance org. commitment
166	COMMIT5	Num	6	2095 Q16g - Continuance org. commitment
167	COMMIT6	Num	6	2101 Q16h - Continuance org. commitment
130	COMRT1	Num	6	1951 Q8e - communication red tape
131	COMRT2	Num	6	1957 Q8f - communication red tape
132	COMRT3	Num	6	1963 Q8g - communication red tape
266	CONPCT1	Num	6	2677 Q32a - % contracts with private
267	CONPCT2	Num	6	2683 Q32b - % contracts with govt.
268	CONPCT3	Num	8	632 Q32c - % contracts with non-profit
191	CUSTORI1	Num	6	2245 Q19e - customer orientation
192	CUSTORI2	Num	6	2251 Q19f - customer orientation
193	CUSTORI3	Num	6	2257 Q19g - customer orientation
194	CUSTORI4	Num	6	2263 Q19h - customer orientation
288	DAYS	Num	8	688 Days after 1st mailing
2	DECBCT	Num	8	0 Q22 Dummy Code - Budget Cut
3	DECCC	Num	8	8 Q22 Dummy Code - Cost Containment
5	DECCOM	Num	8	24 Q22 Dummy Code - Communication
218	DECCRIT1	Num	6	2395 Q23g - cost effectiveness
219	DECCRIT2	Num	6	2401 Q23h - fairness
220	DECCRIT3	Num	6	2407 Q23i - technical feasibility
221	DECCRIT4	Num	6	2413 Q23j - usefulness
222	DECCRIT5	Num	6	2419 Q23k - leadership support
211	DECDX	Char	255	962 Q22 - major decision description
213	DECEXT	Num	6	2371 Q23b - number of non-agency participants
4	DECHR	Num	8	16 Q22 Dummy Code - Personnel
216	DECINF	Num	6	2383 Q23e - degree to which info. needs met
212	DECINT	Num	6	2365 Q23a - number of agency participants
217	DECINTRP	Num	6	2389 Q23f - number of interruptions
7	DECIS	Num	8	40 Q22 Dummy Code - Info. Sys.
6	DECPROC	Num	8	32 Q22 Dummy Code - Procurement
8	DECPROG	Num	8	48 Q22 Dummy Code - Prog. Des.
9	DECREORG	Num	8	56 Q22 Dummy Code - Reorganization
215	DECRT	Num	8	616 Q23d - decision red tape
214	DECTIME	Num	6	2377 Q23c - decision time in months
283	DEGNAME	Char	200	1417 Q39b - name of other graduate degree
154	DELAY1	Num	8	568 Q15a - time to hire f/t employee
155	DELAY2	Num	8	576 Q15b - time to fire f/t employee
156	DELAY3	Num	8	584 Q15c - time to reorganize unit
157	DELAY4	Num	8	592 Q15d - time to buy low cost goods
158	DELAY5	Num	8	600 Q15e - time to buy high cost goods
159	DELAY6	Num	8	608 Q15f - time to contract out large project
16	DENSITY	Num	8	96 Union Density --most recent data (1997) from kellough
70	DEV CULT1	Num	4	708 Q1b - developmental culture (OS Model)
74	DEV CULT2	Num	4	724 Q1f - developmental culture (OS Model)
78	DEV CULT3	Num	4	740 Q1j - developmental culture (OS Model)
49	EARNINS	Num	8	360 2000 fy earnings (from HHS tanf performance measures)
282	EDUC	Num	6	2731 Q39a - level of education
57	ENTREP	Num	8	424 CFED scores on 1-5 scale based on a-f grades, higher score is more entrepreneurial, king
35	ENTRREP	Num	8	248 cfed entrepreneurial energy measure - higher is less entrep, explanation in king
279	EXPNP	Num	8	664 Q37b - years of non-profit exp.
280	EXPPR	Num	8	672 Q37c - years of private exp.

278	EXPPUB	Num	8	656	Q37a - years of public exp.
98	EXTCOMM	Num	4	820	Q3 - ext. comm. style
56	FEDEXP	Num	8	416	HHS federal expenditures on salaries and wages by state FY 2000 000's of dollars
145	FEDRT	Num	8	544	Q12a - %red tape from federal govt.
91	FEEDBK1	Num	4	792	Q2k - feedback
94	FEEDBK2	Num	4	804	Q2n - feedback
269	FFSMA	Num	6	2689	Q33a Ed. - Medicaid FFS
13	FISCCOMF	Num	8	72	fiscal comfort 1999 form tennenwald 1999
12	FISCNEED	Num	8	64	fiscal need 1996 from Tennenwald 1999
172	FREEDOM	Num	6	2131	Q17d - importance of job freedom
261	FULLEMP	Num	6	2647	Q31a Ed. - total number of employees
281	GENDER	Num	6	2725	Q38 - gender
118	GOALAM1	Num	6	1879	Q7c - goal ambiguity R
121	GOALAM2	Num	6	1897	Q7f - goal ambiguity R
125	GOALAM3	Num	6	1921	Q7j - goal ambiguity R
38	GOO_GOO2	Num	8	272	measure of good govt groups from king
21	GOVRPWR	Num	8	136	beyle 2001 measure of govrs power, 1-5, where higher score indicates greater power
69	GRPCULT1	Num	4	704	Q1a - group culture (HR Model)
73	GRPCULT2	Num	4	720	Q1e - group culture (HR Model)
77	GRPCULT3	Num	4	736	Q1i - group culture (HR Model)
26	GSP	Num	8	176	2000 gsp millions of dollars from bureau of economic analysis
27	GSPCAP00	Num	8	184	gsp per capita from bureau of economic analysis 2000
28	GSPCAP01	Num	8	192	gsp per capita from bureau of economic analysis 2001
14	GVTIDEOL	Num	8	80	govt ideology 1999 from berry et al
174	HELPOTH	Num	6	2143	Q17f - importance of opport. to help others
175	HELPSOC	Num	6	2149	Q17g - importance of opport. to help society
31	HISPANIC	Num	8	216	percentage of pop census 2000
126	HRRT1	Num	6	1927	Q8a - personnel red tape
127	HRRT2	Num	6	1933	Q8b - personnel red tape
128	HRRT3	Num	6	1939	Q8c - personnel red tape
129	HRRT4	Num	6	1945	Q8d - personnel red tape R
1	IDCODE	Char	10	896	
170	INCOME	Num	6	2119	Q17b - importance of income
286	INCOME1	Num	4	892	Q41 - income level
257	INFRAT1	Num	6	2623	Q30a - rate intranet accuracy
258	INFRAT2	Num	6	2629	Q30b - rate intranet availability
259	INFRAT3	Num	6	2635	Q30c - rate intranet accessibility
260	INFRAT4	Num	6	2641	Q30d - rate intranet timeliness
99	INTCOMM1	Num	4	824	Q4a - int. comm. - task instructions
100	INTCOMM2	Num	4	828	Q4b - int. comm. - strategic direction
101	INTCOMM3	Num	4	832	Q4c - int. comm. -- feedback
102	INTCOMM4	Num	4	836	Q4d - int. comm.. -- upward
103	INTCOMM5	Num	4	840	Q4e - int. comm. - lateral to peers
252	INTRA1	Num	6	2593	Q29a - intranet usefulness: ability to work well
253	INTRA2	Num	6	2599	Q29b - intranet usefulness: coordination with individuals
254	INTRA3	Num	6	2605	Q29c - intranet usefulness: coordination with units
255	INTRA4	Num	6	2611	Q29d - intranet usefulness: cost-effectiveness
256	INTRA5	Num	6	2617	Q29e - intranet usefulness: client service
249	INTRANET	Num	6	2581	Q28a - agency has intranet
250	INTRAPCT	Num	8	624	Q28b - percent of employees with intranet
251	INTRAUSE	Num	6	2587	Q28c - degree of intranet reliance
136	ISRT1	Num	6	1987	Q8k - information systems red tape R
137	ISRT2	Num	6	1993	Q8l - information systems red tape
138	ISRT3	Num	6	1999	Q8m - information systems red tape R
160	JCLI1	Num	6	2059	Q16a - job involvement

164	JCLI2	Num	6	2083	Q16e - job involvement
168	JCLI3	Num	6	2107	Q16i - job involvement
47	JOENTRY	Num	8	344	2000 fy job entry percentage (from HHS tanf performance measures)
169	JOBSEC	Num	6	2113	Q17a - importance of job security
277	JOBTIMEX	Num	8	648	Q36 - years in position
68	JOBTTYPE	Char	40	922	
81	JSAT1	Num	4	752	Q2a - job satisfaction
88	JSAT2	Num	4	780	Q2h - job satisfaction R
97	JSAT3	Num	4	816	Q2q - job satisfaction
173	LEARNTRG	Num	6	2137	Q17e - importance of learning opportunity
17	LEGISPR2	Num	8	104	Legispro as a percentage (from Kellough)
_The SAS System					
143	LEVELS	Num	8	528	Q10 - hierarchy
270	MCMA	Num	6	2695	Q33d Ed. - Medicaid Managed Care
67	MDCARE00	Num	8	504	total numbers enrolled in medicare HI and/or SMI 2000
66	MDCARE01	Num	8	496	total numbers enrolled in medicare HI and/or SMI 2001
59	MFR	Num	8	440	range of performance information in 2000 mfr documents
262	MGREMP	Num	6	2653	Q31b Ed. - number of managers
58	MILEAGE	Num	8	432	total mileage of highways and roads in 1996, Book of states vol. 32
148	NUMRULE	Num	6	2023	Q13 - number of rules in organization
39	N_FM	Num	8	280	average 1998 financial management state capacity score of neighboring states
40	N_HRM	Num	8	288	average 1998 HRM management state capacity score of neighboring states
41	N_IT	Num	8	296	average 1998 IT management state capacity score of neighboring states
42	N_MFR	Num	8	304	average 1998 MFR management state capacity score of neighboring states
115	ORGEFF	Num	8	512	Q6 - organizational effectiveness
276	ORGTIMEX	Num	8	640	Q35 - years in organization
274	OTHNAME	Char	200	1217	Q33g - other program names
273	OTHPRG	Num	6	2713	Q33f - other programs
20	POLCOMP	Num	8	128	breitschneider measure updated H+S+G, if >1.5, or 3-H+S=G using 2001 book of states data
195	POLINF1	Num	6	2269	Q20a - President influence
196	POLINF2	Num	6	2275	Q20b - Congress influence
197	POLINF3	Num	6	2281	Q20c - Fed. Court influence
198	POLINF4	Num	6	2287	Q20d - Fed. Agency influence
199	POLINF5	Num	6	2293	Q20e - Governor influence
200	POLINF6	Num	6	2299	Q20f - State Legis. influence
201	POLINF7	Num	6	2305	Q20g - State Court influence
202	POLINF8	Num	6	2311	Q20h - Business influence
203	POLINF9	Num	6	2317	Q20i - Client influence
204	POLINF10	Num	6	2323	Q20j - Agency Head influence
205	POLINF11	Num	6	2329	Q20k - Public Opinion influence
206	POLINF12	Num	6	2335	Q20l - Media influence
187	POLSUP1	Num	6	2221	Q19a - political support
188	POLSUP2	Num	6	2227	Q19b - political support
189	POLSUP3	Num	6	2233	Q19c - political support
190	POLSUP4	Num	6	2239	Q19d - political support
133	PROCRT1	Num	6	1969	Q8h - procurement red tape R
134	PROCRT2	Num	6	1975	Q8i - procurement red tape
135	PROCRT3	Num	6	1981	Q8j - procurement red tape
207	PROF1	Num	6	2341	Q21a - member of prof. soc.
208	PROF2	Num	6	2347	Q21b - attend prof. meetings
209	PROF3	Num	6	2353	Q21c - officeholder in prof. soc.
210	PROF4	Num	6	2359	Q21d - presenter at prof. soc.
264	PROGRAMS	Num	6	2665	Q31d Ed. - number of agency programs

171	PROMOT	Num	6	2125	Q17c - importance of advancement opportunity
19	PRO_LEG	Num	8	120	KING'S LEGISLATIVE PROFESSIONALISM
					INDEX (king)
18	PRO_LEG3	Num	8	112	dummy measure of legislative professionalism
					1=NON-PRO; 2=PRO (king)
176	PSM1	Num	6	2155	Q18a - PSM (APP) R
177	PSM2	Num	6	2161	Q18b - PSM (CD)
178	PSM3	Num	6	2167	Q18c - PSM (CD)
179	PSM4	Num	6	2173	Q18d - PSM (APP) R
180	PSM5	Num	6	2179	Q18e - PSM (CD)
181	PSM6	Num	6	2185	Q18f - PSM (CD)
182	PSM7	Num	6	2191	Q18g - PSM (APP) R
183	PSM8	Num	6	2197	Q18h - PSM (Compassion)
184	PSM9	Num	6	2203	Q18i - PSM (Compassion)
185	PSM10	Num	6	2209	Q18j - PSM (Compassion) R
186	PSM11	Num	6	2215	Q18k - PSM (Compassion) R
272	PUBHLTH	Num	6	2707	Q33c Ed. - public health
62	PVRTY1	Num	8	464	percentage of families in poverty 2000
63	PVRTY2	Num	8	472	percentage of families under
					125% of poverty level 2000
284	RACE	Num	6	2737	Q40a - race
285	RACNAME	Char	200	1617	Q40b - specific other race
46	RANNEY2	Num	8	336	UPDATED RANNEY INDEX from King
72	RATCULT1	Num	4	716	Q1d - rational culture (RG Model)
76	RATCULT2	Num	4	732	Q1h - rational culture (RG Model)
80	RATCULT3	Num	4	748	Q1i - rational culture (RG Model)
144	RECORDS	Num	8	536	Q1l - level of record-keeping
142	REDLEVEL	Num	8	520	Q9 - global measure of red tape
104	REINV1	Num	4	844	Q5a - ASAP reinv. - cust. serv. trng.
105	REINV2	Num	4	848	Q5b - ASAP reinv. - QI, team, empower
106	REINV3	Num	4	852	Q5c - ASAP reinv - outcome benchmarks
107	REINV4	Num	4	856	Q5d - ASAP reinv - strat. planning
108	REINV5	Num	4	860	Q5e - ASAP reinv. - cust. serv. measmt.
109	REINV6	Num	4	864	Q5f - ASAP reinv - relax HR rules
110	REINV7	Num	4	868	Q5g - ASAP reinv - carry over funds
111	REINV8	Num	4	872	Q5h - ASAP reinv -- privatization
112	REINV9	Num	4	876	Q5i - ASAP reinv - hierarchy reduction
113	REINV10	Num	4	880	Q5j - ASAP reinv - decentralize DM
114	REINV11	Num	4	884	Q5k - ASAP reinv - procurem. reform
48	RETENT	Num	8	352	2000 fy retention percentage (from
					HHS tanf performance measures)
86	RISK1	Num	4	772	Q2f - risk culture (most employees)
92	RISK2	Num	4	796	Q2l - risk culture (top mgmt)
95	RISK3	Num	4	808	Q2o - Risk Propensity R
90	RISK4	Num	4	788	Q2j - strong top mgmt control
82	ROLEAMB1	Num	4	756	Q2b - role ambiguity
84	ROLEAMB2	Num	4	764	Q2d - role ambiguity
85	ROLEAMB3	Num	4	768	Q2e - role ambiguity
83	ROLECON1	Num	4	760	Q2c - role conflict
87	ROLECON2	Num	4	776	Q2g - role conflict
89	ROLECON3	Num	4	784	Q2i - role conflict
149	RTIMPCT1	Num	6	2029	Q14a - rt impact on clients
150	RTIMPCT2	Num	6	2035	Q14b - rt impact on agency managers
151	RTIMPCT3	Num	6	2041	Q14c rt impact on non-mgr employees
152	RTIMPCT4	Num	6	2047	Q14d rt impact on other-agency managers
153	RTIMPCT5	Num	6	2053	Q14e - rt impact on contractors/vendors
271	SCHIP	Num	6	2701	Q33b Ed. - SCHIP
93	SELF EFF1	Num	4	800	Q2m - self efficacy
96	SELF EFF2	Num	4	812	Q2p - self efficacy
37	SOC_CAP2	Num	8	264	0-1 measure of social capital
					from putnam king
263	SPAN	Num	6	2659	Q31c - numbers of subordinates
11	STATE	Char	8	914	State abbreviation
23	STATEEMP	Num	8	152	number of state employees march 2001 census

10	STATEFUL	Char	8	906	Name of state
	L				
24	STATEPAY	Num	8	160	average monthly pay march 2001 census
25	STATEPOP	Num	8	168	census 2000 state pop in thousands
22	STATERES	Num	8	144	measure of state resources ratio of (difference between state revenue and spending):total spending census 2001, adapted from berry 1994
146	STATERT	Num	8	552	Q12b - %red tape from state govt.
60	STBDGTOT	Num	8	448	same as MFR, but without agency score (just budget and statewide documents)
36	TANF	Num	8	256	average 1998 overall GPP state capacity score of neighboring states
51	TANFBENF	Num	8	376	tanf monthly benefits for family of 3 2001book of states 2002
33	TANFPART	Num	8	232	2000 tanf work part percentage from HHS
55	TANFSPND	Num	8	408	combined fed + state spending on tanf 2000, thousands, HHS office of financial services
124	TASKSP1	Num	6	1915	Q7i - task specialization
44	TAXBUR01	Num	8	320	tax burden 2001, total revenue as a percentage of gsp
43	TAX_L2	Num	8	312	tax burden from king 1996
244	TECHRNK1	Num	6	2551	Q27a -Internet ranking: citizen transactions
245	TECHRNK2	Num	6	2557	Q27b - Internet ranking: information to citizens
246	TECHRNK3	Num	6	2563	Q27c - Internet ranking: citizen interactive comm.
247	TECHRNK4	Num	6	2569	Q27d - Internet ranking: agency procurement
248	TECHRNK5	Num	6	2575	Q27e - Internet ranking: agency contracting
34	TNFPRT01	Num	8	240	2001 tanf work participation measure from HHS, absent waiver, all family rates
265	TOTBUD	Num	6	2671	Q31e Ed.- current year budget in millions
116	TROUT1	Num	4	888	Q7a - routineness of technology
119	TROUT2	Num	6	1885	Q7d - routineness of technology R
122	TROUT3	Num	6	1903	Q7g - routineness of technology R
64	UNEMP01	Num	8	480	state unemployment rate from BLS 2001
65	UNEMP02	Num	8	488	state unemployment rate from BLS 2002
289	WAVE	Num	8	696	Response Wave
236	WEBHELP1	Num	6	2503	Q26a - helps citizens with comments & Qs
237	WEBHELP2	Num	6	2509	Q26b - website helps external groups
238	WEBHELP3	Num	6	2515	Q26c - website facilitates quality, timely services
239	WEBHELP4	Num	6	2521	Q26d - website lets stakeholders get involved
240	WEBHELP5	Num	6	2527	Q26e - website helps interagency coordination
241	WEBHELP6	Num	6	2533	Q26f - website helps interagency info-sharing
242	WEBHELP7	Num	6	2539	Q26g - website promotes cost-effectiveness
243	WEBHELP8	Num	6	2545	Q26h - website streamlines procedures
235	WEBSITE	Num	6	2497	Q25 - numbers of years with website
50	WFSUCS	Num	8	368	work force success rate for tanf programs (earnins+retention)/2 2000