

**Public Management and Organizational Performance:
The Impact of Managerial Quality***

Kenneth J. Meier
Department of Political Science and
George Bush School of Government
4348 TAMUS
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843
kmeier@politics.tamu.edu

and

Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr.
School of Public and International Affairs
Baldwin Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
cmsotool@arches.uga.edu

Forthcoming *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21 (Fall 2002).

*This paper is part of an ongoing research agenda on the role of public management in complex policy settings. We have benefitted from the helpful comments of Stuart Bretschneider, Amy Kneedler Donahue, H. George Frederickson, Carolyn Heinrich, Patricia Ingraham, J. Edward Kellough, Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., H. Brinton Milward, Sean Nicholson-Crotty, David Peterson, and Hal G. Rainey on various aspects of this research program. Needless to say, this paper is the responsibility of the authors only. All data and documentation necessary to replicate this analysis can be found at the National Public Management Research Archive [<http://bush.tamu.edu/pubman/>]

Abstract

This paper presents the first large N study of public management quality and its impact on program performance. Using five years of data from over 1000 Texas school districts, we measure quality as the additional salary paid to school superintendents over and above the normal determinants of salary. This measure of managerial quality is positively correlated with ten of eleven performance indicators covering a wide range of organizational goals, everything from standardized tests to school attendance. These relationships hold even in the presence of controls for other determinants of program success. The measure has the potential to be used in tests of existing management theories, thus moving the literature beyond case studies to more systematic large N research.

Public Management and Organizational Performance:

The Impact of Managerial Quality

A basic tenet of public administration is that public management can make the difference between success and failure in the delivery of public policy results (Lynn, 1984). Despite this widespread belief, this notion has rarely been carefully tested. In this study, we develop a measure of managerial quality suitable for certain kinds of empirical settings and then test whether quality management contributes positively to public program performance. Public education, an important policy field, provides the context for the investigation.

This relatively straightforward test of the management-quality hypothesis confronts a number of challenges. The notion of managerial quality itself, although often used in teaching, research, and practice, is seldom clarified in a way that facilitates systematic investigation. Difficulties of measurement on this score have also impeded research. In addition, many other influences shape what happens via public programs, so the research design needs to take into account these realities. The next sections of this article treat these challenges systematically, then our research on the management-quality hypothesis is presented and discussed.

The Gordian Concept of Public Management Quality

As we have indicated in earlier work (O'Toole and Meier, 1999; 2000), the proposition that public management contributes to the performance of government is at the core of a great deal of scholarship; but few systematic efforts have tested for the relationship empirically. The case-study and qualitative literature, on the other hand, indicates that good management can be a

particularly critical contributor to program success (Ban, 1995; Behn, 1991; Cohen and Eimicke, 1995; Doig and Hargrove, 1987; Hargrove and Glidewell, 1990; Holzer and Callahan, 1998; Riccucci, 1995; Thompson and Jones, 1994). Indeed, this body of work suggests multiple and complex channels of managerial influence.

Still, the conceptual issues are immense. A consideration of management's hypothesized impact on program performance, for instance, must incorporate some attention to the notion of leadership, clearly a theme of substantial importance among researchers. But the literature on leadership is huge and complex (see Rainey, 1997). Rainey and Steinbauer's (1999) succinct characterization serves as a daunting reminder of the difficulties of capturing this key notion in a satisfactory and easily measurable form: "[T]he topic of leadership is vast, richly elaborated, and inconclusive Enough listings of desirable leadership skills and qualities could be gathered to build another great pyramid. They vary widely, and none of them can claim conclusive validation" (pp. 18-19).

The growing emphasis on quality and quality management in recent years (see Beam, 2001) overlaps the attention to leadership in public programs. Interestingly, an examination of this theme also reveals an unresolved tension as to what kinds of broad managerial efforts are likely to be most critical for delivering performance. Much of the attention to quality or excellence in recent years, in the U.S. and elsewhere, has focused on the value of "entrepreneurial" management for achieving results. Certainly, the popularity of Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) volume illustrates this point, and the National Performance Review of the Clinton years — a reform effort with direct intellectual ties to the same perspective — reflected a similar emphasis (Gore, 1993; see Rainey, 1997, pp. 366-68). The New Public Management,

more broadly, emphasizes these themes. And yet some analysts have seen in these approaches a diminished view of management (Lynn, 2001) or one, they argue, likely to limit what public agencies can deliver (see Goodsell, 1993; Moe, 1994). Terry (1995) in particular contends that administrators perform a key function by executing “conservatorship”: preserving established institutional forms and activities that have developed over time and would be difficult to reestablish.

Indeed, while risk-taking, entrepreneurial activities can sometimes bring benefits, protective, conserving efforts can be especially valuable under other circumstances. As we have argued elsewhere, the multiple managerial functions, which likely work through different causal pathways, should all be considered by those who desire to probe the connection between management and performance (O’Toole and Meier, 1999). While this general point may be valid, any systematic effort to explore the link between management and performance across a large number of cases must confront a nearly intractable measurement challenge. If quality public management embraces a multitude of difficult-to-define dimensions and if different strategic approaches and managerial orientations might be appropriate under different difficult-to-specify conditions, how can one test the proposition that good management contributes to good performance across the spectra of cases and circumstances?

The conceptual complexity thus fuels a serious measurement challenge. Recently, the Government Performance Project has developed comprehensive measures of government management systems via a criteria-based approach. Most of this research effort has been devoted to measures of management itself, and management capacity, rather than managerial impacts, although recently some relationships between these measures and managerial (intermediate)

outcomes have been demonstrated (Donahue, Selden, and Ingraham, 2000).

A few additional notes of progress have been sounded in the effort to probe with systematic empirical work the link between elements of public management and ultimate program performance. Wolf (1993) examined subjective assessments of agency leadership and found that these helped explain agency effectiveness. Hennessey (1998) suggested a relationship between public-organizational performance and leadership, defined in terms of Bennis's (1993) four competencies, on the basis of data from nine offices in two federal agencies. His core argument is that leaders help shape organizational culture and, thereby, performance. Attention, however, is directed primarily to reinvention efforts, only secondarily to performance itself. Further, the small number of cases, subjective measurement of leadership features, and lack of controls attenuate the conclusiveness of the work.

Recently, Rainey and Steinbauer (1999) have proposed a “theory of effective government organizations” incorporating a number of features that might explain effectiveness. Several characteristics they analyze are part of, or at minimum closely related to, public management – including the development of human resources, various elements of task design, and — in particular — leadership characterized by certain attributes. Rainey and Steinbauer craft their argument based on a review of existing literature on the likely determinants of effectiveness. While they do no testing, they do “posit” that leadership is likely to “emerge as” among the most important drivers of effectiveness in governmental organizations (p. 28).

Brewer and Selden (2000) recently report a systematic empirical project based on Rainey and Steinbauer's theoretical argument. They explain a large portion of the variance in federal employee perceptions of organizational performance, as interpreted in rather broad terms, across

23 agencies. The model they develop and test includes a leadership and supervision measure, which is positively related to perceptions of performance, although its predictive power is relatively slight. The measure is limited to employee perceptions of how their immediate supervisors rate; and, as Brewer and Selden note, “leadership and supervision may contribute to organizational performance *indirectly*” (p. 704, emphasis in original). Indeed, several other variables they analyze that contribute more to explaining the variance in performance are likely influenced by management as well.

These findings and arguments are provocative, but they are limited in a number of ways and clearly not definitive. Most of the empirical work is cross-sectional, and it is important to test for the impact of public management by incorporating a longitudinal dimension as well. Most of the measures of performance are perceptual and/or intermediate. In addition, the measurements developed thus far capture only a limited part of the concept of quality management as it has been understood by scholars.

If characterizing and measuring managerial quality is challenging, even more demanding is the task of doing so for individuals in specific managerial positions. The general task of individual performance appraisal in the public sector has been notoriously difficult to conduct (Kellough, 2002; see also Murphy and Cleveland, 1995). The approach adopted in the present investigation does not resolve the host of issues under dispute, but it does rely on decisionmaking by knowledgeable political principals in contact with the particular managers whose impact is being analyzed here. To be precise, the method relies on assessments revealed in salary determinations. This approach might seem ironic, since when individual performance appraisals are used in public agencies to determine pay — so-called pay-for-performance systems —

researchers have consistently noted serious flaws (Ingraham, 1993; Rainey, 1997). Under certain conditions and with certain caveats, we argue below, decisions about pay can provide a defensible indirect measure of management quality, particularly given the conceptual and measurement difficulties associated with developing a more direct yet still feasible alternative.

In the next section, we sketch our general approach to measuring managerial quality in the kinds of settings that will be analyzed later: public education in a large, diverse U.S. state. Our focus is on the top managers of public school districts in Texas, school superintendents. We propose an aspect of managerial salary as a reasonable proxy measure for testing the management quality hypothesis. We then note the units of analysis examined, develop the specifics of our empirical measure, and finally model our tests of school-system performance.

Measuring Superintendent Quality

As outlined above, what is needed from public managers seems to vary by program, agency, time, and context. Any simple measure of the quality of management, therefore, is likely to be biased.¹ Those in the best position to know and evaluate what and how managers are doing are knowledgeable observers in the local setting at the time, particularly those with access to information about managerial behavior, organizational morale, environmental demands, and performance results. The strategy in this study is to tap into the judgments of just such a set of individuals who observe the managers -- school system superintendents -- on a day-to-day basis: members of the school board.

¹ Or tautological: Good management is whatever seems retrospectively to have produced good results, a special problem when perceptual measures of both management and performance are used (see Wolf, 1993).

Rather than seeking attitudinal judgements by the school board on management quality (thus merely moving the problems of definition from researchers to practitioners), we assume that actions reveal preferences. Each school board makes an annual assessment of the superintendent's performance and then sets his or her salary for the following year. In that determination, we think that management quality plays a role – not an exclusive role, but a role nonetheless. Similarly, deciding the compensation to offer a new superintendent contains an inherent quality assessment.

Quite clearly political principals face limitations in judging managerial quality – in particular, limitations in access to relevant information. For governmental jurisdictions that perform only one policy function, these limits are less severe. To the extent that principals in such situations are interested in attending to the quality of management in their jurisdictions, they know where to look and are undistracted by competing or overlapping responsibilities. School districts are among the governmental jurisdictions fitting this stipulation.

Furthermore, isolating on the managerial-quality aspect of a superintendent's salary is facilitated by several characteristics of the market for superintendents. That market can be characterized as competitive with substantial information. School-district managerial talent is mobile within the state (and somewhat mobile across states). While some superintendents remain for extended periods in one locale, most individuals typically move among several districts as they pursue their careers. With few exceptions, positions are filled after open searches that are often conducted with the assistance of a search firm. Superintendents seeking to move (the average tenure in Texas is approximately 5.3 years) will know the salary paid the previous superintendent and can access an extensive state data base on the district and its

characteristics. Similarly, the hiring district will have extensive information about how the candidate's current district (or school if they decide to hire a principal) has performed, and assessments of an individual superintendent candidate's management ability are relatively easy to get via the established network of school board members. In short, a manager with a good track record is likely to have several options so that a school district seeking to hire such a manager will need to offer a premium, all other things being equal. There are no regulatory floors or ceilings regarding compensation. The sheer range of salaries in the study (\$35,000 to \$205,228 in 1999 [mean = \$74,400; standard deviation = \$24,087]) supports the notion that market dynamics are at work.

Salary premiums, however, operate within a salary structure that recognizes basic understandings about the job (see Ehrenberg, Chaykowski and Ehrenberg, 1988a;1988b). First, the most significant determinant of salaries, both normatively and empirically, is the size of the district; as the size of the job expands, salaries increase proportionately. Second, human-capital factors such as education, experience and training will result in additional adjustments to salaries. Third, personal characteristics of the individual are likely to affect salaries. Particularly relevant are such factors as race, ethnicity and gender. Although discrimination might play a role here, some districts, such as large inner-city districts, will prefer a minority superintendent for political reasons. Fourth, because the relationship between salaries and performance can be expected to be reciprocal — that is, superintendents could also be rewarded for performance in the past — a control for prior school-district outputs is needed.

Our strategy of analysis is to take variables measuring each of the factors that should influence the manager's salary and use them to predict the manager's actual salary. The residual

from this equation – that is, the portion of the variance in salary not accounted for by job size, human capital, personal characteristics, and past performance – will contain the assessment of managerial quality (for a similar residuals-based measure in a different context see Palmer and Whitten, 1999, p. 629). This measure is quite clearly a messy one since the residual contains all those factors not included in the model such as the ability to sell oneself, experience and renown as a football coach, physical characteristics and other irrelevant factors, as well as the assessment of quality. The impact of this measurement error, however, will attenuate any relationships between a quality measure and organizational outputs (Carmines and Zeller, 1979; Bollen, 1989, pp. 159-167). The measurement error, as a result, creates a bias in favor of null findings.

The Units of Analysis

Our data on public management and performance are for all Texas school districts. U.S. school districts generally, and all districts in this study but one, are independent local governments with their own taxing powers.² While each district determines its own curriculum, policy, and personnel, all districts are subject to both state and federal regulations and receive funds from both sources. The amount of state funding and state control varies from state to state. The state of Texas pays for about 50 percent of education costs, but its oversight focuses on issues of accountability (time in class, testing, attendance, number of courses, and so forth).

Although school districts are the most common public organizations in the United States, they have some distinct characteristics. They are highly professionalized organizations with

²“Independent” in the case of school districts means that the district selects its own governing board (as opposed to having another jurisdiction appoint the board) and it possesses independent taxing power. One district in Texas is a municipal school district; taxing authority in that district rests with the city council.

elaborate certification processes for various occupations. The organizations themselves tend to be decentralized with a great deal of street-level (classroom) discretion. As explained earlier, the compensation scheme for top administrators is relatively distinctive among governmental units. If the findings here are generalizable, they would be applicable to similar types of organizations.

How might a superintendent, a single manager at the top of the hierarchy, actually affect student performance? Our interactions with superintendents, administrators, and teachers suggest several ways. First, superintendents can recruit, train, and reward talented mid-level administrators (school principals) and in some cases teachers. Of particular importance is recruiting individuals who share organizational goals in regard to student standards and approaches to education. Second, superintendents, like all organizational leaders, can motivate employees to invest greater effort in the organization. Superintendents do so by providing and communicating a vision for the organization. They can also generate greater commitment by handling the inevitable problems that arise in the environment; in particular, they can provide political cover for teachers and administrators. Third, superintendents can affect the student learning environment by mandating the adoption of specific educational reforms. The list of possible reforms is endless, and reforms need to be matched to the specific needs of the students and the skills of teaching faculty. Part of this matching process relies on the management ability of the superintendent. Fourth, superintendents can contribute to the predictability and reliability of the system for those who operate within it. They can provide stable processes and avoid the disruptions of policy churn (Hess, 1999) and other activities that interfere with the process of educating children. Finally, superintendents can acquire more resources for the organization. While most of these will then appear in the district's budget, some may be intangible – for

instance, the good will of local business leaders or the support of parent groups.

Measuring Managerial Quality

To generate the residuals-based measure of managerial quality, we use a relatively common salary model from the literature (see Ehrenberg, Chaykowski and Ehrenberg, 1988b). The dependent variable is the logged annual compensation for the superintendent. The log transformation is used to ease the problem of skewed data resulting from the large salaries associated with Texas' megadistricts. The log transformation also permits interpreting the relationships as elasticities. This salary figure only includes the official base salary; it omits the perks some districts offer, such as club memberships, cell phones, and transportation benefits that are not reported to the state of Texas.

Three district characteristics are included as independent variables – the district's total budget, tax rate, and average revenue per student; all three variables are logged. Total district budget is our measure of district size, which should be the strongest predictor in the model. The tax rate is included because some earlier work contends that superintendents are rewarded for keeping taxes low (Ehrenberg, Chaykowski and Ehrenberg, 1988b). Revenue per pupil is a measure of wealth; certain districts will pay higher salaries simply because they can afford to do so. For some districts this decision is a matter of civic pride.

Four human-capital characteristics are included – experience as a superintendent, tenure in the current job, age, and the possession of a doctorate. The first three variables are measured in years; salaries should increase both with total experience as a superintendent (most of this experience will have been in other districts) and time in the current job. Age is commonly

included in models such as these, even though it is considered a surrogate for experience which is already in the model.³ In terms of education, virtually all superintendents have a masters degree (98%), so the most salient distinction is the possession of a doctorate, which should be positively related to salary.

Three personal characteristics are included – whether the superintendent is female, black, or Latino. The predicted signs for these variables are ambiguous, depending on whether a district might see it as an advantage to hire a superintendent with a given demographic. Data on salaries, district characteristics, human capital, and personal characteristics were provided by the Texas Education Agency from their administrative data base.

Finally, we include the prior year's test scores in the model. Because we think managerial quality is affected by prior performance, and because quality then affects future performance; over time, there is reciprocal correlation. We cannot control for prior test scores without adjusting for this endogeneity, or the quality measure's impact will be biased downward. The appropriate method is to purge the reciprocal causation via an instrumental variables technique. We do this using six student characteristics and district resources (percent black, Latino, and low income students, teacher's salaries, class size and instructional funding) as instruments; the purged measure of prior performance is then included in the model. Five years (1995-99) of data are used in the model, and dummy variables for individual years are included to account for the general increase in salaries over this time period.

The results of the salary model appear in Table 1. The predictive ability of the model

³The two are moderately correlated, but the relationship is not strong enough to pose a collinearity problem.

(78%) compares favorably to other models in the literature; and with one exception, all variables are in the predicted direction. That exception is the tax rate, which has a slight positive association with salary rather than a negative relationship, thus indicating that superintendents are not systematically rewarded for keeping taxes low. While the relationships in the model are interesting in terms of both personnel management and educational policy, discussion of them is beyond the scope of the present study. The objective of this part of the analysis is merely to remove as many “non-quality” factors from the superintendent’s salary as possible. The regression residuals are then standardized (converted to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1) for use in the subsequent analysis. Because salaries are set before the school year begins, the quality measure has a natural one-year lag in its relationship to current organizational performance. As a consequence, any relationships that are found can be attributed to quality influencing performance rather than district performance influencing boards’ decisions about superintendent compensation.

[Table 1 about here]

Modeling Performance

Our measure of management quality can now be related to educational performance. Given the preliminary nature of such a measure in public management, this effort might be viewed as an attempt to determine if the measure has external validity – since managerial quality should affect organizational performance when one controls for the resources and constraints on the core organization. The section first introduces the control variables in the model and then discusses the measures of organizational performance.

Control Variables

Any assessment of organizational performance must control for both the difficulty of the job faced by the organization and the resources in its possession. Fortunately, a well-developed literature on educational production functions (Hanushek, 1996; Hedges and Greenwald, 1996) can be used for guidance. Eight variables, all commonly used in education production functions, are included – three measures of task difficulty and five measures of resources.⁴ These are used strictly as controls to make sure that any findings we have relative to management quality are robust to the inclusion of factors normally linked to educational performance.

School districts clearly vary in how difficult it is to educate their students. Some districts have homogeneous student populations from upper middle-class backgrounds. Students such as these are quite likely to do well in school regardless of what the school does (see Burtless, 1996). Other districts with a large number of poor students and a highly diverse student body will find it more difficult to attain high levels of performance because the schools will have to make up for a less supportive home environment and deal with more complex and more varied learning problems (Jencks and Phillips, 1998). Our three measures of task difficulty are the percentages of students who are black, Latino, and poor (measured as the percentage eligible for free or reduced-price school lunch). All three measures should be negatively related to performance.

A basic principle of organization theory is that resources matter. While the linkage between resources and performance in schools has been controversial (see Hanushek, 1996;

⁴The number of candidates for inclusion in education production functions is virtually limitless. Because many of the variables measure the same thing or relatively similar things, collinearity in these models is a problem. As a result, some variables may have an inappropriate sign. Because our concern is with having sufficient controls in the model rather than estimating the precise impact of each control variable, we are less concerned with collinearity.

Hedges and Greenwald, 1996), a growing literature of well-designed, longitudinal studies confirms that like other organizations, schools with more resources generally fare better (Wenglinsky, 1997). Five measures of resources are included. The average teacher salary, the average instructional expenditures per student, and class size are directly tied to monetary resources. The average years of teaching experience and the percentage of teachers who are not certified are related to the human resources of the school district. Class size and noncertified teachers should be negatively related to student performance; teacher experience, teacher salaries, and average instructional expenditures should be positively related to performance.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are highly salient in educational policy circles these days. Generalizing from his experience in Texas, President George W. Bush advocates standardized testing as the measure of educational performance, despite the controversy surrounding such measures (see McNeil, 2000). Although virtually all organizations have multiple goals and thus are subject to multiple performance indicators, some objectives are defined as more important than others by the organization's political environment. This study incorporates eleven different performance indicators in an effort to determine if management quality affects a variety of organizational outputs.

Although each of the different performance indicators is salient to some portion of the educational environment, the first among equals is the student pass rate on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS).⁵ The TAAS is a criterion-based test that all students in grades 3

⁵In a separate survey of superintendents by the authors, 45.5% of superintendent's rated TAAS scores as their top priority; no other goal was endorsed by more than 13% of

through 8 and 10 must take. The grade 10 exam is a high-stakes test, and students must pass it to receive a regular diploma from the state of Texas. TAAS scores are used to rank districts, and it is without question the most visible indicator of performance used to assess the quality of schools. Our measure is the percentage of students in a district who pass all (reading, writing, and math) sections of the TAAS.

Four other TAAS measures are also useful as performance indicators. The state accountability system assesses performance of subgroups of students, and districts must perform well on all these indicators to attain various state rankings. TAAS scores for Anglo, black, Latino and low-income students are included as measures of performance indicators.⁶

TAAS scores are linked most directly to basic skills and performance levels for all students. Many parents and policymakers are also concerned with the performance of school districts regarding college-bound students. Four measures of college-bound student performance are used – the average ACT score, the average SAT score, the percentage of students who score above 1110 on the SAT (or its ACT equivalent), and the percentage of students who take either test. Texas is one of a few states where both the ACT and the SAT are taken by sufficient numbers to provide reliable indicators of both. As with statewide samples where there is no correlation between these scores and the number of students taking them if the proportion of tested students is more than 30 percent of the total eligible to be tested, Texas scores are

superintendents. An additional 46.8% of superintendents rated TAAS scores as “very important.”

⁶The various pass rates do not correlate as highly as one might imagine. The intercorrelations between the Anglo, black and Latino pass rates are all in the neighborhood of .6, thus suggesting the overlap is only a bit more than one-third.

uncorrelated with the percentage of students taking the exams.

The final two measures of performance might be termed bottom-end indicators — attendance rates and dropout rates. High attendance rates are valued for two reasons. Students are unlikely to learn if they are not in class, and state aid is allocated to the school district based on average daily attendance. Attendance, as a result, is a good indicator of low-end performance by these organizations; the measure is simply the average percentage of students who are not absent. Dropout rates, while conceded to contain a great deal of error, are frequently also used to evaluate the performance of school districts.⁷ The official state measure of dropouts is the annual percentage of students who leave school from eighth grade onward.

Findings

The first school-district performance measure assessed is the overall TAAS score; those results are presented in the first two columns of Table 2. The proposed measure of managerial quality is positively and significantly related to school-district performance. Since the measure is standardized and thus ranges between approximately -3 and plus 3, these equations suggest that the maximum impact of quality management is approximately 5.3 points on the TAAS. Although management quality is clearly not the most important factor in determining test scores, in substantive terms 5.3 points is a meaningful amount of change (the standard deviation of TAAS scores is approximately 12.5). The control variables in Table 2 are all generally consistent with the hypothesized relationships, with the exception of instructional spending,

⁷School districts often have annual student turnover of 20% or greater. School districts do not necessarily know where students have gone unless they receive a request for a transcript. In addition, school districts have few incentives to find out why any given student has not returned for a new academic year.

which is negative and insignificant. To check for omitted variables bias, we ran regressions with 41 additional variables without affecting the findings here. These variables included additional student characteristics, budget expenditures in various categories, teacher assignments, and additional measures of district wealth.

[Table 2 about here]

To explore a bit more how management quality might work through other factors known to influence performance, a second regression in Table 2 adds three variables – parental involvement, community support, and student attendance. Parental involvement and community support were assessed via a superintendents’ survey; and because they reflect the impressions of the superintendents, these measures might contain some bias.⁸ All three new measures are positively associated with organizational performance; in the case of student attendance, the relationship is a strong one. Including these factors in the model reduces the size of the management coefficient. These relationships suggest that some of the impact of quality management operates through increasing community support and parental involvement.⁹ Even with the addition of the attendance and support scores, however, management quality as defined in this study has a significant and positive effect on the overall performance of the organization.¹⁰

⁸The specific question asked the superintendent to rate parental involvement and community support on five-point scales that ranged from excellent to inadequate. This survey had a 57% response rate, thus reducing the total number of cases for analysis.

⁹A path analysis of the results of this second analysis shows that 72% of the impact of management quality is direct with the other 28% indirect through community and school board support.

¹⁰Note that we are limiting our analyses to linear specifications in this paper. We recognize that our measure of managerial quality is likely to be controversial. To provide focus on the management quality measure, therefore, we have opted for relatively simple models of

A measure of managerial quality should be general; it should be related to a wide variety of organizational outputs. The relationship should, of course, vary across different measures of outputs because some problems are likely to be more sensitive to the quality of management in the organization. As problems become more intractable, for example, one would expect that management would matter less simply because what the organization could do to solve such problems is more limited.

Table 3 presents the regression coefficients for management quality and the ten additional performance indicators. Each equation also controls for all the variables included in the first regression in Table 2.¹¹ The performance of the managerial quality variable can be appropriately characterized as stunning. For nine of the ten additional performance indicators, management quality is significantly related to performance in the predicted direction (the exception is the percentage of students who take college boards). This pattern of relationships along with those in Table 2 amounts to strong evidence that the residual-based measure of managerial quality is tapping at least in part some aspects of how well superintendents manage their districts.¹²

[Table 3 about here]

Conclusions

management. We believe that management operates in a contingent and nonlinear manner conditioned by structural context (see O'Toole and Meier, 1999). More complex models of management will be pursued in subsequent research.

¹¹When one includes community and school board support in the equations, the results are similar except the impact of management on black TAAS scores is no longer significant.

¹²The n-size varies for these equations because the state reports results only when five or more students per district meet the category. Some districts, for example, do not have sufficient minority students to generate results.

This study offers two principal contributions. First, we develop and apply an uncommon measure of public management quality. The application of the measure relies on avoiding an underspecified model for explaining salary variations, as well as on the notion that the mobility, information, and compensation for managers in the empirical setting approximate the labor-market assumptions of neoclassical economics. We have argued that both conditions hold here. To the extent that these conditions do not hold, in fact, we would expect null results. This article, therefore, offers an innovative, albeit indirect, overall measure of public management quality. The most important limitation here has to do with the specialized nature of the measure, or at least its restricted applicability. Most settings of interest do not approximate the required conditions, although investigations of some other situations – certain additional educational systems, some public authorities or quasigovernmental entities, for instance – might be able to use and perhaps improve on the approach taken here.¹³ Tapping public management quality in many other circumstances, however, will require tackling more directly some of the tough issues about what quality means, how it is related to leadership, and from what sources the requisite quality judgments can be derived.

Second, this research offers the fullest rigorous test to date of the proposition that management quality contributes positively to performance. The results are clear and convincing. If one assumes that the measure of quality is valid, then the almost completely consistent results

¹³We believe this approach will work for other management positions subject to competitive markets where measures of program performance are available. Municipal agency heads such fire chiefs, police chiefs, and public works heads may fit these conditions in some jurisdictions.

across eleven measures of performance are firm evidence indeed.¹⁴ That these results obtain despite a likely measurement error for management quality creating a bias toward null findings is particularly striking. With all the appropriate controls for the educational setting, the quality of superintendents' management makes a difference. Whether the focus is on pass rates, dropout rate, or the performance of specialized groups of students, like those from low-income families or those aiming to attend college, management matters. This set of results is even more striking given that the focus here is on only one managerial position — that of superintendent — at the top of the district. Since almost all school systems include additional managerial layers — at a minimum, school principals — the overall impact of management is probably even higher.

Management's relationship to performance is also likely to be complex. The impact of management quality appears to be partially channeled through the mobilization of parental and community support. In addition to contributing directly to operations, then, and to dealing with political principals and external regulatory authorities, managers appear to contribute to performance by mobilizing the efforts of others who have allied interests in delivering results at the local level.

All these findings are consistent with themes developed by astute observers and analysts of public management (see also Meier and O'Toole, 2001; 2002). That public management quality matters, of course, is hardly news to specialists in public management and public policy. The field of public administration has developed a rich literature arguing for this notion and supporting it with careful case studies. But to find management quality influencing performance

¹⁴Alternatively, if one views this empirical study as a check on external validity, as explained earlier, the results are highly encouraging.

directly, and consistently, in a data set spanning hundreds of governments over a several-year period is particularly persuasive evidence. While this study reports on only one set of administrative units — and in one policy field, at one level of government and, in fact, at only one level of management within that set — it indicates clear support for theoretical arguments that have been articulated for years by scholars and practitioners in the field. And any who doubt the importance of management and managerial quality for what can be delivered by public education in the U.S. should note the implications of this analysis for identifying a critically important point of leverage: in Texas, at a minimum, public management quality itself, not simply influences like district spending or students' home circumstances, makes a difference.

In many respects, therefore, the results of this investigation are suggestive. Considerable additional work is warranted. The links between public management in its various guises and the results of interest to multiple stakeholders need to be explored more thoroughly, and in settings beyond those of public education. Considering the issues in the broadest possible context will require additional conceptual, theoretical, and measurement advances. More complex models need to be considered, as a part of this agenda (see Meier and O'Toole, 2001, 2002). And the implications for public managers themselves need to be unpacked more fully. In short, even if it can now be argued with persuasive evidence that the quality of public management shapes policy outputs, most of the important challenges remain.

References

- Ban, C. (1995). *How Do Public Managers Manage?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Beam, G. (2001). *Quality Public Management: What It Is and How It Can Be Improved and Adapted*. Chicago: Burnham, Inc.
- Behn, R. (1991). *Leadership Counts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bennis, W. (1993). *An Invented Life: Reflections on Leadership and Change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bollen, K. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brewer, G., & Selden, S.C. (2000). Why elephants gallop: assessing and predicting organizational performance in federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administrative Research and Theory* 10: 685-711.
- Burtless, G. (1996). *Does Money Matter?* Washington: Brookings.
- Carmines, E., & Zeller, R. (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, S., & Eimicke, W. (1995). *The New Effective Public Manager*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Doig, J.W., & Hargrove, E.C. (1987). *Leadership and Innovation: A Biographical Perspective on Entrepreneurs in Government*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Donahue, A.K., Selden, S.C., & Ingraham, P.W. (2000). Measuring government management capacity: a comparative analysis of city human resources management systems. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10: 381-411.

Ehrenberg, R.G., Chaykowski, R.P., & Ehrenberg, R.A. (1988a). Determinants of the compensation and mobility of school superintendents. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 41: 386-401.

Ehrenberg, R.G., Chaykowski, R.P., & Ehrenberg, R.A. (1988b). Are school superintendents rewarded for performance? Pp. 337-364 in D.H. Monk (Ed.), *Micro-Level School Finance: Issues and Implications for Policy*. Cambridge MA: Ballinger.

Goodsell, C. (1993). Reinventing government or rediscovering it? *Public Administration Review* 53: 85-86.

Gore, A. (1993). *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less*. Report of the National Performance Review. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Hanushek, E. (1996). School resources and student performance. Pp. 43-73 in G. Burtless (Ed.), *Does Money Matter?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Hargrove, E.C., & Glidewell, J.C. (1990). *Impossible Jobs in Public Management*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Hedges, L.V., & Greenwald, R. (1996). Have times changed? The relation between school resources and student performance. Pp. 74-92 in G. Burtless (Ed.), *Does Money Matter?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

Hennessey, J.T. (1998). 'Reinventing' government: does leadership make the difference? *Public Administration Review* 58: 522-32.

Hess, F.M. (1999). *Spinning Wheels: The Politics of Urban School Reform*. Washington: Brookings.

Holzer, M., & Callahan, K. (1998). *Government at Work: Best Practices and Model Programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Ingraham, P.W. (1993). Of pigs in pokes and policy diffusion: another look at pay for performance. *Public Administration Review* 23: 348-56.

Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1998). *The Black-White Test Score Gap*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Kellough, J.E. (in press). Employee performance appraisal and pay for performance in the public sector: a critical examination. In C. Ban & N.M. Riccucci (Eds.), *Public Personnel Management: Current Concerns, Future Challenges*. 3d ed. New York: Longman.

Lynn, L.E. (1984). The Reagan administration and the renitent bureaucracy. Pp. 339-370 in L.M. Salamon, (Ed.), *The Reagan Presidency and the Governing of America*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Lynn, L.E., (2001). The myth of the bureaucratic paradigm: What traditional public administration really stood for. *Public Administration Review* 61:144-60.

McNeil, L.M. (2000). *Contradictions of School Reform: Educational Costs of Standardized Testing*. New York: Routledge.

Meier, K.J., & O'Toole, L.J. (2001). Managerial strategies and behavior in networks: a model with evidence from U.S. public education. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11: 271-293.

Meier, K.J., & O'Toole, L.J. (in press 2002). Public management and educational performance: the impact of managerial networking. *Public Administration Review* (forthcoming).

Moe, R.C. (1994). The 'reinventing government' exercise: misinterpreting the problem,

- misjudging the consequences. *Public Administration Review* 54: 111-22.
- Murphy, K.R., & Cleveland, J. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal: Social, Organizational, and Goal-Based Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Toole, L.J., & Meier, K.J. (1999). Modeling the impact of public management: the implications of structural context. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9: 505-526.
- O'Toole, L.J., & Meier, K.J. (2000). Networks, hierarchies, and public management: modeling the nonlinearities. Pp. 263-291 in C.J. Heinrich & L.E. Lynn (Eds.), *Governance and Performance: New Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Palmer, H.D., & Whitten, G.D. (1999). The electoral impact of unexpected inflation and economic growth. *British Journal of Political Science* 29:623-39.
- Rainey, H.G. (1997). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations* 2d ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rainey, H.G., & Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galloping elephants: developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9:1-32.
- Riccucci, N.M. (1995). *Unsung Heroes: Federal Executives Making a Difference*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Terry, L.D. (1995). *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: The Administrator as Conservator*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Thompson, F., & Jones, L.R. (1994). *Reinventing the Pentagon*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wenglinsky, H. (1997). *How Educational Expenditures Improve Student Performance and How They Don't*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Wolf, P.J. (1993). A case survey of bureaucratic effectiveness in U.S. cabinet agencies: preliminary results. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 3: 161-81.

Table 1. Determinants of Superintendent Salaries

Dependent Variable = Logged Annual Compensation

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Slope</u>	<u>Error</u>	<u>t-score</u>
District Characteristics			
Logged Budget	.1641	.0017	95.07
Logged Tax Rate	.0272	.0161	1.69
Logged Revenue/Pupil	.0683	.0092	7.45
Human Capital			
Past Experience	.0022	.0003	7.94
Current Job Tenure	.0009	.0002	3.63
Doctorate	.0532	.0045	11.79
Age	.0004	.0002	1.95
Personal Characteristics			
Female	.0025	.0009	2.85
Black	.0941	.0183	5.16
Latino	-.0165	.0081	2.03
Past Performance	.0009	.0003	3.16

R-Square .78
Standard error .1251
F 1193.92
N 5127

Coefficients for individual years not reported

Table 2. The Impact of Management on Performance: Standardized Tests

Dependent Variable = TAAS Pass Rate				
Independent Variable	Slope	t-score	Slope	t-score
Management Quality	.8866	7.76	.4888	3.23
Controls				
Teachers Salaries (K)	.7150	9.07	.6243	6.20
Instruction Spending (K)	-.4040	1.72*	-.8770	2.46
Black Students %	-.2624	23.40	-.1560	10.53
Latino Students %	-.1171	15.69	-.1034	10.80
Low Income Students %	-.1804	17.87	-.1214	8.79
Class Size	-.5718	7.30	-.1825	1.88*
Teacher Experience	.1165	1.68*	.1437	1.61*
Non Certified Teachers	-.1773	7.31	-.1389	4.19
Parental Support	----		.3984	2.01
Community Support	----		.9572	4.51
Student Attendance	----		3.7705	20.90
R-Square	.59		.67	
Standard Error	8.00		6.78	
F	574.29		298.36	
N of cases	5126		2498	
Coefficients for annual dummy variables omitted.				
*not significant, $p < .05$				

Table 3. Management Quality and Other Measures of Performance

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>Slope</u>	<u>t-score</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>N</u>
Latino Pass %	.4832	2.53	.38	4243
Black Pass %	.7014	2.68	.38	2965
Anglo Pass %	.8700	7.60	.41	5053
Low Income Pass %	.8998	6.17	.50	5093
Average ACT Score	.0817	3.94	.36	4248
Average SAT Score	3.1534	2.85	.50	3516
Percent Above 1100	.6535	4.23	.29	4682
Percent Tested	.0113	.05*	.12	4601
Dropout %	-.1241	8.21	.16	5026
Class Attendance	.0866	7.49	.24	5126

All equations control for teacher's salaries, instructional expenditures per student, class size, teacher experience, percent of teachers not certified, percentage of black, Latino and low income students and yearly dummy variables.

* not significant $p < .05$