August 2014

An Empirical Evaluation of the Influence of Descriptive Representation on Human Resource Practice at the Local Government Level

Edward P. French
Mississippi State University

Doug Goodman
The University of Texas at Dallas

Minion K. C Morrison
Mississippi State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/jpmsp

Part of the Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons

Recommended Citation

An Empirical Evaluation of the Influence of Descriptive Representation on Human Resource Practice at the Local Government Level

P. Edward French
Mississippi State University

Doug Goodman
The University of Texas at Dallas

Minion K. C. Morrison
Mississippi State University

Significant changes in employee demographics and values and the nature of public service employment have impacted personnel administration. This study evaluates the impact of both gender and race on the assessment of current HRM practices and reforms at the local level of government. Results from a national survey are assessed in order to enhance the field's understanding of whether differences in administrative perceptions and values attributed to these two factors have the potential to translate in HR policy positions that continue to embrace or strive to transcend traditional public personnel management. We find that although certain functions and activities are seen as more important by specific groups in the study, the order of importance of these functions and activities is very similar between groups.

Public administration scholars have longingly searched for a comprehensive understanding of how an individual's life shapes his or her political attitude and policy orientation (Campbell et al. 1960). This quest has been even further complicated by the interjection of race, gender, and representation issues into the field's critique of its theory and practice. The research on representative bureaucracy has explored several areas of interest including both passive and active representation (Bradbury and Kellough 2008; Kim 2003; Mosher 1982; Riccucci and Saidel 1997; Saltzstein 1983; Selden 1997; Selden, Brudney, and Kellough 1998), demographics and political leadership (Brenner 2009; Cohen-Bell and Rosenthal 2003; Fox and Lawless 2010; Garcia 1997; Kathlene 1989; Meier 1993;

- 47 -

Mansbridge 1999; Schlesinger and Heldman 2001; Schwindt-Bayer and Mishler 2005; Swers 2002; Tate 2003; Whitby 1997; Wilkins 2006), diversity in the workforce (Pitts and Wise 2010; Rehfuss 1986; Soni 2000), and organizational structure and discretion (Bratton and Ray 2002; Hindera 1993; Keiser et al. 2002; Keiser, Meuser, and Choi 2004; Meier and Nigro 1976; Meier and Stewart, Jr. 1992; Saidel and Loscocco 2005; Wilkins and Keiser 2006). These studies have confirmed that passive representation can transmute into active representation in public organizations and that demographic variables can significantly influence the pursuit of certain policy outcomes. Pitts and Wise (2010) highlight the importance of research concerning the impact of workforce diversity on organizational outcomes. As the public workforce continues to become increasingly diverse, focused attention on the influence of women, minorities, older workers, and immigrants on the public organization's norms and practices is imperative.

Public sector human resource management (HRM) in the twenty-first century has changed significantly as national reinvention initiatives and a host of other efforts at the state and local levels of government have required public officials, administrators and employers to be more accountable in an environment with increased emphasis on performance and results-oriented government service. Additional initiatives that have resulted in the development and promulgation of multicultural public organizations (Selden and Selden 2001) have also elevated the potential influence of women and minorities on administrative processes and practices to unprecedented levels. As these individuals assume management positions in these organizations, significant opportunities will arise to use their discretion to effect personnel practices. Furthermore, generational differences in public sector employees have prompted organizations to reevaluate traditional methods of employee management and motivation (Jurkiewicz 2000). Effective human resource strategies play a crucial role in navigating the legislative, policy, and technological challenges that are required by the accompanying changes in structure, processes and the management of employees; and these strategies have become a crucial component of many organizations' long term planning processes. Human resource managers have significant input regarding the strategic human capital planning, recruitment and selection, retention, training and development, and performance management processes that are necessary to deliver public services. As the public sector workforce becomes more diverse and skilled, a greater emphasis for understanding changes in the public employee's motivations and needs becomes essential, and emphases on organizational culture and the work-life issues of employees, rather than traditional human resource management functions and activities, gain greater relevance.

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationships between gender and race and the perceived importance of several traditional and non-traditional HR functions by human resource managers at the local government level. We consider the attitudes of these individuals to be of relevance and interest as they provide us with a sense as to the efficacy of current HRM practices. In addition, and we expect them to continue to shape personnel practices in the future. We also evaluate the influence of organizational contexts on the variations in policy priorities exhibited by these individuals. This manuscript begins with an overview of the theoretical framework on passive and active representation that includes gender and race as constructs. We relate these concepts to an understanding of the means by which certain attributes can influence bureaucratic assessments of public policy issues and subsequent responses. Through data analysis of the survey results, we explore the potential differences in local government human resource managers' perceptions regarding the importance of several HR functions and activities due to gender, race, age, and

- 48 -

organizational environment. Discussion focuses on the influence that the individuals in this study may have on human resource policy prioritization affecting public employees at the local level of government based on the findings. We conclude with implications of this study with respect to representative bureaucracy, social equity, and the field of public administration.

Theory of Representation

Representation is one of the fundamental questions that arise in democratic governments and in the consequent processes of governance and administration. Hannah Pitkin (1967) contributed one of the most discriminating theoretical renderings of representation since the classical delegate vs. trustee formulation found in Edmund Burke. Pitkin described three types of the phenomenon: descriptive, symbolic and substantive, that allow us to account for how an elected representative's actions may accord with the characteristics and interests of the constituency (e.g. race, ethnicity, gender, and class) (Pitkin 1967). A significant body of sophisticated literature has followed that explores these elements, (Mansbridge 1999; Tate 2003; Whitby 1997) including several seminal pieces of work in the field of public administration which have focused on two forms of representation within the bureaucracy – passive and active. Passive representation occurs when individual bureaucrats are of the same gender, race, class, religion, etc. as the individuals they serve (Mosher 1982; Riccucci and Saidel 1997; Saltzstein 1983); whereas, active representation emerges when these bureaucrats actively pursue policy and outputs which are consistent with the interests of these specific groups (Hindera 1993; Keiser et al. 2002; Meier 1993; Meier and Stewart, Jr. 1992; Selden 1997; Selden, Brudney, and Kellough 1998; Wilkins and Keiser 2006). Thusly, the understanding of the impacts of socialized differences attributed to gender and race on policy preferences and outcomes is beneficial in assessing variations in these outcomes.

Over the past few decades, the ascendency of diversity issues in both the U.S. population and its workforce has thrust the importance of studies regarding race, gender, and representation to the forefront of the field of public administration. Frederickson (1990) discusses the three pillars of public administration including economy, efficiency, and social equity, thus elevating this concept and its applications in the field of public affairs. In addition, Wise (2002) notes that three normative drivers of reform during the recent New Public Management period have included the demand for greater social equity, the demand for democratization and empowerment, and the humanization of the public service. Legislation has allowed underrepresented groups to increase their shares of positions in the public sector and decrease the wage gap among gendered and racial groups, while democratization and empowerment have allowed woman and minorities to have equal access to leadership positions (Wise 2002). Humanization centered reforms have focused on providing flexibility to public employees in terms of balancing their work and family times (Wise 2002); and an organizational culture advocating a more family friendly workplace has become a top priority for many public sector employers (Secret and Swanberg 2008).

Socialized Differences Attributed to Gender and Race

Research has shown that employment in a bureaucratic organization of individuals of diverse backgrounds can lead to the pursuit of policy interests that are reflective of their individual backgrounds and personal values (Bradbury and Kellough 2008; Brudney, Herbert, and Wright 2000; Fox and Schuhmann 2000; Kathlene 1989; Saidel and Loscocco

- 49 -

2005; Saltzstein 1983; Schlesinger and Heldman 2001; Selden 1997; Soni 2000; Thompson 1976). In a recent study comparing the attitudes of public administrators and the citizens they serve, race is found to be a significant predictor for attitude congruence between African American citizens and administrators and possible adoption of the minority representative role (Bradbury and Kellough 2008). Also, a study of local Latina government officials revealed that ethnicity plays a significant role in their policy intention and ultimately policy outcome (Brenner 2009). Race and gender also influence the emphasis that high level administrators placed on organizational goals (Brudney, Hebert, and Wright 2000) and employee acceptance and support of diversity initiatives (Soni 2000). Soni (2000) notes that variations between males/females and minorities/non-minorities are most pronounced in the area of perception of discrimination. Additionally, gender provides some explanation for the differences in how males and females approach their work (Bratton and Haynie 1999; Fox and Schuhmann 2000); and why female and minority bureaucrats are more likely than male Caucasian bureaucrats to identify policy that would advance female and minority interests as a top priority (Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006; Saidel and Loscocco 2005; Selden 1997; Wilkins and Keiser 2006).

For active representation to occur, bureaucrats must have the opportunity to engage in agenda setting and policy implementation salient to the represented groups (Keiser et al. 2002; Meier 1993; Selden 1997). In a study of child support enforcement area offices, Wilkins and Keiser (2006) found that the link between passive and active representation occurs only when the policy area directly benefits women. Additional research has shown that the categorization of the agency as distributive, redistributive, or regulatory is significantly related to active representation. Saidel and Loscocco (2005) found that employment in a redistributive agency affects whether the bureaucrat pursues women-centered policies agendas. Active representation of women is more likely to occur in a redistributive agency than in either a distributive or regulatory agency (Kelly and Newman 2001). Also, differences exist between female and male supervisors in their priorities and how they spend their time (Wilkins 2006). Diversity in the bureaucracy has been shown to positively affect the allocation of resources for all clients, regardless of race, in a recent study of minority political power on local bureaucratic offices (Davis, Livermore, and Lim (2011). In addition, Nicholson-Crotty, Grissom, and Nicholson-Crotty (2011) found that active representation was significantly related to the assignment of minority students to a Gifted and Talented student program.   As such descriptive representation is included in the mix of other important influences upon policy and agenda prioritization, including work socialization (Fox and Schuhmann 2000; Meier 1993; Meier and Nigro 1976; Rehfuss 1986), professional training (Hebert and Wright 1982; Keiser et al. 2002; Mosher 1982), and political culture (Elazar 1984; Erickson, Wright, and McIver 1993). Specific organizations may limit the ability of policy makers to engage in active representation through institutional policies or priorities which override the identification of these individuals with demographic groups (Meier 1993). Also, while social origins can be linked to representative attitudes agency socialization often subdues the tendency of bureaucrats to hold attitudes rooted in their social origins (Meier and Nigro 1976).

The literature on representative bureaucracy has demonstrated that men and women and individuals of different race and ethnic backgrounds have different life experiences and these in turn are sometimes manifested as different attitudes emanating out of these life experiences. The research in this project focuses on the impact of gender and race on the role of the public personnel manager and his/her perceived comparative importance of several personnel functions. Numerous changes and reforms in work design, performance

appraisal, training, compensation, recruitment and selection, and labor management relations have resulted from legislative, policy, and technological changes aimed at enhancing governmental accountability for performance and outcomes. In addition, diversity and work-life issues have prompted significant changes in traditional public sector human resource management practices. Questions arise as to whether there are significant differences between men and women and white and non-white human resource professionals in how they perceive several functional changes and reforms. Or are there organizational contexts or other factors that explain the variations in their perceptions? Issues of fairness and equity have influenced numerous HRM functions and practices as both female and minority groups have historically experienced discriminatory practices in recruitment and selection. In addition, the progress of these two groups in terms of compensation and promotion has been much slower than their white male counterparts. Thus, practices that are focused on reducing discriminatory barriers and promoting equity and fairness in the workplace should be viewed more favorably by those they are intended to benefit directly. Based on the research previously cited, we anticipate that attitudinal differences regarding HRM policies and practices exist between male and female and minority and non-minority human resource managers.

Methods and Data Collection

In our effort to explore the differences in perception of HR functions and activities based on gender and race, we utilized a mail survey carried out during the spring of 2010. This survey was distributed in a three wave mailing to each human resource director from the top fifty populated cities in the United States and to 506 human resource directors derived from a random sample of all cities with populations equal to or greater than 20,000. A total response rate of 33 percent was attained (184 responses after the three mailings). Given the considerable length of the instrument, we believe this to be an acceptable response rate, and it is consistent with other unsponsored, general mass-mailing surveys in this profession.[1]

The following characteristics were reflected in the sample. Human resource managers responded from 14 of the top 50 populated cities (28%); while 170 (34%) of the respondents were from cities with populations equal to or greater than 20,000. Seventy-one percent of respondents were female, while 29 percent were male. Eighty percent of these respondents were white, 10 percent African American, 6 percent Hispanic, 3 percent Asian, and 1 percent identified as "other". In regard to gender and race identifiers, 57 percent of the respondents were white females, 24 percent white males, 13 percent non-white females, and 6 percent non-white males. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents were employed by a municipality with the council-manager form of government, and 38 percent were employed by municipalities with the mayor-council form of government. Those from other forms of government made up the remaining 5 percent of respondents. Approximately 76 percent of the respondents were from urban municipalities with a mean population of 141,470.

The local government HRM practices and reforms questionnaire was divided into several sections. Information was solicited regarding the respondents and their respective municipalities including personal demographics, form of government, number of employees, and other characteristics relevant to the study. Individuals were specifically requested to indicate the current importance of several HR functions and activities regarding staffing and

---

[1] See also West and Berman (1993); Hays and Kearney (2001); Gorman et al. (2003); Feeney (2008); Fernandez, Ryu, and Brudney (2008); Liou and Korosec (2009).

- 51 -

selection, compensation and benefits, performance appraisal, and use of time. A 5 - point Likert-type scale was utilized so that respondents could assess the HR functions and activities from very important to not very important. As this survey was designed to explore attitudinal differences exhibited between the demographic variations between response groups, descriptive statistics including the means of several variables are compared. In addition, chi-square analysis is utilized to evaluate whether perceived level of importance for the HR functions and activities identified in this study are significantly different between male and female respondents and white and non-white respondents. There are limitations, however, to the interpretation of the relationships between the variables as chi-square does not reveal much information regarding the degree or strength of these relationships. Chi-square analysis is also a test of association and cannot be used to infer causation.

Table 1. *Survey Respondent Demographics*

		Female	Male	Non-White	White
Mean City Pop		128520	185354	324477	100894
Mean # City Employees		1245	3830	3929	1561
Years in HRM Field	≤ 5	9.3%	5.6%	16.7%	6.8%
	6-10	20.2%	9.3%	19.4%	15.8%
	11-15	20.2%	11.1%	16.7%	17.2%
	16-20	22.5%	14.8%	13.9%	21.9%
	21-25	10.9%	20.4%	19.4%	12.3%
	25+	17.1%	38.9%	13.9%	26%
Level of Education	Less than High school	1.6%	0.0%	2.8%	0.7%
	High School /GED	7.0%	0.0%	5.6%	4.8%
	Two Year College	8.5%	1.9%	2.8%	6.8%
	Four Year College	41.1%	33.3%	38.9%	39.0%
	Master's Degree	37.2%	57.4%	38.9%	44.5%
	Law Degree	3.9%	3.7%	8.3%	2.7%
	Doctorate Degree	0.8%	3.7%	2.8%	1.4%

Table one reveals demographic information between the sample of men and women managers and the sample of non-white and white managers in this survey. Significant differences in the mean level of education and the mean number of years HR experience for males verses females are evident; while the only significant difference between the non-white and white respondents to the survey is seen in city population. Female respondents are less educated and have less years of experience in the field of human resource management as compared to the male respondents. The average female human resource manager in this study has a 4 year college degree and 15 years HRM experience; while the average male human resource manager has a master's degree and 20 years HRM experience. Table one also shows that non-white respondents tend to be employed by the larger municipalities in this survey. However, there are no significant differences in the mean

level of education and the mean number of years HR experience between non-white and white respondents.

Findings and Analysis

The findings reported in this research are divided into two sections. The first section addresses differences seen in local government human resource managers' perceptions regarding the importance of several HR functions and activities due to gender and race. The second section examines other variables that may transcend gender or minority status. The findings tend to demonstrate that females view HR functions and activities related to staffing and selection, compensation, benefits, and performance as more important when compared to their male counterparts; while very few differences in perception of these same HR functions and activities emerged between white and non-white respondents.

Table 2. *Mean Score of Respondents*

	Function/Activity	Female	Male	Non-White	White
Staffing and Selection	Use of Temp. Workers	2.64*	2.98	2.42	2.83
	Contracting Out	2.81*	2.98	2.81	2.88
	Direct Hire	2.34*	2.78	2.34	2.51
	Use of Volunteers	2.46*	2.81	2.42	2.62
	Reductions in Force	2.42	2.57	2.11*	2.54
	Resume Data Bases	2.69	2.94	2.31*	2.89
	Computer Matching of Applicants	3.02	3.26	2.56**	3.24
Compensation and Benefits	Merit Pay	1.87*	2.41	1.78	2.10
	Skill Based Pay	2.20*	2.48	2.00	2.36
	Bonuses	3.33*	3.51	3.17	3.43
	Benefits	1.17**	1.56	1.35	1.27
	Family Leave	1.47**	1.83	1.50	1.59
	Cafeteria Benefits	2.14*	2.60	2.22	2.29
	Employee Recognition	1.78**	2.29	1.62	1.98
	Tuition Assistance	2.14**	2.81	2.03	2.41
	Child Care	2.84*	3.28	2.53	3.09
	Elder Care	2.76**	3.49	2.72	3.05
Performance Appraisal	Use of Performance Appraisals	1.79*	2.19	1.58	2.00
	Rating Scales	2.28*	2.58	2.11	2.42
	360 degree	3.03*	3.45	2.81	3.24
	Peer Evaluation	3.11*	4.29	3.14	3.54
	Subordinate Evaluation	3.00*	3.35	3.09	3.12
Use of Time	Staffing	1.74*	2.15	1.78	1.88
	Managing Information	1.68*	2.07	1.81	1.78
	Emergency / Disaster Planning	1.95*	2.43	1.86*	2.16
	Workforce Planning	1.99*	2.33	1.94	2.13

Note: Scale (means) 1= very important, 2 = important, 3 = neutral, 4 = not important, and 5 = not very important.

*Pearson Chi-Square significant at <.05   **Pearson Chi-Square significant at <.01

Table 3. *Significant Differences in Perceptions Regarding Staffing and Selection*

	Rating	Female	Male	Total
	Very Important	16.4%	5.7%	13.3%
	Important	35.2%	37.7%	35.9%
	Neutral	26.6%	18.9%	24.3%
	Not Important	11.7%	28.3%	16.6%
	Not Very Important	10.2%	9.4%	9.9%
Contracting Out	Very Important	9.4%	11.3%	9.9%
	Important	30.5%	17.0%	26.5%
	Neutral	39.8%	39.6%	39.8%
	Not Important	10.2%	26.4%	14.9%
	Not Very Important	10.2%	5.7%	8.8%
Direct Hire	Very Important	21.5%	10.0%	18.1%
	Important	40.5%	34.0%	38.6%
	Neutral	28.1%	32,0%	29.2%
	Not Important	2.5%	16.0%	6.4%
	Not Very Important	7.4%	8.0%	7.6%
Use of Volunteers	Very Important	23.6%	3.8%	17.8%
	Important	35.4%	45.3%	38.3%
	Neutral	21.3%	26.4%	22.8%
	Not Important	10.2%	15.1%	11.7%
	Not Very Important	9.4%	9.4%	9.4%

Under staffing and selection, significant differences in the perceptions of female and male respondents were evident in four of the fifteen functions and activities under this category. Significant differences between the mean scores of female and male respondents evaluating the importance of the use of temporary workers, contracting out, direct hire, and use of volunteers were evident in survey responses. Fifty-two percent of females viewed the use of temporary workers as very important or important as compared to 43 percent of males. The use of volunteers was also perceived as very important or important by 59 percent of females in the survey as compared to 49 percent of male respondents. Additionally, a significant percentage of female human resource managers perceived direct hire and contracting out as very important or important activities as compared to the male human resource managers, 62 percent versus 44 percent and 40 percent versus 28 percent respectively. The two groups perceived the functions and activities related to reductions in force, retirement incentives, performance testing, computer assisted testing, paper and pencil exams, biodata, rule of three, direct hire, resume databases, computer matching of applicants, and walk-in testing as equally important.

Table 4. *Significant Differences in Perceptions Regarding Compensation and Benefits*

	Rating	Female		Male
	Very Important	37.5%	26.4%	Total
Merit Pay	Important	46.1%	37.7%	34.3%
	Neutral	10.2%	15.1%	43.6%
	Not Important	4.7%	9.4%	11.6%
	Not Very Important	1.6%	11.3%	6.1%

	Rating	Female		Male
	Very Important	26.8%	19.2%	4.4%
Skill Based Pay	Important	41.7%	32.7%	24.6%
	Neutral	18.1%	36.5%	39.1%
	Not Important	11.0%	30.8%	23.5%
	Not Very Important	2.4%	7.7%	8.9%
	Very Important	11.1%	1.9%	3.9%
Bonuses	Important	20.6%	17.0%	8.4%
	Neutral	20.6%	28.3%	19.6%
	Not Important	19,0%	34.0%	22.9%
	Not Very Important	28.6%	18.9%	23.5%
	Very Important	84.9%	64.0%	25.7%
Benefits	Important	12.7%	24.0%	79.0%
	Neutral	2.4%	6.0%	15.9%
	Not Important	0.0%	4.0%	3.4%
	Not Very Important	0.0%	2.0%	1.1%
	Very Important	57.0%	30.2%	0.6%
Family Leave	Important	39.1%	58.5%	49.2%
	Neutral	3.9%	9.4%	44.8%
	Not Important	0.0%	1.9%	5.5%
	Not Very Important	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
	Very Important	26.4%	15.1%	0.0%
Cafeteria Benefits	Important	43.2%	41.5%	23.0%
	Neutral	22.4%	24.5%	42.7%
	Not Important	6.4%	5.7%	23.0%
	Not Very Important	1.6%	13.2%	6.2%
	Very Important	36.7%	28.8%	5.1%
Employee Recognition	Important	50.8%	32.7%	34.4%
	Neutral	10.2%	21.2%	45.6%
	Not Important	0.8%	15.4%	13.3%
	Not Very Important	0.8%	1.9%	5.0%
	Very Important	24.2%	5.7%	1.1%
Tuition Assistance	Important	47.7%	43.4%	18.8%
	Neutral	21.1%	26.4%	46.4%
	Not Important	3.9%	13.2%	22.7%
	Not Very Important	3.1%	11.3%	6.6%
	Very Important	10.3%	5.7%	5.5%
Child Care	Important	29.4%	15.1%	8.9%
	Neutral	37.3%	47.2%	25.1%
	Not Important	11.9%	9.4%	40.2%
	Not Very Important	11.1%	22.6%	11.2%
	Very Important	12.6%	3.8%	14.5%
Elder Care	Important	27.6%	20.8%	10.0%
	Neutral	38.6%	26.4%	25.6%
	Not Important	13.4%	20.8%	35.0%
	Not Very Important	7.9%	28.3%	15.6%

- 55 -

There were several more significant differences in the perceptions of the survey respondents regarding the functions and activities under compensation and benefits (ten out of seventeen functions/activities). Females perceived merit pay, skill based pay, bonuses, benefits, family leave, cafeteria benefits, employee recognition, tuition assistance, child care, and elder care as significantly more important as compared to their male counterparts in this study. Eighty-four percent of females in the study felt merit pay was very important or important compared to 64 percent of males; and 69 percent of females ranked skilled based pay as very important or important as compared to 52 percent of males. Benefits were considered very important or important by 32 percent of females but only 19 percent of males considered this function/activity to be very important or important. Several significant differences were seen in the responses grouped according to gender regarding specific benefits as very important or important including family leave (96 percent female/89 percent male), cafeteria benefits (70 percent female/56 percent male), employee recognition (88 percent female/62 percent male), tuition assistance (73 percent female/49 percent male), child care (40 percent female/21 percent male), and elder care (40 percent female/25 percent male). There were no significant differences in the perception of importance by the two groups regarding cost of living adjustments, broadbanding, and team based pay under compensation and defined benefits, healthcare, professional development, and defined contribution under employee benefits.

Table 5. *Significant Differences in Perceptions Regarding Appraisal of Employee Performance*

	Rating	Female	Male	Total
Use of Performance Appraisals	Very Important	44.9%	25.0%	39.1%
	Important	40.2%	46.2%	41.9%
	Neutral	9.4%	17.3%	11.7%
	Not Important	2.4%	7.7%	3.9%
	Not Very Important	3.1%	3.8%	3.4%
Rating Scales	Very Important	24.4%	9.6%	20.0%
	Important	34.1%	46.2%	37.7%
	Neutral	34.1%	26.9%	32.0%
	Not Important	3.3%	11.5%	5.7%
	Not Very Important	4.1%	5.8%	4.6%
360 Degree Evaluations	Very Important	6.5%	8.2%	7.0%
	Important	22.8%	8.2%	18.6%
	Neutral	44.7%	36.7%	42.4%
	Not Important	13.0%	24.5%	16.3%
	Not Very Important	13.0%	22.4%	15.7%
Peer Evaluations	Very Important	7.2%	5.9%	6.8%
	Important	22.4%	7.8%	18.2%
	Neutral	36.8%	33.3%	35.8%
	Not Important	19.2%	29.4%	22.2%
	Not Very Important	14.4%	23.6%	17.1%
Subordinate Evaluations	Very Important	10.3%	9.8%	10.2%
	Important	24.6%	5.9%	19.2%
	Neutral	33.3%	45.1%	36.7%
	Not Important	18.3%	17.6%	18.1%
	Not Very Important	13.5%	21.6%	15.8%

- 56 -

There were fewer differences seen in the perceptions of these two same groups in the survey regarding the functions and activities related to the appraisal of employee performance. Respondents were once again asked to rank thirteen different items under this section as very important, important, neutral, not important, or not very important. The only significant differences emerged regarding the use of performance appraisals, rating scales, 360 degree evaluations, peer evaluations, and subordinate evaluations. Twenty-nine percent of females viewed 360 degree evaluations as very important or important as compared to 16 percent of males. Also, 30 percent of females as compared to 14 percent of males viewed peer evaluations as very important or important and 35 percent of females verses 16 percent of males ranked subordinate evaluations as very important or important. As a note, the majority of respondents, whether male or female, viewed these three activities as neutral, not important, or not very important. There were no significant differences in the mean perceived level of importance between females and males regarding performance measurement, evaluation by clients, management by objectives, critical incidents, behaviorally anchored rating scales, team based performance, checklist, and forced choice.

Table 6. *Significant Differences in Perceptions Regarding Use of Time*

	Rating	Female	Male	Total
Staffing	Very Important	41.9%	20.4%	35.5%
	Important	47.3%	55.6%	49.7%
	Neutral	7.7%	16.7%	10.4%
	Not Important	1.6%	3.7%	2.2%
	Not Very Important	1.6%	3.7%	2.2%
Managing Information	Very Important	41.7%	25.9%	37.0%
	Important	50.4%	48.1%	49.7%
	Neutral	6.2%	20.4%	10.5%
	Not Important	1.6%	3.7%	2.2%
	Not Very Important	0.0%	1.9%	0.6%
Emergency / Disaster Planning	Very Important	32.0%	22.2%	29.1%
	Important	47.7%	37.0%	44.5%
	Neutral	14.8%	24.1%	17.6%
	Not Important	3.9%	9.3%	5.5%
	Not Very Important	1.6%	7.4%	3.3%
Workforce Planning	Very Important	25.0%	22.2%	24.2%
	Important	54.7%	38.9%	50.0%
	Neutral	18.0%	25.9%	20.3%
	Not Important	0.8%	9.3%	33.0%
	Not Very Important	1.6%	3.7%	2.2%

Respondents in the survey were also asked to indicate the importance of twenty activities as related to use of their time. Significant differences between female and male respondents only emerged regarding staffing, managing information, emergency/disaster planning, and workforce planning. Eighty-nine percent of females viewed staffing activities as very important or important compared to 70 percent of males; and 92 percent females regarded managing information as a very important or important function/activity as compared to 74 percent of male respondents. Also, a greater percentage of female human

- 57 -

resource managers (80 percent) indicated emergency/disaster planning was either very important or important than male human resource managers (59 percent) evaluating this same function/activity as very important or important. Workforce planning was perceived as very important or important by 80 percent of female respondents as compared to 61 percent of males responding to the survey. There were no significant differences attributed to gender regarding the perceived importance of responding to agency or politician requests, pay administration, developing HRM policy, position classification, training and development, and grievance processing. Also, survey respondents considered the importance of functions and activities related to performance measurement and appraisal, brokering conflict, collective bargaining, mastering HRM software, managing diversity, managing incentives, monitoring outsourcing, and succession planning similarly.

Table 7. *Significant Differences in Perceptions Regarding All Functions and Use of Time for Non-White and White*

		Rating	Non-White	White	Total
Staffing and Selection	**Reductions in Force**	Very Important	20.0%	19.6%	19.7%
		Important	48.6%	35.7%	38.2%
		Neutral	31.4%	21.7%	23.6%
		Not Important	0.0%	16.8%	13.5%
		Not Very Important	0.0%	6.3%	5.1%
	Resume Data Bases	Very Important	27.8%	10.0%	13.6%
		Important	33.3%	29.3%	30.1%
		Neutral	35.0%	32.1%	30.7%
		Not Important	8.3%	20.0%	17.6%
		Not Very Important	5.6%	8.6%	8.0%
	Computer Matching of Applicants	Very Important	22.2%	4.9%	8.4%
		Important	16.7%	16.8%	16.8%
		Neutral	50.0%	42.7%	44.1%
		Not Important	5.6%	21.0%	17.9%
		Not Very Important	5.6%	14.7%	12.8%
Use of Time	**Emergency / Disaster Planning**	Very Important	44.4%	24.8%	28.7%
		Important	27.8%	49.0%	44.8%
		Neutral	25.0%	15.9%	17.7%
		Not Important	2.8%	6.2%	5.5%
		Not Very Important	0.0%	4.1%	3.3%

This same data set was examined with respect to race and very few significant differences emerged between white and non-white respondents, only under staffing and selection and use of time. Sixty-nine percent of non-white respondents viewed reductions in force as very important or important as compared to 55 percent of white respondents. Also, the majority of non-white respondents (62 percent) perceived resume databases as a very important or important function under staffing and selection as compared to only 39 percent of white survey participants. Overall, the computer matching of applicants was seen as neutral, not important, or not very important by a majority of respondents regardless of race; however, a significant difference in this activity's level of importance between the two groups is evident. The only significant difference between non-white and white human resource managers regarding the importance of the twenty activities under use of time is

seen with emergency / disaster planning. White human resource managers perceived this activity as more important compared to non-white human resource managers in the study.

The perceived importance of these same HR functions and activities were again evaluated using Chi-Square analyses to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the four sub groups: white females, white males, non-white females, and non-white males. Differences in opinions were most evidenced regarding compensation and benefits. White female respondents viewed merit pay, skill based pay, benefits, family leave, employee recognition, tuition assistance, child care, and elder care as significantly more important than white male respondents. There were not any significant differences seen in the perceived importance of these functions and activities under compensation and benefits, between non-white females and non-white males. There were also no significant differences seen when the responses of white females and non-white females were compared; however, non-white males perceived tuition assistance and child care as significantly more important areas under compensation and benefits than white males.

Differences in the perceived importance of the functions and activities in other areas were less prominent. White females ranked only direct hire and managing information as significantly more important than white males; and they perceived resume data bases to be of greater importance than non-white females. Non-white females ranked use of temporary workers, contracting out, and 360 degree evaluation as significantly more important compared to the responses of non-white males in the survey; and they viewed the computer matching of applicants to be significantly more important than white female respondents. Non-white males considered tuition assistance and child care to be more important than white males in the study. There were no significant differences seen in the responses of these four sub groups regarding the perceived importance of the use of volunteers, reductions in force, cafeteria benefits, use of performance appraisals, rating scales, peer evaluation, subordinate evaluation, staffing, emergency/disaster planning, and workforce/succession planning.

As a final comparative assessment between subgroups in the survey, responses from white males were compared to the responses of all others in the survey (females and minorities – considered to be traditionally underrepresented groups). Under staffing and selection significant differences were evidenced as females and minorities perceived the use of non-classified workers and direct hire as more important than male respondents in the survey. Numerous differences were also seen between the two groups regarding compensation and benefits including merit pay, skill based pay, bonuses, employee recognition, child care, tuition assistance, and elder care. Females and minorities also considered the use of performance appraisals and critical incidents to be more important functions as related to the assessment of employee performance; and in evaluating use of time, females and minorities rated responding to agency requests, managing information, performance appraisal, mastering HRM software, and emergency/disaster planning as significantly more important than white male respondents in the study.

The impact of other variables on the perceived importance of these same activities and functions by human resource administrators in this survey was also analyzed. These variables included form of government (mayor-council/council-manager), age of respondent (Generation Xer/Baby Boomer), years of HR experience, and level of education. Relatively few significant differences emerged in these analyses. Human resource managers from the council-manager governments viewed merit pay, benefits, and employee recognition as statistically more important functions/activities than human resource managers from mayor-

- 59 -

council governments. Generation Xers in this survey also ranked contracting out and child care as significantly more important functions/activities than the Baby Boomer respondents. Human resource managers with fewer years of HR experience tended to view the use of volunteers and tuition assistance of greater importance; while the use of performance appraisals was considered more important by human resource managers with more years of experience.   Also, a difference in the perception of respondents regarding the use of temporary workers was attributed to education level as less educated human resource managers viewed this function/activity as significantly more important. The influences of both gender and race on the previously noted functions/activities were reevaluated using these additional variables as control variables. The significant differences attributed to race remained; however, the apparent association of gender with the perceived importance of contracting out, the use of volunteers, and the use of temporary workers disappears when the control variables are introduced.

CONCLUSION
In this study we have explored the roles of gender and race in shaping the perceptions of local government human resource managers regarding the importance of several functions and activities related to compensation and benefits, staffing and selection, appraisal of employee performance, and use of their time.   The data demonstrate that significant differences do exist in some of these areas; yet, the majority of the functions and activities evaluated in this survey are perceived to be of similar importance/unimportance leading us to believe that these individuals more often serve as a value neutral and non-political actors in the development and implementation of human resource policy at this level of government. While the literature has shown that certain attributes such as gender and race can bring different leadership qualities, agendas, and priorities to the professional roles of public managers and that female and minority bureaucrats are more likely than male bureaucrats to identify policy that would advance female and minority interests as a top priority, it is important to note that these differences may not always result in the emergence of policy-relevant attitudes that serve as a precondition for active representation. Supporting evidence of a strong link between descriptive representation and human resource practice and reform does not emerge from this study. While we do find that a significantly greater percentage of female local government human resource managers perceive several functions and activities under the four areas as very important or important as compared to male respondents in this survey (31% of survey items), no significant differences in the perceptions of these two groups were noted on over two-thirds of the total survey items.[2]
Female human resource managers tended to view "family friendly" functions and policies as more important than male managers in this study. Female respondents also placed more emphasis on the area of compensation and benefits where females have traditionally been treated less equitably than males but viewed most other activities pertaining to staffing, selection, appraisal, performance, and use of time as of the same level of importance as their

---

[2] This percentage is derived from the significant difference between female and male survey respondents regarding direct hire under staffing and selection; merit pay, skill based pay, benefits, bonuses, family leave, cafeteria benefits, employee recognition, tuition assistance, child care, and elder care under compensation and benefits; use of performance appraisals, rating scales, 360 degree evaluations, peer evaluations, and subordinate evaluations under performance appraisal; and staffing, managing information, emergency / disaster planning, and workforce planning under use of time. Gender influence on the perceived importance of contracting out, the use of volunteers, and the use of temporary workers was not included in this calculation since the significance of the relationships were negated when control variables were introduced.

- 60 -

Table 8. *Order of Importance for Functions and Activities*

	Order of Importance	Female	Male	Non-White	White
Staffing and Selection	1	Use of Non-Classified Workers	Use of Non-Classified Workers	Performance Testing	Use of Non-Classified Workers
	2	Performance Testing	Performance Testing	Use of Non-Classified Workers	Performance Testing
	3	Direct Hire	Reductions in Force	Reductions in Force	Direct Hire
	4	Reductions in Force	Retirement Incentives	Resume Databases	Reductions in Force
	5	Computer - Assisted Testing	Computer – Assisted Testing	Direct Hire	Retirement Incentives
Compensation and Benefits	1	Health Care	Health Care	Health Care	Health Care
	2	Benefits	Benefits	Benefits	Benefits
	3	Family Leave	Family Leave	Family Leave	Family Leave
	4	Defined Benefits	Professional Develop.	Employee Recognition	Professional Develop.
	5	Professional Develop.	Defined Benefits	Professional Develop.	Defined Benefits
Performance Appraisal	1	Use of Perf Appraisals	Use of Perf. Appraisals	Use of Perf. Appraisals	Use of Perf. Appraisals
	2	Performance Mgmt	Performance Mgmt	Performance Mgmt	Performance Mgmt
	3	Rating Scales	Rating Scales	Rating Scales	Rating Scales
	4	Critical Incidents	Critical Incidents	Management by Objectives	Critical Incidents
	5	Management by Objectives	Management by Objectives	Critical Incidents	Management by Objectives
Use of Time	1	Pay Administration	Pay Administration	Training and Develop.	Pay Administration
	2	Training and Develop.	Training and Develop.	Grievance Processing	Managing Information
	3	Managing Information	Developing HRM Policy	Pay Administration	Developing HRM Policy
	4	Developing HRM Policy	Responding to Politicians	Performance Appraisals	Training and Develop.
	5	Staffing	Position Classification	Developing HRM Policy	Staffing

male counterparts. While this finding has merit, we find very little variation in the top five activities for each category when the mean values for perceived level of importance are ranked in order of importance. Female and male respondents and Non-white and white respondents share the same perceptions as to which activities and functions are more important under staffing and selection, compensation and benefits, employee performance appraisal, and use of their time. This is especially evidenced in the areas of compensation and benefits and employee performance appraisal.

Table 9. *Combined Results Regarding Importance of HRM Functions and Activities Top 10*

	Female	Male	Non-White	White
1	Health Care	Health Care	Health Care	Health Care
2	Benefits	Benefits	Benefits	Benefits
3	Family Leave	Family Leave	Family Leave	Family Leave
4	Defined Benefits	Professional Development	Use of Performance Appraisals	Professional Development
5	Professional Development	Defined Benefits	Employee Recognition	Defined Benefits
6	Employee Recognition	Cost of Living Adjustments	Professional Development	Cost of Living Adjustments
7	Use of Performance Appraisals	Use of Performance Appraisals	Defined Benefits	Employee Recognition
8	Cost of Living Adjustments	Employee Recognition	Defined Contribution	Use of Performance Appraisals
9	Merit Pay	Performance Measurement	Merit Pay	Merit Pay
10	Defined Contribution	Use of Non-Classified Workers	Performance Measurement	Defined Contribution

In addition, the influence of race in this study did not emerge as all respondents were equal in their perception of importance regarding all but four of the sixty-five human resource functions and activities included in this survey. Table nine illustrates the top ten functions and activities for the survey groups based on mean perceived level of significance. All respondents viewed healthcare, benefits, and family leave as most important; and the majority of the functions and activities included in the top ten for each group of respondents pertained to compensation and benefits. This study also demonstrated that a significant predispose due to other demographic variables including age of respondent, years of HR experience, level of education, and form of government was not evidenced. These findings coupled with the tendency of female, male, non-white, and white human resource managers in the survey to view the majority of functions and activities similar statistically relative to level of importance offer support of earlier research on the socialization effects of public agencies. In a study of representative bureaucracy and policy preferences in the attitudes of federal executives, Meier and Nigro (1976) found that agency socialization has the potential to overcome the tendency for bureaucrats to possess attitudes rooted in their social origins. The role that an individual holds within an agency can be as important in their policy preferences as other demographic influences (Meier and Nigro 1976; Selden 1997). Human resource managers have significant input regarding the strategic human capital planning processes for many local governments, and their understanding of emerging changes in public employee motivation and needs is essential for the recruitment and retention of an

increasingly diverse public workforce. While their roles in staffing and selection, compensation and benefits, and performance appraisal functions can offer significant opportunities for these individuals to promote their individual policy preferences; this study adds support to the line of theoretical thought that the professionalization and socialization of their positions seem to overcome any social origins and assure they are pursuing the general interests of their governmental employers and those employees they represent.

Our study has shown that even though certain functions and activities can be perceived as more important by certain individuals, the same functions and activities are viewed by all HR managers in this survey very similarly with respect to order of importance. While these findings are of interest to scholars and practitioners, there are some limitations to a study of this nature. The questions were designed to measure the respondent's perceived level of importance for several human resource functions and activities and use of time. The resulting data were measures of attitude rather than direct measures. Also, as noted in the methodology section, analyses of the data have presented only descriptive and associative views of the relationships between the variables. There is no evidence of causality provided. However, these findings offer interesting insight which can be used to explore the relationship between descriptive representation and human resource management and outcomes. Future research is needed to further evaluate the correlations between this perceived importance and the work behaviors of public human resource managers and HRM policy outcomes. These individuals play a crucial role in aligning the personnel practices and objectives with the mission and goals of the public organization, and they also have significant opportunities to shape the underlying values of public personnel systems and promote significant reform in the field.

P. Edward French is an Associate Professor and Interim Director of the Stennis Institute of Government at Mississippi State University. His work has appeared in numerous academic journals and his teaching and research interests encompass local government administration, including human resource issues, risk management, and selected topics in public management and policy. He is Editor-in-Chief of Public Personnel Management.

Doug Goodman is an Associate Professor in the School of Economic, Political, and Policy Studies at The University of Texas at Dallas. His work has appeared in numerous academic journals and his teaching and research interests encompass human resource management, emergency management, and selected topics in public management and policy. He is Associate Editor for Practitioner Outreach with Review of Public Personnel Administration.

Minion K.C. Morrison is a Professor and Department Head in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Mississippi State University. His work focuses on both Comparative Politics and American Politics, and specializes in Africa and Third World politics as well African American and Mississippi politics. He has served as Chairman of Afro-American Studies at Syracuse University and Vice Provost for Minority Affairs and Faculty Development at The University of Missouri.

References

Bradbury, Mark D., and J. Edward Kellough. 2008. Representative Bureaucracy: Exploring the Potential for Active Representation in Local Government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(4): 697-714.

Bratton, Kathleen A., and Kerry L. Haynie. 1999. Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: The Effects of Gender and Race. *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 658-679.

Bratton, Kathleen A., and Leonard P. Ray. 2002. Descriptive Representation, Policy Outcomes, and Municipal Day-Care Coverage in Norway. *American Journal of Political Science* 46(2): 428-437.

Brenner, Christine Thurlow, 2009. Latina Administrators in Local Government: The Interplay of Role Orientation and Policy Intentions. *Administration and Society* 40(8): 825-851.

Brudney, Jeffrey L., F. Ted Hebert, and Deil S. Wright. 2000. From Organizational Values to Organizational Roles: Examining Representative Bureaucracy in State Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(3): 491-512.

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter:* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen-Bell, Linda, and Cindy Simon Rosenthal. 2003. From Passive to Active Representation: The Case of Women Congressional Staff. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 13(1): 65-82.

Davis, Belinda Creel, Michelle Livermore, and Younghee Lim. 2011. The Extended Reach of Minority Political Power: The Interaction of Descriptive Representation, Managerial Networking, and Race. *Journal of Politics* 73(2): 494-507.

Elazar, Daniel J. 1984. *American Federalism: A View From the States.* New York: Harper and Row.

Erickson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright, and John P. McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Feeney, Mary K. 2008. Sector Perceptions Among State-level Public Managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* 18 (3): 465-495.

Fernandez, Sergio, Jay Eungha Ryu, and Jeffrey L. Brudney. 2008. Exploring Variations in Contracting for Services Among American Local Governments: Do Politics Still Matter? *The American Review of Public Administration* 38 (4): 439-462.

Frederickson, H. George. 1990. Public Administration and Social Equity. *Public Administration Review* 56(2): 266-269.

Fox, Richard L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2010. If Only They'd Ask: Gender, Recruitment, and Political Ambition. *The Journal of Politics* 72: 310-326.

Fox, Richard L. and Robert A. Schuhmann. 2000. Gender and the Role of the City Manager. *Social Science Quarterly* 81(2): 604-621.

Garcia, F. Chris. 1997. *Pursuing Power: Latinos and the Political System*. Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press.

Gorman, Phil, Bruce McDonald, Richard Moore, Alan Glassman, Lu Takeuchi, and Michael J. Henry. 2003. Custom Needs Assessment for Strategic HR Training: The Los Angeles County Experience. *Public Personnel Management* 32 (4): 475-496.

Hays, Steven W. and Richard C. Kearney. 2001. Anticipated Changes in Human Resource Management: View from the Field. *Public Administration Review* 61 (5): 585-97.

Hebert, F. Ted and Deil S. Wright. 1982. State Administrators: How Representative? How Professional? *State Government* 55(1): 22-28.

Hindera, John J. 1993. Representative Bureaucracy: Further Evidence of Active
    Representation in EEOC District Offices. *Journal of Public Administration
    Research and Theory* 3: 415-429.
Jurkiewicz, Carole L. 2000. Generation X and the Public Employee. *Public Personnel
    Management* 29(1): pp. 55-79.
Kathlene, Lyn. 1989. Uncovering The Political Impacts of Gender: An Exploratory Study.
    The Western Political Quarterly 42(2): 397-421.
Kelly, Rita M. and Meredith Newman. 2001. The Gendered Bureaucracy: Agency Mission,
    Equality of Opportunity, and Representative Bureaucracies. *Women and Politics*
    22(3): pp. 1-32.
Keiser, Lael R., Peter R. Meuser, and Seung-Whan Choi. 2004. Race, Bureaucratic
    Discretion, and the Implementation of Welfare Reform. *American Journal of
    Political Science*, 48(2): 314-327.
Keiser, Lael R,, Vicky M. Wilkins, Kenneth J. Meier, and Catherine A. Holland. 2002.
    Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative
    Bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review* 96: 553-564.
Kim, Chon-Kyun. 2003. Representation and Policy Outputs: Examining the Linkage
    Between Passive and Active Representation. *Public Personnel Management* 32(4):
    549-560.
Liou, Kuotsai Tom, and Ronnie Korosec. 2009. Implementing Organizational Reform
    Strategies in State Governments. *Public Administration Quarterly* 33 (3): 429-453.
Mansbridge, Jane.1999. Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A
    Contingent Yes. *Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628-657.
Meier, Kenneth J. 1993. Latinos and Representative Bureaucracy: Testing the Thompson
    and Henderson Hypotheses. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*
    3: 393-414.
Meier, Kenneth J.. and Lloyd Nigro. 1976. Representative Bureaucracy and Policy
    Preferences: A Study in the Attitudes of Federal Executives. *Public Administration
    Review* 36: 458-469.
Meier, Kenneth J., and Joseph J. Stewart, Jr. 1992. The Impact of Representative
    Bureaucracies: Educational Systems and Public Policies. *American Review of
    Public Administration* 22: 157-171.
Mosher, Frederick C. 1982. *Democracy and the Public Service,* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford
    University Press.
Nicholson-Crotty, Jill, Jason A. Grissom, and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. 2011. Bureaucratic
    Representation, Distributional Equity, and Democratic Values in the
    Administration of Public Programs. *Journal of Politics* 73(2): 582-596.
Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley: University of California
    Press.
Pitts, David W., and Lois R. Wise. 2010. Workforce Diversity in the New Millennium:
    Prospects for Research. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 30 (1): 44-69.
Rehfuss, John A. 1986. A Representative Bureaucracy? Women and Minority Executives in
    California Career Service. *Public Administration Review* 46: 454-460.
Riccucci, Norma M., and Judith R. Saidel. 1997. The Representativeness of State-Level
    Bureaucratic Leaders: A Missing Piece of the Representative Bureaucracy Puzzle.
    Public Administration Review 57(5): 423-430.
Saidel, Judith R., and Karyn Loscocco. 2005. Agency Leaders, Gendered Institutions, and

- 65 -

Representative Bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 158-170.

Saltzstein, Grace Hall. 1983. Personnel Directors and Femal Employment Representation. *Social Science Quarterly* 64: 734-746.

Schlesinger, Mark and Caroline Heldman. 2001. Gender Gap or Gender Gaps? New Perspectives on Support for Government Action and Policies. *The Journal of Politics* 63(1): 59-92.

Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A., and William Mishler. 2005. An Integrated Model of Women's Representation. *The Journal of Politics* 67(2): 407-428.

Secret, Mary and Jennifer Swanberg. 2008. Work-family Experiences and the Insights of Municipal Government Employees: A Case Study. *Public Personnel Management* 37(2): 199-222.

Selden, Sally C., and Frank Selden. 2001. Rethinking Diversity in Public Organizations For the 21st Century: Moving Toward a Multicultural Model. *Administration and Society* 33(3): 303-329.

Selden, Sally Coleman. 1997. *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy.* Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.

Selden, Sally Coleman, Jeffrey L. Brudney, and J. Edward Kellough. 1998. Bureaucracy as a Representative Institution: Toward a Reconciliation of Bureaucratic Government and Democratic Theory. *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 717-744.

Soni, Vidu. 2000. A Twenty-First Century Reception for Diversity in the Public Sector: A Case Study. *Public Administration Review* 60(5): 395-408.

Swers, Michele L. 2002. The Difference Women Make: The Policy of Women In Congress. The University of Chicago Press.

Tate, Katherine. 2003. Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in the U.S. Congress. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thompson, Frank J. 1976. Minority Groups in Public Bureaucracies: Are Passive and Active Representation Linked? *Administration and Society* 8: 201-226.

West, Jonathan P., and Evan Berman. 1993. Human Resource Strategies in Local Government: A Survey of Progress and Future Directions. *American Review of Public Administration* 23(3): 279-297.

Wilkins, Vicky M. 2006. Exploring the Causal Story: Gender, Active Representation, and Bureaucratic Priorities. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(1): 77-94.

Wilkins, Vicky M., and Lael R. Keiser. 2006. Linking Passive and Active Representation by Gender: The Case of Child Support Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(1): 87-102.

Wise, Lois Recascino. 2002. Public Management Reform: Competing Drivers of Change. *Public Administration Review* 62(5): 555-567.

Whitby, Kenny. 1997. The Color of Representation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.