Formation of New Ideologies of Administration in American and Russian
Administrative Reform

Boris V. Bruk

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Public Administration and Public Affairs

Larkin S. Dudley, Co-Chair
Gary L. Wamsley, Co-Chair
Matthew M. Dull
Laura S. Jensen
Michael Urban

December 12, 2012
Blacksburg, Virginia

UMI Number: 3692172

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3692172

ProQuest

ABSTRACT

Formation of New Ideologies of Administration in American and Russian
Administrative Reform

Boris V. Bruk

This research project seeks to identify commonalities and differences between new administrative ideologies in the United States and post-Soviet Russia. To achieve this goal, the study explores the question of administrative ideology through the lens of the New Public Management (NPM) related reforms, which spread around much of the world in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The discussion is structured around two broad themes identified in the review of the literature on NPM and Reinventing Government: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public. As a method of inquiry, the study uses the review and analysis of official publications and elite interviews with high-ranking officials, analysts, and scholars in the United States and Russia. The research demonstrates that although new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia share significant characteristics, they differ in a number of important respects.

Dedication

To my family, for all their love, support, encouragement, and belief in me.

Acknowledgements

Throughout my doctoral journey, I was privileged to get to know and work with many outstanding individuals, whose contribution to my educational aspirations was truly immeasurable. Thanks so much to all of you!

I am lucky to have had exceptional mentors throughout my graduate studies. I am deeply indebted to my advisor, an excellent professor, and genuinely caring person, Dr. Larkin Dudley, for her invaluable guidance, understanding, and encouragement. Indeed, I could not have asked for a better advisor; no words can describe how thankful I am for all Dr. Dudley's help and advice during my studies and dissertation process.

I am also very grateful to a brilliant scholar, wonderful and supportive individual, Dr. Gary Wamsley, who, along with Dr. Dudley, served as co-chair of my dissertation committee. I am very appreciative for Dr. Wamsley's help, wisdom, and insight. I owe my co-chairs a lot for always being caring, motivating, and inspirational.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to other members of my dissertation committee. I benefited from the opportunity to work with Dr. Laura Jensen, who helped me when I needed it, encouraged my comparative efforts, and provided valuable comments and suggestions. I am very thankful to Dr. Michael Urban for writing a book on American and Soviet ideologies of administration, for serving on my dissertation committee, and for offering very constructive feedback. I would like to thank Dr. Matthew Dull for his help in recommending and reaching out to the interviewees, as well as for providing thoughtful advice and support throughout the whole dissertation process.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. John Rohr, whose scholarship, teaching, and way of thinking influenced me tremendously. I will always remember Dr. Rohr; he has a special place in my heart.

I am very grateful to individuals from the United States and Russia who contributed their insight to this research project through interviews, including Donald Kettl, Christopher Mihm, David Osborne, Paul Posner, Beryl Radin, Harold Relyea, Bob Stone, Oleg Alexandrov, Alexei Barabashev, Yelena Dobrolyubova, Andrey Klimenko, Yelena Maslennikova, Vladimir Yuzhakov, Andrey Zhulin, as well as anonymous contributors.

During the last three years of my graduate studies, I was fortunate to have the support of Minnis Ridenour, Senior Fellow for Resource Development at Virginia Tech. I am very thankful to Minnis for his kindness, encouragement, mentorship, and trust in my professional abilities to engage in high-level research to support the work of the Virginia Governor's Commission on Higher Education Reform, Innovation, and Investment and the Secretary of Education Laura Fornash. Thank you so much for everything, Minnis.

I am also grateful to Dr. Brian Cook, Dr. Karen Hult, Dr. Patrick Roberts, Dr. Paul Knox, Dr. John Dooley, Mary Beth Dunkenberger, and Ted Settle (as well as the whole team of the Office of Economic Development) for all their support and assistance.

My friends and colleagues at CPAP – the CPAP community – and the Office of the Senior Fellow for Resource Development: thank you all for your encouragement and the opportunity to work with you and learn together. As one of my highly respected professors, Dr. Charles Goodsell, once told me, "Never give up!" and I tried not to.

My non-Virginia Tech friends in Russia, the United States, and Canada: thank you so much! I always knew that you were with me.

Finally, I am grateful and deeply indebted to my family. For all these years, you, my loved ones, were my guiding light. It is *our* achievement; I would not have been able to do it without your incredible support.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1:
Introduction

Statement of the Problem and Research Approach

This comparative study places the administrative systems of the United States and Russia at the center of research. The decision to conduct a comparative study and to focus on these two countries was based on several factors. First, there is a personal factor, which is clearly related to my experience of living, working, and studying in both countries. As a graduate student in the United States, I could not help but draw parallels between certain features of the American and Russian political systems as well as the administrative experiences in the two countries. Second, a number of previous studies have allowed scholars to conclude that despite largely divergent historical, political, and cultural paths of development, the two seemingly "manifestly dissimilar" countries (Urban, 1982) have important commonalities.

In 1960, after his visit to the Soviet Union, Marshall Dimock wrote an article "Management in the USSR – Comparisons to the United States," where he pointed out that there were obvious similarities between management and public administration approaches in the two countries. As Dimock (1960) wrote,

Khrushchev,[1] who seldom admits that Russia is not the first in everything, told us that his country had two things to thank the Americans for – hybrid corn and scientific management of the Frederick W. Taylor variety. Russian administration, large-scale and bureaucratic, is more like our own in some respects than that of any other country (p. 139).

---

[1] Nikita Khrushchev served as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1953 to 1964.

In a related vein, in a more recent article, "The Relevance of US Public Administration Theory for Russian Public Administration" (2004), Larry Luton suggested that quite a few concepts from American public administration theory were not foreign in the Russian context.

In his 1982 book *The Ideology of Administration: American and Soviet Cases*, Michael Urban argued that the United States and the Soviet Union converged in many aspects around the ideology of administration. According to Urban, despite the existing differences (one of them being the Soviet departure from the Weberian bureaucratic ideal type), the "logic of bureaucracy" as well the "ideology of administration" had been quite similar in the two countries throughout the 20th century. Three decades after Urban's book was published, this study undertakes a similar effort, although using a different research approach, and focuses on the formation of *new* ideologies of administration in the United States and post-Soviet Russia.

To understand ideology, one can look through the lens of particular policies and/or actions of political institutions (Fox & Meyer, 1995). This work places the discussion in the context of administrative reform to achieve this task. The focus is on reforms associated with the New Public Management (NPM), which spread around much of the world in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The study is mostly concerned with the beginnings and early development of reforms in the spirit of NPM and covers the periods from 1993 to 2001 in the United States and from 2000 to 2008 in Russia.

This research project seeks to answer the following question: What comparisons can be made between American and Russian ideologies of administration with the advent and adoption of NPM-related reforms? To answer this question, the study uses a multi-dimensional approach involving descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory orientations. It presents a review and analysis of official publications issued in the course of reforms and findings from elite interviews with

American and Russian high-ranking officials who were involved in reform efforts, as well as the leading analysts and scholars from the two countries who have written extensively on administrative reform.

Research Significance

The end of the Cold War brought important changes in domestic and international politics of countries and regions around the world. In addition, this momentous event accelerated the diffusion of ideas across national borders. American political scientists and public administration theorists expressed an increased interest in comparative work arguing that it was no longer possible "to think of the United States a world apart, … [to] base … theories on the truly exceptional American experience, and to limit 'Comparative Public Administration' to the study of 'foreign' governments" (Riggs, 1991, p. 473).

An additional impetus for comparative research stemmed from the "global revolution in public management" (Kettl, 1997). Management consulting firms and intergovernmental organizations led the revolutionary movement and played a significant role in "packaging, selling, and implementing" NPM ideas (Greer, 1994 as quoted in Saint-Martin, 2001, p. 589). The victorious march of NPM gave new significance to the familiar question of the universality of administrative remedies. Some hundred years ago, Woodrow Wilson argued that the principles of good administration were much the same in any government (Wilson, 1941). In the early 1900s, it was scientific management that was found to be the single best way to rationalize administrative processes, to make bureaucracy efficient and predictable, and, as a result, to improve government performance (Fry, 1989).

According to some observers, in the NPM era, many public organizations in different parts of the world absorbed new ideas and became more homogeneous in terms of ideological

orientation, structure, process, and outcomes (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). An alternative view is that despite external pressures, considerable differences do exist; institutional dynamics are shaped by a whole range of factors, including "environmental characteristics, polity features and historical-institutional context" (Christensen & Laegrid, 2001). Moreover, governments' understanding and expectations of "good government" could be different. In the course of time, it became obvious that countries that had undergone NPM-related administrative reforms demonstrated various operational features and reform outcomes. At the same time, in the opinion of some commentators, the core ideas constituting the new "global" ideology have appeared to be quite similar in different contexts (Pollitt, 2007).

My research becomes part of this cross-national discussion by extending it to include two "manifestly dissimilar" countries: the United States and Russia. To determine commonalities and differences between administrative ideologies in the two countries, the study reflects a relatively new trend in comparative research to investigate administrative reform across countries. Until the last decades of the twentieth century, with a few exceptions, comparative knowledge was largely derived from single-case research employing such units of analysis as the individual, the organization, and the national bureaucracy (Jreisat, 2002).

In addition, this research expands a traditional descriptive scope of a comparative analysis and places an important emphasis on examining "language use in speech and writing" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). As Bouckaert (2007) indicates, "Language remains an important element for reform and culture, but also for research on it" (p. 45). In broader terms, Farmer (1995) argues that language "is more than a tool for thinking, for conceiving and communicating thoughts. It is also a factory of ideas, approaches, institutions, assumptions, and urges that make up our world view" (p. 1).

Another important point that needs to be highlighted is that in the case of the Soviet Union and post-Soviet Russia, much of the literature has been focused on the broader issues related to the working of the political system and decision-making processes (Rees, 2004). Also, at the level of cross-national research, there has been limited amount of work examining the United States and Russia through a comparative perspective. I expect that this work will deepen understanding of administrative reform and the mainstream ideational systems in the United States and post-Soviet Russia and illuminate each country's administrative experiences and ideological agendas through a comparative lens.

Key Definitions

Before the discussion continues, it seems important to provide definitions of the key terms used in this study: "ideology," "ideology of administration"/"administrative ideology," and "administrative reform."

There is little consistency among definitions of the term "ideology" in the scholarly literature. The term ideology was introduced in the late 1700s by Destutt de Tracy as "a label for a proposed science of ideas" (Thompson, 1991). In a related vein, according to some more recent definitions, ideology represents a set of interrelated and interdependent ideas shared by representatives of particular social groups (see, for example, Fox & Meyer, 1995). This line of argument suggests that, "…on meeting ideas in connection, particularly ideas which in some way express social values, we have the assurance of knowing that it is ideology with which we are dealing" (Urban, 1982, p. 3).

According to Sargent (1972), the term "ideology" can be understood as:

A value or belief system that is accepted as fact or truth by some group. It is composed of sets of attitudes toward the various institutions and processes of society. It provides the

believer with a picture of the world both as it is and as it should be, and, in so dRoing, it organizes the tremendous complexity of the world into something fairly simple and understandable" (as cited in Kramer, 1975, p. 510).

Another point of view is that ideology is a concept immediately related to the notion of hegemony and conveys the "meaning in the service of power" (Fairclough, 1995, as quoted in Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 75). According to this line of argument, "… ideology always works to favour some and to disadvantage others" (Purvis & Hunt, 1993, p. 478).

All definitions presented above highlight important shades of meaning that ideologies may possess. To a significant extent, the definition of the term "ideology" offered by Teun van Dijk (2006) combines the above mentioned attributes of ideology and helps to uncover some of its additional important characteristics. Van Dijk (2006) defines ideologies as "systems of ideas" understood as "shared representations of social groups, and more specifically as the 'axiomatic' principles of such representations" (p. 115). According to van Dijk, ideologies are "primarily some kind of 'ideas,' that is *belief systems*" that "control and organize other socially shared beliefs." Ideologies are "gradually acquired" and "need to be relatively stable" (p. 116). Within this context, the term "administrative ideology," as part of the broader notion of ideology, is understood in this paper as the "systems of ideas" of the key political and bureaucratic actors (van Dijk, 2006).

"Administrative reform" is another key term that needs to be clearly defined from the very beginning. As Caiden (2007) suggests, some commentators have described administrative reform as a managerial "rationalizing process," while others have insisted that administrative reform is mostly a political phenomenon. From the managerial perspective, the common definition of administrative or public management reform is "deliberate changes to the structure

and processes of public sector organizations with the objective of getting them (in some sense) to perform better" (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004, p. 8). Along the same lines, Stepashin (2002) defines administrative reform as "rationalization of public administration."

From the political point of view, reform focuses on political interests and preferences (March & Olsen, 1989). This approach considers reform as a political issue; the administrative structures and processes become the products of political interests, values, and objectives. In addition, according to Montgomery (1967), administrative reform can be defined as "a political process designed to adjust the relationships between a bureaucracy and other elements in a society, or within the bureaucracy itself" (as cited in Caiden, 2007, p. 9). In this research project, administrative reform is understood both as a managerial and political process (Arnold, 1995).

As March and Olsen (1989) suggest, reform traditionally has embraced two rhetorics: the rhetoric of orthodox administrative theory and the rhetoric of realpolitik. Administrative rhetoric is "the official language" of laws governing reform," while the rhetoric of realpolitik may represent the struggle for political control and benefits (March & Olsen, 1989). The two rhetorics are "mutually supporting;" the administrative rhetoric is 'the voice of the prologue to comprehensive administrative reform, and the rhetoric of realpolitik is the "voice of the epilogue" (pp. 91-92). Similarly, if one adopts a theater metaphor and compares administrative reform to theatrical performance, representations of a reform can be demonstrated in connection with front-stage and back-stage performance (Goffman, 1959). Within this context, the managerial component would appear at the front stage, while the political factors would be attributable to the back-stage performance.

Setting the Scene

In his book *The Ideologies of Administration: American and Soviet Cases*, Michael Urban (1982) argues that, "Allowing for contextual difference, we can count the notion of "rationality" as the gravitational center of administrative ideology in both its American and Soviet versions" (p. 39). Urban suggests that administrative ideology includes the notion of "rational form of organization," which is capable of maximizing results in an efficient and effective manner. According to Urban, "rational organization has traditionally been understood as the one "embracing the attributes of efficiency and effectiveness" (p. 39). In both countries, the quest for efficiency and effectiveness started in the early 1900s, paving the way for the emergence of the scientific tradition in public administration.

A Snapshot into History: The United States

As Light (1998) points out, in the United States, efficiency "appears at or near the top in virtually every reform report of the past one hundred years" (p. 21). Progressive reforms, initiated by President Theodore Roosevelt, sought to make government more efficient and effective, eliminate corruption, and "prevent and relieve social and economic distress" (De Witt, 1915). According to Waldo (1948), efficiency became a "rallying cry of Progressivism." As Mosher (1968) argues, the Progressives firmly believed that "[t]he public service, to be good must be both politically neutral and efficient, and there was more than a little doubt that it could be efficient unless it was also politically neutral" (Mosher, 1968, p. 71).

In a related vein, Woodrow Wilson, whose famous 1887 essay "The Study of Administration" represented Progressive ideas, argued that civil servants had to perform their tasks in an efficient and competent manner, remaining politically neutral and responsible to democratically elected officials. In Wilson's view, "public administration is a field of business";

to make the business work, the role of public administration should be defined as "the detailed and systematic execution of public law" (Wilson, 1887, p. 212). As Rohr (1989) noted, Wilson's definition encompassed the idea that administration was the process "subsequent to legislation."

According to Riggs (1963), "In Western countries it has become a habit to think of the bureaucracy as an instrumental apparatus for the execution of policies established through "political," non-bureaucratic institutions" (p. 120). This point of view "became high orthodoxy in [American] public administration circles throughout most of the twentieth century" (Rohr, 1989, p. 9). Wilson's idea of legislative supremacy accommodates the "instrumental" view of public administration; administration is a "tool used by elected representatives of the citizenry to accomplish public goals" (Box, 2009, p. 4).

To determine and apply the most efficient ways to improve organizational operations and to increase productivity, Frederick Taylor, the founder of scientific management, suggested using scientific methods. According to Taylor, inefficiency is not only a mechanical engineering issue, but also a major social problem. Taylor's teaching spread from the factory to the public sector, where reformers accepted scientific management as the best way to rationalize management processes and to make bureaucracy predictable and efficient (Fry, 1989).

In the rational machine world, created by the father of scientific management, organizations should primarily focus on efficiency of internal operations. The major techniques to "achieve greater efficiency in the management of the public business" have to be borrowed from the private sector (Fry, 1989, p. 47). For decades the "logic of scientific management" was the paramount ideology that dominated the American society (Sayre, 1948).

Expanding on Taylor's theories and advancing the scientific tradition, Max Weber argued that in order to achieve the greatest degree of efficiency, the "most 'rational' mode of social

9

organization" had to be created (Denhardt & Baker, 2007, p. 127). Weber maintained that the rational-legal bureaucracy model is directly related to the notion of efficient administration. As Weber (1991) argued, "The more perfectly the bureaucracy is 'dehumanized,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. This is the specific nature of bureaucracy and it is appraised as its special virtue" (p. 216). According to Weber (1997), "the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization" is "superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability" (p. 337).

A Snapshot into History: The Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union of the early 1900s, the view of government administration was largely antithetical to the Western understanding of ideal bureaucracy founded on rational-legal authority. The literature typically describes Soviet bureaucracy as operating under the principles opposite to those offered by the Weberian bureaucracy model (Ryavec, 2005). According to Holzer and Illiash (2009), the role of bureaucracy was to "protect the [Communist] party's power and to provide a political buffer for its leadership" (p. 154). In general, as Fainsod (1949) argues, the notion of political neutrality of a public administrator was "utterly foreign to the Soviet scene" (p. 679). Within this context, the civil servant was to serve the Party's interests loyally and efficiently: "He must learn to manipulate the environment around him to meet the demands which are made on him. He cannot afford to be overscrupulous in obeying legal regulations if the price of conformity means failure to meet his set goals" (Fainsod, 1965, p. 419).

In Soviet era, formal rules and regulations often played a "decorative role" (Jakobson, 2001). For example, as Jakobson explains, federal ministers were nominally subordinate to the

prime-minister; in reality, however, they reported to the General Secretary of the Communist Party (p. 41). Following the Party's guidelines, "The Soviet bureaucrat's job was to implement and even predict the leadership's demands and to follow the party guidelines, but never to work directly in the interest of citizens – a bourgeois concept, at best" (Barabashev & Straussman, 2007, p. 376).

The Marxist-Leninist perspective adopted by the Soviet Union suggested that capitalist bureaucracy served as the instrument of the bourgeoisie domination to promote the interests of the ruling class and that "state bureaucracy was merely disguised by claims of neutrality, expertise and efficiency" (Lutjens, 2001, p. 620). Originally, the intention of Russian revolutionaries' was to destroy the old bureaucratic machine and build a new one that would allow for the gradual elimination of bureaucracy by expanding opportunities for democratic participation in administration. Ironically, however, "Marxian communism actually created one of the very things to which it was originally most opposed – the great state" (Ryavec, 2005, p. 11). The great state operated the "bureaucratic machine" that was one of the biggest in the world (Holzer & Illiash, 2009, p. 153).

Over time, in both political and bureaucratic circles of the Soviet Union there emerged a growing realization that bureaucracy would not be eliminated but, rather, require new ways to work efficiently in the central planning system. Being a part of socialist tradition of rationality (Munck, 2000), Lenin argued, "The art of administration is not an art that one is born to, it is acquired by experience. … Without the guidance of specialists in the various fields of knowledge, technology and experience, the transition to socialism will be impossible" (as quoted in Fainsod, 1963, p. 249). According to Lenin, to improve efficiency of administrative processes, "human material" was to become of modern quality, not lower than in other countries.

Within this context, Frederick Taylor's principles, previously viewed by Lenin as advancing the "extortion of sweat," were found to be of particular value for Soviet administration. In 1918, Lenin "publicly endorsed the universal application of Taylorism throughout Russia" and by the mid-twenties, Soviet Russia became one of the forerunners in applying scientific management under the guidance of the proponents of Scientific Organization of Labor (*Nauchnaya Organizatsiya Truda* (NOT) – the Soviet form of Taylorism (Beissinger, 1988).

As Urban (1982) argues, "Taylorism, originally an American phenomenon, seem[ed] equally at home in the USSR" (p. 53). Along the same lines, Beissinger (1988) points out,

Throughout much of the twentieth century there has been a mutual attraction between Bolshevism and Scientific Management. So strong at times has this affinity been that Stalin himself once defined "the essence of Leninism" as "the combination of Russian revolutionary sweep with American efficiency" (p. 5).

In the second half of the 1920s, Soviet reformers undertook the task of rationalizing the administrative structure and improving the performance of Soviet bureaucracy, which was widely criticized by the party leaders for inefficiency, corruption, and mismanagement. As Beissinger (1988) points out, "Soviet NOTisty [the proponents of Scientific Organization of Labor] did succeed in eliminating instances of red tape, training a skilled work force, creating improved systems of accounting and paperwork, trimming the fat from bloated staffs, and organizing less cumbersome bureaucratic structures" (p. 60). The general view of an "ideal" Soviet bureaucracy was that of an efficient institution with "administrative, technical and managerial competence" operating within a "tightly disciplined bureaucratic hierarchy" (Fainsod, 1963, p. 391).

Welcome, New Public Management!

In the course of time, the "international scientific management movement" (Merkle, 1980) transformed into the New Public Management (NPM). Some scholars, including Bremner (1995) and Stilwell (1995), describe NPM as an attempt to revive Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management. Along the same lines, Hood (1989; 1991) portrays NPM related reforms as "Taylorism with computers applied to public services" and as a "mix of public choice and updated Taylorism."

In their search for "more rational modes of public management" (Moynihan, 2006), many countries, including the United States and post-Soviet Russia, adopted reforms in the spirit of NPM under the rhetoric of increasing efficiency and effectiveness of public administration. As Liegl (2001) argues, "Most of the recent administrative reforms have counted on elements of New Public Management (NPM)" (p. 69).

Originally, as Christensen (2006) indicates, when the NPM movement started in the early 1980s, "it was presented as a kind of antithesis to the centralized state model. It was labeled a 'supermarket state' because it focused on the service-providing functions of government. NPM emphasizes cost efficiency, markets, competition, contracts, devolution, decentralization, etc." (p. 448). Christensen (2006) argues that efficiency is the central focus of NPM. According to Christensen, efficiency is immediately related to the view of government as a service provider and a belief that public organizations can "learn from the private sector, often in an unconditional and one-dimensional way" (p. 450).

In many countries, it was expected that NPM solutions would help to replace standard instruments of the "old" public administration (Brodkin, 2006). The general belief was that the traditional systems and strategies used by governments in different parts of the world were no

longer appropriate for addressing complex problems facing the nations. The "global revolution in public management" (Kettl, 1997) challenged the ideology of "old" public administration and emphasized the importance of shifting away from the traditional model of public bureaucracy towards de-bureaucratization, reduction of rules, which constrained employees, and empowerment (Suleiman, 2003; Thompson & Riccucci, 1998).

NPM is often discussed as a worldwide phenomenon that brings together a variety of mechanisms to increase efficiency of doing government business, shift agencies' focus from inputs to results, disaggregate government units, and downsize the public sector (Hood, 1991; Thompson & Riccucci, 1998). Pollitt (2005) argues that in quite a few countries, NPM has become a "dominant public management ideology." According to Hood (2000), in the opinion of some commentators the NPM ideas have constituted a "single best practice model of public management" (p.18).

According to Christensen and Laegreid (2002), NPM placed a "one-dimensional emphasis" on economic norms and values, which implied an ideological dominance of these norms and values in governance (p. 268). Within this context, as will be further discussed in chapter 2, more than a few observers emphasized a "considerable degree of convergence" among administrative reforms around the world (Pollitt, 2007). As Jones and Kettl (2003) suggest, administrative reform "invites evaluation of convergence: how much, of what kind, and in what directions" (p. 12). The design and initial implementation of administrative reforms in the spirit of NPM led some scholars and practitioners to believe that NPM had virtually universal applicability and to argue that NPM had become the "public management for all seasons" (Hood, 1991).

The actual course of reforms in many countries, however, reflected somewhat different approaches to administrative reform, challenging the idea of global convergence (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). For example, among introducing other changes, American reformers emphasized the importance of shifting away from the traditional Weberian model of public bureaucracy towards a post-bureaucratic form. By contrast, a number of other countries gradually recognized the importance of combining "classic Weberian principles … with elements like citizen orientation, consultation, results orientation and professionalization of the public service" (Homburg, Pollitt, & van Thiel, 2007).

In the United States, the early 1990s were marked by a new way of thinking about a whole range of elements comprising American political system. President Clinton believed that one of the major problems his administration needed to address was "the notorious inefficiencies of government." In March 1993, Clinton declared: "The federal government is broken and we intend to fix it" (Gore, 1995, p. 1). American administrative reform – reinventing government – that is often equated with NPM was expected to bring a "historic change in the way the government work[ed]" (Gore, 1993).

Over time, like a variety of other solutions, the NPM remedies were "prescribed, in varying doses, by the Anglo-Saxon world for use by the rest of the world – both developed and developing" (Pollitt, 2004, p. 2). As Peters (2008) argues, post-Soviet countries "have been far from immune from the pressures to adopt New Public Management (NPM)" (p. 1). In the early 2000s, the NPM ideas start gaining influence in Russia attempting to reform government by means of introducing new tools to make government institutions more efficient and effective (Logunov, 2006). In the 2002 Annual Address to the Federal Assembly, President Putin stated that administrative reform was needed because of the fact that the "functions of the state

apparatus were inadequate for solving strategic problems," while "the knowledge of the modern science of administration" was still rarely available. The new Russian government was to become efficient, compact, and well-functioning.

Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter presented the study's research question, major research approach, and definitions of the key terms. It also explained the significance of this research project and laid the groundwork for further discussion by providing the historical context and brief information related to NPM.

Following the current chapter, Chapter 2 explores the NPM related literature and identifies two broad themes around which the analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 is organized: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public. In addition, Chapter 2 offers two propositions that will be tested through the study of the American and Russian cases. Chapter 3 presents the research methodology that focuses on the research approach, the nature of the study, and explanation of methods used for the analysis.

Chapters 4 and 5 provide a review and analysis of official publications and explanatory comments offered by the interviewees with the ultimate purpose of identifying the systems of ideas of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia. Finally, Chapter 6 presents the discussion of the key findings and conclusions from the analysis. Particular attention is focused on highlighting commonalities and differences between American and Russian ideologies of administration through the comparative perspective.

Chapter 2:
Literature Review

The Point of Departure

Given the goal of understanding *new* ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia, Michael Urban's 1982 book *The Ideologies of Administration: American and Soviet cases* is the point of departure for this literature review. Presenting many valuable observations on American and Soviet administrative systems and their ideological construction, and building on the analysis of interview data and examination of professional literature, Urban's book reaches a number of important conclusions. I will list just a few of them.

First, according to Urban, the notion of rationality is "the gravitational center of administrative ideology in both its American and Soviet versions" (p. 39). As Urban explains, "rational organization has traditionally been understood as the one "embracing the attributes of efficiency and effectiveness" (p. 39). Second, in addition to identifying rationality as the "general" ideology of administration in the United States and Russia, Urban finds important parallels between the so-called "special" ideologies of administration in the two countries, including the ideologies of administrative leadership, and ideologies of democratic bureaucracy in the United States and administrative communism in the Soviet Union.

According to Urban, in both countries the ideologies of administration embrace the recognition of the administrator's decision-making authority and the vision of the limited role of the public in policy-making. Another important finding Urban offers is related to what he calls "the nature of the link between population and government." Urban found that while academics tend to recognize the importance of democratic aspects in policy-making, practitioners tend to consider these aspects as "impediments to getting results" (p. 122). As Urban puts it, "In the

manner of American administrators, then, those in the Soviet sample seem to regard democratic action as a "problem" in their environment" (p. 122).

The main purpose of Michael Urban's book is to "examine two types of bureaucratic societies from the standpoint of the ideologies generated by each and, making allowances for contextual differences, to focus on what they appear to hold in common" (p. xii). Similar questions related to identifying commonalities and differences, convergence and divergence have been widely discussed in the social sciences literature. One of the examples is the new institutionalist studies, which among a variety of other topics have discussed the ideas, causes, and types of institutional isomorphism.

The institutional isomorphism perspective leads to the view of organizations as becoming more homogenous (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Giddens 1979). The homogenization process "is effected largely by the state and the professions, which have become the great rationalizers of the second half of the twentieth century" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 147). The "common ideology of change" was diffused through multiple sources, including international organizations and management consulting firms, to "spread a few organizational models throughout the land" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; McKenna, 2006).

In public administration and management literature, many studies have focused extensively on the issues of convergence and divergence, commonalities and differences among and between administrative systems, external influence and historical, political, and institutional contexts, patterns and "trajectories" of administrative reform (Pollitt & Bouckaet, 2004). The NPM era enhanced the significance of the convergence-versus-divergence debate and NPM became a topic of extensive study (Jones & Kettl, 2003).

The Convergence-versus-Divergence Debate

In the last decades of the twentieth century, which saw the advent and increased acceptance of NPM concepts and ideas, there has been "a strong suggestion, if not outright assertion, of a convergence in the forms and aims of governance" (Lynn, 2001, p. 193). According to Christensen and Laegrid (2001), "NPM is essentially an idea of generic management because it argues that all management faces similar challenges and hence should be approached in similar ways, not differentiated according to type of structure or task" (p. 269).

In a related vein, Ongaro (2010) points out that NPM proponents advocated the idea that "the same reform agenda can be used to improve public management almost anywhere" (p. 8). NPM is often viewed as representing "a global paradigm change" (Christensen & Laegrid, 2001, commenting on the OECD reports) or as a "global model" (Haque, 2007) or a trend with the "ideas that have come to be regarded as universal and as applicable everywhere, regardless of the special circumstances of different countries" (Sahlin-Andersson, 2001, p. 56).

According to Rosenbloom and Yaroni (2001), in the 1990s, NPM became "a ready model for administrative reform, and one that has had substantial diffusion across nations" (p. 81). Comparing NPM with "old" public administration, the scholars make an interesting allusion to Wilson's 1887 essay, which emphasized the idea of immediate transferability of administrative systems and practices:

If I see a murderous fellow sharpening a knife cleverly, I can borrow his way of sharpening the knife without borrowing his probable intention to commit murder with it; and so, if I see a monarchist dyed in the wool managing a public bureau well, I can learn

his business methods without changing one of my republican spots. (Wilson, 1941, p. 504)

Over time, however, the idea of global convergence has been challenged by more than a few public administration/management scholars (see, for example, Hood, 1995; Pollitt, van Thiel, & Homburg, 2007; Christensen & Laegrid, 2001). Hood (1995) argues that,

… even if apparently similar developments have occurred in different countries, the similarities may not be more than skin deep. Scratch the surface, and we may find major differences and even divergence beneath the superficial worldwide 'economanagement speak' of the international agencies and management consultants. (p. 169)

Accordingly, in their study of NPM reforms in Europe, Pollitt, van Thiel, and Homburg (2007) maintain that there has been a high degree of divergence in terms of implementation of public sector reforms. The divergence may be so significant that some states are currently described in the literature as "neo-Weberian" (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). As the new approach to administrative reform or a new modernization concept (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004), the neo-Weberian State (NWS) model that emerged in Europe, places an "emphasis on the state as the irreplaceable integrative force in society, with a legal personality and operative value system that cannot be reduced to the private sector discourse of efficiency, competitiveness, and consumer satisfaction" (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004, p. 98).

Building upon and furthering the arguments of different schools of thought regarding the implementation of the NPM reforms in different parts of the world, Christensen and Laegrid (2001) challenge the "convergence thesis" and offer a so-called "transformative perspective:"

We will argue that public reform processes, such as those related to NPM, are not characterised by a simple adjustment to current international administrative doctrines but

must be understood from a transformative perspective. By this we mean that the institutional dynamics in this kind of reform process can best be interpreted as a complex mix of environmental characteristics, polity features and historical-institutional context. A transformative perspective emerges when we combine internal and environmental reform features to explain why NPM may have different content, effects and implications in different countries (p. 24).

Pollitt (2001; 2007) argues that when scholars argue about convergence of administrative reforms they mean different things. Pollitt identifies four stages of convergence: discursive, decisional, practice and results. He suggests that when scholars indicate the convergence of administrative reforms across the borders, they often refer to "discursive convergence," which he understands as convergence around the same concepts, rhetoric, and/or vocabulary terms. As Pollitt (2001) explains, "Discursive convergence is most obviously researched using the largely desk-based techniques of documentary analysis and textual deconstruction. One studies government documents, political speeches, conference agendas, keywords in academic and professional publications, and so on" (p. 478).

The decisional convergence may also be found quite frequently. According to Pollitt (2001), the decisional convergence occurs when "the authorities … publicly decide to adopt a particular organizational form or technique" (p. 477). At the "operational" and "results" stages, which are associated with public servants' behavior and reform outcomes, however, considerable differences are likely to be found. According to Edwards, Jones, Lawton, and Llewellyn (2002), even at the discursive stage, however, some countries may be "more willing to enter into the discourse than others; Germany and France are less inclined to enter the discussion than the UK, USA or Australia" (p. 1541).

Moynihan (2006), examining agentification experience in Sweden, UK, and Slovakia, describes the convergence theory as "too simple" and, recognizing the importance of environmental factors to policy selection, offers an additional dimension that needs to be taken into consideration – the way "policy-makers *understand* [and interpret] policy lessons," which further shapes "how they adopt and implement policies" (p. 1031). To support his argument, Moynihan uses several theoretical approaches, including discourse theory. From a discourse-theoretical perspective, "The meanings assigned to objects or ideas are malleable and are communicated through discursive practices (such as talk, memos or reports). The ability to define meaning is powerful, shaping the attitudes and decisions of organizational actors and policy-makers" (Moynihan, 2006, p. 1032).

As Moynihan argues along this line of reasoning, "ideas are translated into a different meaning as they are transferred from one setting to another" (p. 1032). To illustrate his argument, Moynihan explains that different countries have had their own "understanding of what the agentification idea meant" (p. 1042). Smullen (2004) comes up with a similar conclusion: "While the international language surrounding agencies has been adopted at a number of government levels, this adoption has been selective and translated in ways quite specific to national and organizational contexts" (as quoted in Moynihan, 2006, p. 1033).

Taking into consideration the arguments made in the context of the convergence-versus-divergence debate (especially those made by Pollitt (2001; 2007) and Moynihan (2006) and combining them with Michael Urban's findings, I expect to uncover both commonalities and differences in the new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia. To test this argument, the following propositions will be explored:

22

Proposition 1.

With the acceptance of NPM concepts and ideas, the new ideologies of administration in the United States and post-Soviet Russia are likely to share important characteristics, and, at the same time, reflect particular differences.

Proposition 2.

If one explores reform talk and texts:

- *convergence is likely to be found at the discursive stage (e.g., concepts, rhetoric, vocabulary terms);*

- *divergence is likely to be found at the level of translation of ideas in different contexts.*

The following sections will continue examination of NPM related literature that will lay the foundation for analyzing administrative reforms with the ultimate purpose of understanding new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia. The discussion begins with the review of scholarly studies of NPM, followed by examination of the reinventing government literature.

According to Toonen (2001), the NPM and reinventing government reforms may "serve as the 'ideal type" for studying reforms" (p. 185). Based on this argument, I find it important to review the two interrelated bodies of work on NPM and reinventing government to provide a comprehensive background of the "ideal model" that will be further used for comparative purposes in the analysis chapters of the dissertation. Further review of literature will focus on the studies that offered a critique of the NPM/Reinventing Government model. This body of research will help to make the first important step in developing a critical lens through which the reform talk and texts will be analyzed.

The Essence of the New Public Management

A "remarkable revolution" in public management started in the mid- to late 1970s in the United Kingdom (Kettl, 1997). The UK reforms were followed by quite similar efforts in New Zealand with major reforms aimed at reducing the size of government and transforming administrative structures (Box, Marshall, Reed, & Reed, 2001). The term "new public management" was first used by Christopher Hood in 1990 when he analyzed changes in public administration practice in the OECD countries and saw a number of important similarities (Sahlin-Andersson, 2001). According to Hood (1991), NPM may be considered as a "marriage of two different streams of ideas" originated from the new institutional economics and tradition of the international scientific management movement.

The literature indicates various reasons for initial NPM-type reform initiatives, including, but not limited to, the need to address financial and economic challenges that emerged after the oil crisis of the 1970s (Kickert, 1996). While in developing countries the main explanations for reform were related to different kinds of pressures, in developed countries the prescriptions for reform also seemed compelling to policymakers claiming that "greater reliance on markets and greater competition were 'urgently needed'" (p. 15). The literature underscores the relationship between the increasing calls for reform and shared dissatisfaction with government that, according to multiple critics, was unable to adequately address the demands of changing environment and solve complex problems in an efficient and effective manner.

According to the literature, the NPM reforms challenged the Weberian model (Christensen & Laegrid, 2001) and highlighted an internationally accepted goal of replacing "administrative, hierarchical, and professional cultures' by a 'private, commercial, market culture" (Lynn, 2001, p. 192-193). Sahlin-Andersson (2001) points out that the new form of

24

governing offered by NPM has been often explained "in terms of what it is not – i.e., the old public administration and bureaucracy" (p. 57). As Jones and Kettl (2003) argue,

> Over the past three decades, criticisms about government performance have surfaced across the world from all points of the political spectrum. Critics have alleged that governments are inefficient, ineffective, too large, too costly, overly bureaucratic, overburdened by unnecessary rules, unresponsive to public wants and needs, secretive, undemocratic, invasive into the private rights of citizens, self-serving, and failing in the provision of either the quantity or quality of services deserved by the taxpaying public. (p. 1)

What comes in the place of "old" public administration is the new model of public management. According to one of the strong advocates for NPM:

> … the traditional model of administration is obsolete and has been effectively replaced by a new model of public management. This change represents a paradigm shift from a bureaucratic model of administration to a market model of management closely related to that of the private sector. Managerial reforms mean a transformation, not only of public management, but of the relationships between market and government, government and the bureaucracy, and bureaucracy and the citizenry. (Hughes, 1998, p. 242).

Over time, as Peters (2011) notes, "The widespread proliferation of NPM ideas has converted this approach into the new orthodoxy in the public sector, even though it remains far from a unified and coherent set of ideas" (p. 5). Pollitt, van Thiel, and Homburg (2007) compare NPM with a chameleon that adjusts its colors to a particular situation or context. The literature does not provide a single definition for NPM. Jones and Kettl (2003) describe NPM as "reforms and transformations flying loosely under the banner of the 'new public management" (p. 8).

Despite the absence of a particular definition, scholars attempted to outline the key components of NPM. Hood (1991, 1995) has identified seven dimensions of change or doctrinal components associated with NPM. The first dimension is "greater disaggregation of public organizations into separately managed "corporatized" units for each public sector "product" (p. 95). The second dimension is associated with an increasing reliance on the principles of competition both among the public agencies, and public and private organizations. The third doctrinal component highlights the increased acceptance of private-sector management techniques and practices by the public sector organizations. The fourth component places the focus on "discipline and frugality in resource use" (p. 96).

The three other doctrines are related to resolving the tension between rules and discretion: "visible top managers" are seen as gaining increased discretionary authority; public organizations are viewed as moving towards "more explicit and measurable" performance standards; and, as the last doctrine indicates, results are expected to gain the upper hand over process with a greater organizational emphasis placed on output controls.

According to Peters (2001), at the initial implementation stages, the NPM-type reforms were mostly targeted at structural changes, empowerment, process, deregulation, and marketization. As Peters explains, structural changes often brought devolution of powers of central ministries/departments to agencies and/or subnational governments. Empowerment has been associated with granting increased authority to public sector employees at the lower organizational levels and/or to clients of public organizations.

In addition, according to Peters (2001), reforms sought to alter decision-making processes, including, but not limited to, resource allocation. Also, as Peters notes, many governments have been deregulating their civil service systems to promote less rule-bound

public personnel management. Finally, according to Peters, reformers have seen marketization as "a means of reducing the costs of public programs and perhaps incidentally also improving the services provided to the public" (p. 43).

Many scholars emphasize the fact that NPM blurred distinctions between the public and private sectors (Olsen, 2008). According to Jenssen (2001), although NPM brought a number of different approaches to different countries, the "basic philosophy" remained the same "namely, that private-sector principles should be applied much more comprehensively and rigorously to the public sector" (p. 295). Kickert (1996) finds that many NPM-type reforms pointed in the same direction: "the adoption of business management techniques, a greater service and client orientation, the introduction of market mechanisms and competition in public administration" (p. 1). In a related vein, Box, Marshall, Reed, and Reed (2001), point out that at the core of NPM is "shrinking government and making administration more efficient through use of private-sector performance-management and motivation techniques" (p. 611).

Christensen (2006) indicates that "the efficiency perspective … embraces the assumption that the public sector can learn from the private sector, often in an unconditional and one-dimensional way" (p. 449). According to Rosenbloom, Carroll, and Carroll (2000), NPM emphasizes a particular importance of increasing efficiency in the public sector and even considers efficiency as a "moral good." Although efficiency is central to NPM, in contrast with previous reform efforts, the concept of efficiency is placed in a broader context of achieving outcomes and customer satisfaction (Rosenbloom, Carroll, and Carroll, 2000).

As Lynn (2006) argues, "Properly understood, NPM's focal emphasis is on reducing or eliminating structural distinctions between the public and private sectors so that the behavior of public managers resembles that of managers in entrepreneurial, profit-driven, investor-owned

27

firms" (p.1). To "break through bureaucracy" (Barzelay, 1992), civil servants (that have been "transformed into public managers" (Kickert, 1996) need to be empowered (Peters & Pierre, 2000).

Empowerment became one of the important ideas that guided reformers; as Peters and Pierre (2000) explain, in many cases, empowerment "means permitting employees to make more decisions on their own, without reference to superiors or to formal rules, with the assumption that these employees know best their local conditions and the needs of their clients" (p. 13). A civil servant/public manager remains responsible to his/her higher-ups, but, at the same time becomes responsible to the customers (Ridley, 1995).

Kettl (1997) points out that in different countries NPM has been associated with different philosophies based on the idea of "letting managers manage" (Australia and Sweden) or "making managers manage" (New Zealand and the United Kingdom). The philosophy of "letting managers manage" appeared to be bottom-up and required decision-makers to "sweep away" regulations preventing managers from doing their job of serving customers. "Make managers manage" approach, in contrast, is described as a top-down effort to increase managerial responsibility for results through the framework of regulations and performance management systems.

Some countries, including the United States, tried to select the most applicable ideas from both philosophies. In general, these attempts were often "trouble-prone" given the fact that the philosophies often "drive in opposite directions" (Kettl, 1997). According to Khademian (1998),

[W]hether managers are free to manage or made to manage is a deeper concern than a debate over identifying best management practices. It is fundamentally a question of what

role we think public managers should play in developing and implementing public policy in a democracy (p. 271).

According to Christensen and Laegrid (2001), the central feature of NPM is the "supermarket state model," which emphasizes the role of the government as service provider, focus on efficiency and customer satisfaction. In the view of NPM proponents, competition for customers and customer satisfaction standards are among important tools to make government more efficient. Pierre (1995) argues that NPM places purchasing power in the hands of the public and creates "a 'public market in which this purchasing power can be unleashed, as a choice between different (types of) suppliers of public services" (p. 59). Within this context,

> The population is a collection of customers focused on individual benefits. They have primarily a commercial rather than a political relationship to government. Customers can also have greater leverage than citizens, implying a fundamental transformation in relations between governors and governed … Self interested behavior and competition are assumed to improve efficiency and adaptability" (Olsen, 2004, p. 70).

In the early 1990s, the customer strategy found acceptance in the public sector through introduction of the Citizen's Charter by John Major's government in the UK. As Pierre (1995) explains, the Citizen's Charter outlined obligations of the state to its citizens. One of the goals of the UK Conservative government was to make managers look beyond efficiency and to "produce quality services for their customers" who "wanted the subways and commuter trains to run on time, the mail to arrive in one day, and their children to receive a quality education" (Singh, 2006, p. 13). As part of the effort, all public organizations were required to develop and put into practice customer service standards. Government was expected to serve the customers with the public bureaucracy having the role of monitoring "the service production process and [assessing]

the quality of the goods being produced" (Pierre, 1998, p. 141). In the course of time, the UK experience was disseminated to other countries, including Russia and the United States.

The New Public Management in the Russian Literature

The NPM concepts and ideas were well-known and used in Russia as part of administrative reform of the 2000s. The translations of some of the key NPM related books and articles have been available to Russian decision-makers involved in setting the direction for reform (e.g., Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Manning & Parison, 2001). It should be noted that in Russia, the number of books and articles written on NPM has been relatively insignificant, especially if compared with those in the United States and Europe. Additionally, the access to these books and articles has been quite limited since many of them are available only in Russian libraries. However, of the articles available, a number of questions discussed in the literature are presented below.

Some Russian academic journals, including one of the most prominent public administration journals in Russia *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i municipal'nogo upravleniya* ("The questions of public and municipal administration"), have featured discussions on the issues related to NPM reforms. For example, an article entitled "The retrospective analysis of the main directions for modernizing the system of public administration and public service," that was featured in one of the 2010 issues of the journal, provides a comprehensive review of the key reform efforts in Russia. Among other things, writing about NPM, Barabashev and Klimenko, the authors of the article, point out (without going into specifics) that depending on the context, NPM-related initiatives may acquire a new meaning.

At the same time, as Klimenko (2005) argues, NPM involves a number of practices that could be used in countries with different political systems. Kapoguzov (2007) offers an

integrated view of NPM reforms. He recognizes the fact that many elements of NPM have been well-known and utilized multiple times under various labels in different parts of the world. In addition, however, Kapoguzov suggests that the "new" aspect of NPM is primarily based on the systemic and multidimensional character of reforms, which may produce a synergetic effect in the public sector organizations.

Russian scholars recognize that in many cases it may be impossible and/or inappropriate to copy and paste solutions that other countries have found successful. For example, Naryshkin (2007) maintains that the reformers cannot just blindly use the prescriptions offered in the "libraries of best practices;" it is important to identify solutions appropriate for a particular context. The solutions developed both in Russia and abroad should be "creatively adjusted and adapted" so that they fit the organizational context.

In many cases, the process of adjustment and adaptation takes time. According to Russian scholars, despite declarations about the importance of "breaking the existing systems of public administration," many countries followed the path of transformation rather gradually and, while rejecting a number of previous solutions, built on the achievements (Barabashev, 2007). Russia's way traditionally was quite different; the decision-makers often sought to establish a totally new direction for public administration by means of rejecting previous experiences and referring to the new, "correct" approaches that, in their opinion, could magically solve all the problems.

Writing about the beginning of NPM related reforms in Russia, Gaman-Golutvina (2008) suggests that there were significant differences between the initial conditions for the realization of administrative reform in Russia and the circumstances that stimulated similar reforms in developed countries. Kochegura (2002) goes as far as to argue that implementation of modern NPM related reforms in Russia may be premature – a country might need to go through a

number of other stages of development before it could become adequately prepared for those kinds of reform.

Additionally, some NPM approaches can be considered as being in significant contradiction with the political direction chosen by political leaders and decision-makers. For example, in the Russian context, decentralization, one of the important NPM postulates, may be in contrast with the political course toward the development of a strong "vertical of power" to implement policy – a concept relevant in both Russian intergovernmental relations and organizational settings – and an "authoritarian approach toward implementation of liberal reforms" (Kurennoy, 2004).

According to Barabashev and Klimenko (2010), the reformers should take into consideration multiple factors that would inevitably influence the results of reform efforts. For example, in the opinion of the scholars, unlike their Western counterparts, a significant number of Russian bureaucrats are not prepared to use the discretionary authority in a proper way since the existing ethical standards – although prescribed on the paper – do not really serve as an appropriate guidance for them. Because of that, the performance of Russian bureaucrats should be closely regulated by specific documents that would describe in detail their responsibilities and rights.

Klimenko (2005) points out that one of the key goals of administrative reform is the "creation of an understanding of efficient bureaucrat." According to Boykov (1997), the bureaucrat is required to serve as an intermediary between the state and the public keeping the relationship between the two parties alive even under the conditions of political instability. Interestingly, in Klimenko's opinion, the juxtaposition of traditional bureaucracy and NPM - that can be found in multiple studies - represents an "emotional and, in essence, wrong" point of

view, since both models seek to attain similar goals and require efficient implementation of particular tasks by a bureaucrat.

Jakobson (2005) identifies "efficiency" as the core concept of the "economic approach" – the one based on NPM principles – to administrative reform. Jakobson believes that, in the NPM era, in many important respects, bureaucratic activities have become more reminiscent of activities in the private sector guided by the "entrepreneurial spirit." Similar trends are emphasized by Krasilnikov and Troitskaya (2009). The scholars believe that management in the public sector is currently based on a number of values and solutions from the corporate world. According to Panina (2006), the so-called managerial approach to public administration requires the adoption of effective and rational methods and principles from the private sector by the public sector organizations.

According to Kochegura (2002), the strong focus on business values and solutions may have a "counterproductive effect;" there is no clear evidence supporting their effectiveness and usefulness in the public sector, while the negative effect may be quite obvious. This may be true especially for the systems lacking a well-developed legal and regulatory framework, still following a patronage route, and preserving corrupt practices.

Panina (2006) also points out that the managerial approach has not been immune from flaws. In Panina's opinion, NPM offers a simplistic vision of citizens as clients; in reality, the relationship between government and the public includes multiple dimensions all of which should be taken into consideration. Importantly, according to Panina, the public sector organizations cannot and should not make decisions exclusively in accordance with the private sector goals of achieving efficiency and gaining profit.

According to Tambovtsev (2004), the key objective of NPM reforms is to improve the quality of services provided to the public. In Russia, the importance of this objective is emphasized in a number of official documents, including the documents identifying the approaches to the budgeting process and the quality standards for public services. Another example is the Law on Public Civil Service in the Russian Federation that is largely based on findings from international experiences and promoting the idea of establishing citizen-oriented public service (Pchelintsev, 2005).

Kuznetsov (2004) argues that NPM brought to the table the concept of service production – the state is expected to produce and deliver services to the public in accordance with the principles of economic logics. Despite declarations, however, in Kuznetsov's opinion, these principles have not been followed in Russia. Yuzhakov supports a well-known argument emphasized by the NPM reformers that feedback from customers is of particular importance in the context of public service delivery. According to Yuzhakov, with the absence of immediate influence of public service users the service does not make sense. In support of NPM, Krasilnikov and Troitskaya argue that while placing an important emphasis on the considerations of modern recipes of efficiency, the NPM reforms prioritize the needs and interests of the citizens.

The Essence of Reinventing Government

Rhetorically, evidenced by the theme of "putting people first," the needs and interests of citizens were at the core of the Clinton administration's reinventing government (or National Performance Review (NPR) effort that featured a range of NPM-type reforms seeking to make American government "work better and cost less" (Gore, 1993). According to Kettl (1994),

Vice-President Gore's NPR provided "the most ambitious and sweeping examination of American public management in a generation" (p. 307).

According to Stivers (1999), NPM and reinventing government are closely related. Christensen (2006) suggests that, "The Reinventing Government program introduced in the USA in the 1990s was viewed both as one in a series of many rationally oriented reforms in US history and as a US version of NPM" (p. 449). Lynn (2006) indicates that many NPM-related ideas and concepts had been tested long before the movement came to the United States under the heading of "reinventing government." Similarly, Frederickson (1996), comparing reinventing government with the new public administration conception of change of the late 1960s, calls reinventing government "old wine in new bottles."

Stivers (1999) refers to NPM as "the most recent manifestation of the repeated urge among students of public administration to develop a science of administration with principles of universal validity" (p. 4). Likewise, Radin (2006) describes the reinvention movement as the "move towards a science of management such as that outlined by Luther Gulick" (p. 95). According to Gulick (1937),

> Administration has to do with getting things done; with the accomplishment of defined objectives … In the science of administration, whether public or private, the basic "good" is efficiency. The fundamental objective of the science of administration is the accomplishment of the work in hand with the least expenditure of man-power and materials. Efficiency is thus axiom number one in the value scale of administration" (p. 191-192).

Kamensky (1996) suggests that there is no "single intellectual source" for reinventing government. In Kamensky's opinion, the reform movement emerged in the circles of

"practitioners of public administration in different places of the world but with many similar tenets. Their premises are based, in part, on the pioneering intellectual work of public choice theoreticians such as Mancur Olson, E. S. Savas, Gordon Tullock, and William Niskanen" (p. 248).

According to Rosenbloom (1993), reinventing government rejected the idea of centralized government and favored "decentralization, competition, deregulation, load-shedding, privatization, user fees, an "enterprise' culture … and entrepreneurship. Its management doctrine emphasize[d] 'customer service" (p. 506). In the same vein, Thompson and Riccucci (1998) argue that reinvention emphasized deregulation of government and increasing the degree of discretion exercised by government employees. According to Suleiman (2003), the key concepts behind reinventing government include entrepreneurism, customer orientation, flattening hierarchies, and alternative forms of implementation.

Major reinventing government principles were articulated by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler in their 1992 book "Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector," which sought to provide a "clear outline of a new way of conducting the public's business" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. xvii). Commenting on Osborne and Gaebler's book, Carroll (1996) argues that, "[R]arely have the ideas expressed in one book … so quickly become the framework of a reform effort …" (p. 245).

Osborne and Gaebler maintain that government has to become catalytic, community-owned, competitive, mission-driven, enterprising, customer-driven, enterprising, anticipatory, decentralized, and market-oriented. To improve performance and to increase customer satisfaction, Osborne and Gaebler suggest separating "policy decisions (steering) from service delivery (rowing)" (p. 266). To support their argument, Osborn and Gaebler (1992) refer to Peter

Drucker's argument that "successful organizations" concentrate policy-making responsibilities in the hands of top-management, whereas staff should be in charge of operations or policy-implementation.

In the opinion of reinventors, the "administrative management paradigm" based on law was the "paradigm that failed," since it had become the cause of bureaucratic red-tape and inefficiency (Moe, 1994). According to Frederickson (1996), for reinventors the "bureaucratic paradigm" is the problem and change is urgently needed. As Hyde et al. (2011) indicate, American reformers viewed government departments and agencies as inefficient and lacking in "incentives to perform well unless the expansion of their own programs and the increase of their budgets were involved" (p. 372). Within this context, the lessons from the private sector were seen as of particular relevance and value for the public sector organizations. According to Suleiman (2003),

> If only government or the state followed the private sector and learned the lessons of competition and customer satisfaction, we would restore trust in government and save a lot of money. This is a view that underlies the "reinvention of government" (p. 14).

Christensen (2011) maintains that NPR established "a direct link between the functioning of public services and citizens' trust" (p. 310). As the scholars argue, measurements of public attitudes towards the performance of government institutions played an important role in evaluating their performance. This performance was expected to be in line with the prescriptions of the new customer service contract with the American public, the contract that was to be at the core of the new "entrepreneurial management paradigm" (Moe, 1994).

Moe (1994) suggests that the new "entrepreneurial management paradigm" offered by reinventors seeks "to institute a highly pluralistic organizational and management structure upon

the executive branch. Congress is viewed as essentially a minor and negative factor in this new paradigm. The President, in turn, is seen more as a catalytic agent than as the legal agent of the sovereign power" (p. 115). In this context, it was considered essential to liberate executive departments and agencies from "congressional micromanagement" (Rosenbloom, 2001). According to the representatives of reinventing government, less control and less regulation would allow departments and agencies to come out of the "dark legal shadow" and get rid of the "defective philosophy," which implied that "law should dictate the answer" (Howard, xvi in Gore, 1995).

The "development of an entrepreneurial spirit" (Radin, 2006) within government is one of the important themes highlighted by reinventors. As Osborn and Gaebler argue, "We must turn bureaucratic institutions into entrepreneurial institutions, ready to kill off obsolete initiatives, willing to do more with less, eager to absorb new ideas" (p. 23). Following this line of argument, Bob Stone, who served as the NPR project director, highlights the idea of entrepreneurialism by drawing a sharp contrast between the entrepreneurial leadership and a so-called "contra-preneurial" leadership:

> The old, which I labeled "contra-preneurial leadership," defends the status quo, avoids risk, centralizes decision-making, and fixes unexpected failures. The new entrepreneurial leadership does just the reverse. It welcomes change, encourages sensible risk taking, decentralizes decision making, and builds on unexpected successes. (p. 104)

According to Mashaw (1995), reinventors "borrowed directly" from "empowerment-oriented" and "customer-centered" managerial approaches widely accepted in the private sector. In line with these approaches, civil servants are expected to act as entrepreneurs, facilitators, and educators, which often permits a large degree of discretion (Khademian, 1998; Osborne and

Gaebler, 1992). As Kellough (1998) explains, to perform their functions efficiently and effectively, public managers need to operate in an environment free from excessive rules and procedural requirements. As Osborn and Gaebler argue,

> We embrace our rules and red tape to prevent bad things from happening, of course. But those same rules prevent good things from happening. They slow government to a snail's pace. They make it impossible to respond to rapidly changing environments. They build wasted time and effort into the very fabric of the organization. (p. 111)

According to Kellough (1998), the idea of customer orientation "complements the notion of empowering managers in that the central purpose of increased managerial discretion is to allow managers to satisfy "customers" better" (p. 10). To achieve this goal, government "enters into a 'customer service contract' where administrators give taxpayers the same responsiveness and consideration businesses give customers" (Smith & Huntsman, 1997, p. 309). According to Osborne and Gaebler (1992), good customer service is based on the private sector principles and requires competition, which "lets each citizen choose his or her service provider." As Osborn and Gaebler argue, "customer-driven systems force service providers to be accountable to their customers" (p. 181).

Within this context, government is expected to listen carefully to its customers and strive to improve the quality of goods and services. To improve the quality, "They survey client attitudes, make services convenient, empower their subordinates, and decide which programs to contract out or decentralize-in many ways acting as owners do in private business"(Schachter, 1995, p. 534). According to McGuire (2001), one of the key tools used by American reformers were customer service plans - the American equivalent of the UK Citizen's Charter.

In the United States, customer service plans included customer service standards and surveys, which government departments were mandated to develop. As McGuire (2001) explains, "Setting service standards and making agencies more responsive to customers has shifted the focus from internal processes to agency objectives and people served, which has encouraged a focus on the needs of citizens rather than administrative convenience" (p. 500). Yet, as seen in the next section, not all spoke of reinvention in complimentary terms.

A Critique of the New Public Management/Reinventing Government

The critique of NPM/Reinventing Government is based on a range of arguments presented in the public administration literature. Some scholarly studies emphasize the political nature of NPM reforms, the reformers' distorted vision of governance, government, and public service, as well as negative aspects associated with transformation of relationship between government and the public as a result of reform. This section discusses some of the major critical arguments highlighted in the reviewed literature.

According to Radin (2006), since the reforms were largely guided by the private sector experiences, the main emphasis of reform was placed on using the managerial approach. The managerial approach (that is often associated with the "apolitical managerial mindset"), however, may serve "to support a political agenda" (Radin, 2006, p. 42). For instance, Suleiman (2003), argues that, "Politicians, however demagogic as they might be, are seeking to maximize their chances of election and reelection …" Within this context, "The bureaucracy is never unaffected by politics (p. 10).

Kettl (2005a) suggests that the American tradition embraces the use of reforms as "political symbols" that serve as a leverage for "political gain." In Kettl's words, this tradition differs from the broader NPM approach, which was grounded in the idea that "improvements in

40

administrative efficiency would provide leverage for political gain" (p. 345). In general, for Kettl, management reforms are not only about management but also, to a significant extent, about policy and politics. "Management reform is not fundamentally about management. Elected officials do not pursue management reform for its own sake but because they believe it helps them achieve a broader political purpose" (Kettl, 2005b, p. 77).

Frederickson (1996), commenting on reinventing government movement, has a similar vision of the purpose of reform, "It is a reform ideally suited to executive electoral politics. Like most earlier reforms, such as the Hoover Commissions, the reinventing reform is favorable to the interest of political executives" (p. 266). In the same vein, Goodsell (1993), describes reinvention exercise as a political act: "While the movement may portray itself as bringing the public sector into accord with objective principles of good management, its real goal is to achieve a record of chief executive achievement or lay the basis for doing so" (p. 8).

Kettl (1994) argues that among important recommendations of Al Gore's NPR was to redistribute power "from Congress to the executive branch, and from top levels of the executive to lower levels" (p. 309). According to Carroll (1995), the principles of the NPR and reinventing government were elements of "an explicit agenda to control bureaucracy and address public dissatisfaction with and media criticism of bureaucratic government by making bureaucracy more responsive to public perceptions and concerns" (p. 304). Carroll refers to NPR I as the "presidential bureaucracy policy." According to Radin (2006), the NPR used "the concept of a chief executive as the focal point" (p. 41-42).

Wamsley and Dudley (1998) offer a similar argument emphasizing the idea that the image of the managerial chief executive that had emerged in the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (Brownlow report) in 1937 was reinforced under the

41

reinventing government program. The Brownlow report states that "the canons of efficiency" required the chief executive to be the "center of energy, direction, and administrative management" (PCAM, 1937, p. 3). The report advised that the principle of the separation of powers had placed "in the President, and in the President alone the whole executive power of the Government of the United States" (PCAM, 1937 quoted in Rohr 1986, p. 139).

Although it is highly questionable if the American Constitution invested *all* executive power in the president, the conventional wisdom has been that the president is to preside over the administrative agencies as the "sole executive officer" (Rohr, 1986), "the exclusive "manager" of the public bureaucracy according to norms of "efficiency" and effectiveness" (Riggs, 1991, p. 475). The congressional involvement in executive management has often been discouraged; for many president-led reformers, it has been essential to liberate agencies from "congressional micromanagement" (Rosenbloom, 2001, p. 163). Not surprisingly, the Report suggested that the president was to exercise exclusive control over reorganization of the executive branch. According to the Brownlow Report, all the efforts, which were made by its creators, had one single "grand purpose": "to make democracy work today in our National Government; that is to make our government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the Nation" (PCAM, 1937, p. 4).

The rise of the NPM-type reforms intensified the scholarly debate on the applicability of the private sector approaches, solutions, and values to the public sector. In the public administration literature, many critical arguments resonate with earlier works of such well-regarded public administration scholars as Paul Appleby, underscoring his point of view in the title "Government Is Different" (1953), and Wallace Sayre arguing that "business and public administration are alike only in all unimportant respects" (Sayre, 1958, p. 245). As one of the

contemporary commentators puts it, "I argue that the new public management is basically flawed. By its very nature the public administration field does not lend itself to big answers because private sector management practices very rarely apply to government operations" (Savoie, 2006).

A number of scholars emphasize the idea that managerial approaches and belief structures may threaten to undermine the very foundations of public service as well as democratic and constitutional values. For example, Haque (2001) indicates the "diminishing publicness of public service" and points out that "under the current ethos of market-driven reforms, the unique public service norms or standards (e.g., citizenship, representation, accountability, equality, impartiality, openness, responsiveness, and justice) … have recently been marginalized, if not replaced" (p. 67). Similarly, according to Edwards et al. (2002), "Entrepreneurial motives may conflict with public service values of equity, accountability and probity; risk-taking with the stewardship function; the uneven distribution of entrepreneurial resources with equity" (p. 1543). At the same time, the rhetoric of entrepreneurship may be found appealing to different audiences as "exciting, heroic, new, innovative" (Edwards et al., 2002, p. 1545).

Terry (1998) points out that neo-managerialism promotes the idea of public entrepreneurialism, which distorts the fundamentals of the American regime. As Terry notes, "public entrepreneurs of the neo-managerialist persuasion are oblivious to other values highly prized in the U.S. constitutional democracy. Values such as fairness, justice, representation, or participation are not on the radar screen. This is indeed, troublesome" (p. 198).

Rosenbloom and Piotrowski (2005) look at reforms from the public interest and individual rights perspective and emphasize the significant tension between managerial and

constitutional values. According to James Madison, the U. S. Constitution was to "secure the public good and private rights" (*Federalist 10*); however, the supreme law of the land "does not apply to purely private relationships" that may be established when governmental functions are transferred to the private sector (Rosenbloom & Piotrowski, 2005). By presenting two court cases - *Pedreira v. Kentucky Baptist Homes for Children* and *Downs v. Town of Guilderland et al.* - the authors demonstrate the idea that "when government activities are privatized or outsourced, democratic norms embodied in constitutional and administrative law are apt to be lost" (p. 103).

Rosenbloom and O'Leary (1997) maintain that the values embedded in the American constitutionalism are quite different from those suggested by the managerial approach and emphasize tension between constitutional rights and economic efficiency. As Rosenbloom and O'Leary argue, many key processes involved in the enforcement of constitutional rights (including the procedural due process) are "not necessarily efficient [and] economical …" and from the managerial perspective may be viewed as "micromanagement" or "red-tape" (p. 4).

Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) argue that NPM became a "normative model for public administration and public management" by bringing not only the "*techniques*" of business administration, but also "certain business *values*" (p. 551). The scholars maintain that "in a democratic society, a concern for democratic values should be paramount in the way we think about systems of governance. Values such as efficiency and productivity should not be lost, but should be placed in the larger context of democracy, community, and the public interest" (p. 557). In a related vein, Frederickson (1996) commenting on the market-defined notion of customer, highlights the drift towards individualistic values rather than "the values of achieving

collective democratic consensus" (p. 265). As Frederickson (1996) notes, "The public official is to develop choice makers rather than build a community" (p. 265).

Within this context, according to NPM critics, the degree to which citizens can influence policy making is very limited. According to Peters (2009), NPM "transformed the public from citizens to customers of public services," which "tends to denigrate the political role of citizens" (Peters, 2009, p. 15). As Borgmann (1992) notes, in the NPM era "[w]hen consumers begin to act, the fundamental decisions have already been made. Consumers are in a politically and morally weak position" (as quoted in Box, 2001, p. 613).

According to Pierre (1995), the "reconceptualization of citizenship" and "transformation of the concept of the citizen into that of the customer" is unfortunate because "many of the qualities associated with citizenship are critical to the relationship between the individual and the polity at large" (p. 57). In Pierre's words, the reconceptualization of citizenship may result in increased inequality among individuals. Moreover, the very definition of customers may seem quite "elusive" (Vann, 2004). As Kettl and Dilulio (1995) argue, "The concept is poorly developed, and overenthusiastic rhetoric has often substituted for clear thinking. If there is something to customer service, that something needs more careful development" (p. 54). In a related vein, the idea of customer satisfaction borrowed from the private sector may be compromised given its (often silenced) intention of realizing a "broader strategy to increase profits" since "… firms exist to satisfy shareholders, not customers" (Fountain, 2001, p. 59). This issue becomes especially problematic when public organizations adopt customer-oriented practices.

Looking from a broader perspective, Wamsley and Dudley (1998) point out that in general reforms brought confusion of management principles and the principles of government

and governance. While management "is more likely in business organizations," the principles of government and governance incorporate evocation of "certain kinds of relations among and between citizens and government: relations that allow us to maintain a collective coherence; establish our identities individually and collectively; and generally foster conditions which ultimately permit us, individually and collectively, to discover ourselves and the meaning and significance of our lives" (p. 356).

Conclusion

Starting off with a brief discussion of Michael Urban's key findings on commonalities between American and Soviet administrative ideologies, this chapter presented a number of key issues highlighted in the public administration/public management literature on NPM. The examination of the broader convergence-versus-divergence debate was followed by the review of literature explaining the essence of NPM and reinventing government. In addition, this chapter presented critical arguments related to the NPM/Reinventing Government model.

As this literature review demonstrates, scholars have explored a wide variety of concepts and ideas that have been at the core of NPM and reinventing government. Many of these concepts and ideas overlap and, in their combination, revolve around two broad themes: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public.

The theme of the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) embraces several key attributes or *subthemes*. First, according to the reviewed literature, reformers view the new "ideal" government as an effectively and efficiently operating business-like or entrepreneurial institution. A substantial body of scholarly literature highlights this vision (see, for example, Box, 2001; Hughes, 1998; Jenssen, 2001; Kickert, 1996; Lynn, 2001, 2006, 2008; Olsen, 2008;

Peters, 2001). Second, according to the literature, within this vision, civil servants are no longer viewed as rule-followers, but, rather, acquire a new, "managerial" identity (see, for example, Kickert, 1996; Peter, 2001; Peters & Pierre, 2000; Ridley, 1995; Thompson & Riccucci, 1998). Empowerment is a significant "piece" of the new managerial identity that links the theme of the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) with the second theme - the new vision of the relationship between government and the public (Kellough, 1998).

The theme of the new vision of the relationship between government and the public includes two important subthemes. First, according to the literature, the new vision of the relationship between government and the public is structured around a new customer service contract with the public. More than a few studies mentioned in this chapter discuss this point (see, for example, Christensen & Laegrid, 2001; Olsen, 2004; Pierre, 1995, 1998; Schachter, 1995; Singh, 2006; Smith & Huntsman, 1997). Second, according to the literature, the customer service contract is an important trust-making mechanism (Suleiman, 2003; Christensen, 2011). The new government is the government that can be trusted by the people. In general, the NPM/Reinventing Government model reflects and reinforces a particular view of a new, better government that needs to be changed or transformed along with the fundamental principles that have shaped "the nature of the link between population and government" (Urban, 1982, p. 122).

As for the comparison of the literature's emphasis on the Russian versus the American experience, some important points were identified. Russian scholars believe that NPM reforms may require "adjustment and adaptation" when they are "placed" in a different context. Moreover, under particular circumstances, the implementation of NPM reforms may be premature unless a governance system has achieved a certain level of development. In the Russian context, some of the core NPM ideas related to the new vision of the government and

the relationship between government and the public may be found to be in contradiction to those identified in the review of the NPM and Reinventing Government literature (for example, the vision of the role of the public servant) or only in partial agreement with the core NPM ideas (for example, the vision of government as a business-like or entrepreneurial institution).

Further research, which has been conducted as part of this study, will help to draw a more detailed picture capturing the essence of NPM in Russia. Based on the literature review, the NPM/Reinventing Government model will shape the American case and help to structure, understand, and analyze the case of Russia. Driving off the broader framework established on the basis of the themes and subthemes identified in the literature review, the following chapter will present the methodology used in this study in a more particular manner.

Chapter 3:
Methodology

Research Approach and the Nature of the Study

The examination of administrative reform at the level of reform talk and texts provides a suitable lens for identifying and comparing new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia (Fox & Meyer, 1995). To understand new ideologies of administration in the United States and post-Soviet Russia, this study presents a relatively new trend in comparative research to investigate, compare, and contrast administrative reforms across countries. Through examination of reform related official publications and interviews, particular attention will be focused on identifying the "systems of ideas" of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the two countries.

The two case studies of reforms are structured around two broad themes identified through the literature review: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public. The review and analysis of official publications and interview data were conducted in immediate relevance to the broad themes and subthemes identified in the literature review chapter with the purpose of understanding how ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia developed around these themes/subthemes.

The literature review set the groundwork for case studies by demonstrating major characteristics of and issues immediately related to the NPM/Reinventing Government model. This model will shape the American case and will be extended further and deeper through the analysis of official publications and interview data. The American case organized around the themes and subthemes identified in the literature review will serve as a yardstick against which the Russian case will be framed and analyzed, which will allow for systematic analysis and comparison.

According to Collier (1993), "Comparison is a fundamental tool of analysis. It sharpens our power of description, and plays a central role in concept-formation by bringing into focus suggestive similarities and contrasts among cases" (p. 105). Much of the literature on administrative reform is in agreement with the idea that, "[i]n contrast to past reforms, reinvention is notable for its apparent relationship to similar administrative reforms that are under way beyond the borders of the United States" (Brudney & Wright, 2002, p. 354).

Despite the suggested similarity of reforms, however, the underlying assumption is that the study deals with the administrative systems of two "manifestly dissimilar" countries. Thus, it seems reasonable to suggest that the broader framework of this research project is shaped by the "most different" systems design based on heterogeneous cases, which have the potential for convergence in some areas (Przeworski & Teune, 1970). Through examination of official publications and interview data, this study seeks to determine commonalities and differences between new ideologies of administration in the two countries under analysis. Following Toonen (2008), the intention of this study is to provide "understanding and insight into commonalities within the differences among countries" and to understand the "differences within the commonalities" (Toonen, 2008, p. 222).

This study is descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory in nature. The descriptive aspect is important because of the fact that there is an evident lack of research comparing reform efforts by examining a range of official publications of the United States and of Russia. The lack of descriptive information itself is especially true in the case of Russia. That is why the descriptive aspect is instrumental in understanding what official publications "say" in relation to the identified themes. The descriptive part is extended by the interpretive and explanatory aspects that help to provide detail and depth to the analysis.

50

As scholars suggest, in the humanities, the social sciences, and applied fields, including law and public administration, there has been a narrative and interpretive turn or "turn to language" that allows to "move beyond efforts to describe a universalized, orderly social world" (Ospina & Dodge, 2005, p. 143). One of the techniques used in this research to pursue interpretation and explanation, is "ideological discourse analysis" of selected texts (van Dijk, 1995a). In this dissertation, ideological discourse analysis is instrumental in moving the discussion to the level of administrative ideology by helping to uncover specific ideas through the examination of particular discourse structures. Elite interviews conducted with American and Russian government officials and analysts contribute to all three aspects of the study and play a special role in expanding the explanatory aspect of this research by providing links between texts and broader context.

The Review and Analysis of Official Publications

In this study, the focus is on "official discourse" (Burton & Carlen, 1979), which, within the context of this research, is based on "already existing" data and "researcher-generated" data (Rapley, 2007). The already existing data, which exits independently of a researcher's action, was collected from government/official publications - publications produced by the government and/or at the command or request of the government (Burton & Carlen, 1979) - including federal laws, presidential documents, and government reports. Documents were accessed through publicly accessible sources, including libraries and the Internet. The researcher-generated data is represented by interpretations and explanations developed through discourse analysis and interview data. Thus, the corpus of material was formed by the official publications and enhanced through elite interviews.

This study is based on examination of a large quantity of qualitative data (Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001). The purpose of gathering the large quantity of data was to capture maximum number of important aspects that would help to understand the new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia. Given the goal of this study, it did not seem feasible to focus only on several texts and provide for their in-depth analysis. Some documents were used exclusively for descriptive purposes to create the narrative in support of the themes and subthemes in chapters 4 and 5. Ideological discourse analysis was conducted on a number of other documents to highlight specific ideas of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia. The most illustrative stretches of texts that contained discourse structures with ideological markings (van Dijk, 1995) became part of the narrative in the two chapters.

The selection of official publications for discourse analysis was based on (1) the review of scholarly studies, (2) review of the websites of the entities, which, in many respects, have been driving reform efforts in the United States and Russia, including the National Partnership for Reinventing Government and the Russian Ministry of Economy, (3) relevance of documents to the two broad themes identified in the literature review: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public, and (4) consultations with the interviewees. The official documents under analysis include legislation, presidential documents, government reports, and, in the Russian case, the reports produced by external organizations (such as, the World Bank and the Higher School of Economics) that played a key role in formulating the reform agenda in Russia.

The vast majority of documents analyzed in this study were published within the period from 1993 to 2001 (the United States) and from 2000 to 2008 (Russia). The selection of these

two particular periods was based on two factors: 1) during these periods the United States and Russia initiated and advanced NPM related reform efforts; 2) these two periods cover the administration of President Clinton and President Putin who played a significant role in shaping new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia.

The following official publications were reviewed and analyzed as part of this research project:

United States

Legislation

- Government Performance & Results Act of 1993

Presidential Documents

-First Inaugural Address (1993)
-Executive Order 12862-Setting Customer Service Standards (September 11, 1993)
-Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies. Streamlining the Bureaucracy (September 11, 1993)
 -Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Improving Customer Service (March 23, 1995)
-Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Plain language in Government Writing (June 1, 1998)
-Presidential Directive: Conducting "Conversations with America" to Further Improve Customer Service (March 3, 1998)
-White House Memorandum on Electronic Government (December 17, 1999)

Government Documents

-From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less (September 1993)
-Common Sense Government (September 1995)
-The Best Kept Secrets in Government (September 1996)
-The Blair House Papers (January 1997)
-Access America: Reengineering through Information Technology (February 1997)
-Businesslike Government: Lessons Learned From America's Best Companies (October 1997)
-Putting Customers First: Standards for Serving the American People (1994-1997)
-Serving the American Public Reports (1995-1997)

Russia

Legislation

-Federal Law No. 59-FZ On the Procedure for Considering Applications from Citizens of the Russian Federation (May 2, 2006)
-Federal Law No. 8-FZ On Ensuring Access to Information on the Activities of State and Municipal Bodies (February 2, 2009)
-Draft Federal Bill on General Principles for Organizing the Delivery of Public (Municipal) Services and Performance of Public (Municipal) Functions No. 254940-5 (Draft Federal Bill on Public Services)
-Draft Federal Bill on Administrative Regulations
-Draft Federal Bill on Standards of Public Services
-Federal Law No. 79-FZ On State Civil Service in the Russian Federation (July 27, 2004)

Presidential Documents

Addresses to the Federal Assembly (2000-2006)
Presidential Decree No. 1496 - Concept of Reform of the System Public Service in the Russian Federation (August 15, 2001)
Presidential Decree No. 824 – On Measures for Implementation of Administrative Reform in 2003-2004 (July 23, 2003)
Presidential Decree No. 314 – On System and Structure of the Federal Bodies of Executive Power (March 9, 2004)

Government Documents

-Government Resolution No. 98 - On Guaranteeing Access to Information on the Activities of the Government of the Russian Federation and Federal Bodies of Executive Power (February 12, 2003)
-Government Resolution No. 249 - On Measures to Improve Effectiveness of Budget Expenditures / Concept for Reforming Budgeting Process in the Russian Federation for 2004-2006 (May 22, 2004)
-Draft Federal Target Program Administrative Reform, 2004
-Government Resolution No. 1789-r - Concept of Administrative Reform in the Russian Federation (October 25, 2005)
-On Priority Initiatives of the Government Commission on Administrative Reform
-Government Resolution No. 679 - On Sequence of Development and Approval of Administrative Regulations to Perform Public Functions (Deliver Public Services) (November 11, 2005)
-Russia at the Turn of the Millennium (Putin, 1999)
-The results of implementing programs, plans, and projects by the federal and regional executive agencies in 2006 (Sharonov, 2007)
-Priorities of the Government Commission on Administrative Reform in 2008 (Popova, 2007)
-Anti-Corruption Program, July 27, 2007
-On the First Stages of Administrative Reform, 2008

Reports Produced by External Organizations

-Modernization of the Federal Civil Service: Methodology for Functional Reviews (World Bank, 2001)
-International public administration reform: Implications for the Russian Federation (World Bank, 2004)
-Administrative and regulatory reform in Russia: Addressing potential sources of corruption (World Bank, 2006).
-Executive branch: Functions, Types, Economic Mechanism (Higher School of Economics, 2002)
-Methodological recommendations on the development of registers of government services and standards of government services (Higher School of Economics, 2004)
-The All-Russian Monitoring of Introduction of Administrative Regulations (Higher School of Economics, 2009)

Guided by the goal of achieving an understanding of ideational systems of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia within the context of administrative reform, following Fairclough (1993) and Rapley (2007), the analysis of official publications involved several stages. At the initial stage of the analysis, I carefully read the selected official publications and interview data and noted down what I was learning from these materials in relevance to the broad themes and subthemes identified in the literature review. After that, I segmented the data and applied codes to the segments of data. This process helped me to expand on the subthemes under each of the two broader themes identified in the literature review. In many respects, the subthemes highlighted more specific items discussed in the literature review, such as for example, entrepreneurialism and empowerment in the American case. Following van Dijk (1995b; 2000), I also viewed and analyzed how ideologies are expressed in various discourse structures. I paid particular attention to identifying various stretches of the text with ideological markings at the level of lexicon, rhetoric, syntax, and semantics (van Dijk, 1995b).

My analysis continued until further collection of materials provided no new information (Rapley, 2007). As Milliken (1999) suggests,

> An analysis can be said to be complete (validated) when upon adding new texts and comparing their object spaces, the researcher finds consistently that the theoretical categories she has generated work for those texts. This is also a partial response to the issue of the reliability of discourse analyses, i.e. that the interpretation offered has been checked and reworked until it fits with and explains consistently texts that were not originally part of its empirical base (p. 234-235).

In addition, according to Milliken (1999), reliability and interpretation could be a "matter of external checks." I followed Milliken's argument and used previous studies discussed in the literature review and consultations with the interviewees to ensure that adequate checks are performed in this study. At the final stages of the analysis, the data from the analysis of official publications were refined and updated by the data gathered from the elite interviews.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis plays an important role in achieving the goals of this research project. Discourse analysis, which involves the "study of talk and texts" (Wetherell, Taylor, and Yates, 2001), tries to understand the 'interpretive repertoires' … or related sets of ideas which influence how we use language" (Hyde, 2004, p. 48). As Wetherell and Potter (1992) argue,

> Interpretive repertoires are pre-eminently a way of understanding the content of discourse and how that content is organized. Although stylistic and grammatical elements are sometimes closely associated with this organization, our analytic focus is not a linguistic one; it is concerned with language use, what is achieved by that use and the nature of the interpretive resources that allow that achievement. (p. 90-91)

The term "discourse" is understood in this study as "language use in speech and writing" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258) and as a "particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1). As Milliken (1999) argues, "…discourses are understood to work to define and to enable, and also to silence and to exclude …;" they also give things "taken-for granted qualities and attributes" (p. 229-231). According to Herrera and Braumoeller (2004), discourse is represented by a "constitutive set of structures and practices that do not merely reflect thoughts or realities, but rather structure and constitute them" (p. 16).

As Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) argue, "With language, we create representations of reality that are never mere reflections of a pre-existing reality but contribute to constructing reality" (p. 9). For Burton and Carlen (1979), "The discourse is a necessary requirement for political and ideological hegemony" (p. 48). Along the same lines, Foucault (1981) argues that "discourse is the power which is to be seized" (p. 52).

There are two major streams of discourse analysis: non-critical discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Non-critical discourse analysis is largely focused on the formal characteristics of a text and typically is concerned with vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure. Although recognizing the importance of textual dimension, CDA does not stop there and looks to determine broader connections of texts with different dimensions of social life. As Fairclough (1993) argues,

Critical approaches differ from non-critical approaches in not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations and

57

systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants. (p. 12)

According to Villanueva-Russell (2011), "The "critical" aspect of discourse analysis specifically goes beyond mere description to include an interpretation that demonstrates how the discourse is shaped by power and ideology that is often not visible to participants" (p.1828). Fairclough (1993) maintains that, "there is no set procedure for doing discourse analysis" (p. 225). However, an important point that is emphasized by many scholars is that discourse analysis requires an "examination of *both* text and context" (Gasper & Apthorpe, 1996, p. 5). As Fairlough and Wodak (1997) argue, "discourse is socially *constitutive* as well as socially shaped …" (p. 258). As Fairclough (2003) explains,

> Texts have causal effects upon, and contribute to changes in, people (beliefs, attitudes, etc.), actions, social relations, and the material world. It would make little sense to focus on language in new capitalism if we didn't think that texts have causal effects of this sort, and effects on social change. (p. 8)

According to Fairclough (1993a), "text analysis is not something that should be done in isolation … analysis cannot consist merely of description of texts carried out in isolation from their interpretation" (p. 198). In broader terms, discourse analysis seeks to understand the relationship between texts and reality, uncovering how meaning is made (van Dijk, 1993).

In many cases, discourse can be viewed both as a product of an ideology and as a mechanism to produce the ideology (van Dijk, 1997). Discourse analysis may show that some levels of texts are ideologically invested within particular social contexts. According to discourse analysis literature, there are different aspects of meaning that may be characterized as ideological, including (but not limited to) word meanings and metaphors. According to van Dijk

58

(2006), "depending on context, any variable structure of discourse may be ideologically marked" (p. 124). Expanding on this argument, van Dijk points out that "as such words, phrases, topics or intonations, are not ideologically biased. It is their specific use in specific communicative situations that make them so …" (p. 128).

According to the literature, ideological analysis of language and discourse or "ideological discourse analysis" has gained increased acceptance in the humanities and social sciences (van Dijk, 1995a; Barrett et. al., 2010). Ideological discourse analysis allows a researcher to reveal the ideology of participants either through investigating a communicative act or a particular text. As van Dijk (1995) puts it, "The presupposition of such analyses is that ideologies of speakers or writers may be 'uncovered' by close reading, understanding or systematic analysis, if language users explicitly or unwittingly 'express' their ideologies through language and communication" (p. 135). Van Dijk (2008) argues that discourse has a "special status" in the reproduction of ideologies and "various properties of text and talk allow social members to actually *express* or *formulate* abstract ideological beliefs or any other opinion related to such ideologies" (p. 192).

Addressing the question of how specifically one could see the expressions of ideology in discourse, van Dijk (1995) offers a number of suggestions related to discourse structures that may contain ideological markings. For example, according to van Dijk (1995), lexical choices can be indicative of ideology. As van Dijk argues, "Lexicalization is a major and well-known domain of ideological expression and persuasion" (p. 25). In many cases, lexical choices can demonstrate a preference to a specific vocabulary that reflects or supports particular ideologies.

Another example offered by van Dijk is the "rhetorical structures of discourse," including, but not limited to, metaphors, hyperboles, over- and understatements, comparisons, and anaphoras. Linking lexicalization and rhetoric, van Dijk (1995) illustrates his point by the

following example: "Racist, sexist and other inegalitarian ideologies, for instance, may typically be expressed, not only by derogating lexical items referring to minorities or women, but also by demeaning metaphors that belittle, marginalize or dehumanize the 'others'" (p. 29).

In addition to lexicalization and rhetoric, syntax can reflect ideology. As van Dijk (1995) explains, word order may play an important role in determining a particular (sometimes implicit) meaning or semantic content. Also, syntactic sentence structures may be instrumental in presenting positive actions or characteristics of "us" and negative actions/characteristics of "them." At the same time, "the agency of ingroup members who engage in negative actions will be syntactically played down by the use of passive sentences" (p. 24). An additional link between syntax and ideology is related to possible sentence complexity that may restrict "access to outsiders." As an example,

> Elite speakers and institutions may restrict comprehensibility of their discourses in this way and, thereby, control access to public discourse, e.g., to political and media text and talk. The public may, for example, be excluded from elite debate and decision making. (van Dijk, 1995a, p. 25).

The expression of ideology often penetrates the border between syntax and semantics. In this context, pronouns play a prominent role in carrying out ideological work. For example, pronouns "us" and "them" may serve the purpose of polarization between ingroups and outgroups (van Dijk, 2000). As van Dijk (1995b) explains, "Ingroup-outgroup distinction, differentiation and polarization, which … are the central characteristic of all ideologies, are marked in discourse structure first of all by personal and possessive pronouns (we, they, us, them, our, their, etc.)" (p. 150).

Given the fact that this study seeks to uncover administrative ideologies of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia, van Dijk's approach to the analysis of language and discourse was found to be of particular relevance to this research project. To identify ideological markers for the purpose of understanding administrative ideologies in the United States and Russia, particular attention will be focused on such discourse structures as lexicon, rhetoric, syntax, and semantics.

Elite Interviews

In addition to conducting ideological discourse analysis, the decision was made to conduct elite interviews in the two countries under analysis. As Fairclough (1993a) notes, interviews are one of the most frequently used ways of enhancing a corpus of material. In a related vein, writing about comparative research, Carmel (1999) argues that, "comparative documentary research is much enriched by interviews and an intimacy with the language and social, political and economic environment of the countries being studied" (p. 148). In this research project, the objective of the interviews was three-fold: to enhance the corpus of material with supplementary data, to obtain interpretations and explanations of ideas that were advanced by reformers, and to clarify the meaning of certain texts by providing links with a broader context. The elite interviews provided invaluable insight into this research project; it may be argued that discourse analysis of already existing texts can lack important features and explanations that can be found exclusively through interviews.

The interview questions focused on major ideas that guided reformers, administrative reform experiences, and reasons behind a range of decisions. Most questions were immediately related to the themes and subthemes identified in the literature review. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured fashion, which provided an opportunity to frame the interviews

61

around particular questions, and, at the same time, to probe beyond given answers. See Appendix A for the list of key interview questions.

The interviews were conducted with (1) current and former American and Russian high-ranking officials - the "authorized speakers/writers of a dominant discourse" (Milliken, 1999) - including the members of government work groups on administrative reform, who were immediately involved in setting the federal government's reform agenda during the periods under analysis and (2) leading analysts and scholars who have written extensively on administrative reform. At the stage of planning the interviews, I sought and received advice on the potential interviewees from the members of my dissertation committee and my former colleagues in the Russian government. Interestingly, in the process of interviews, the interviewees recommended me to talk with the same individuals that had already been included on my list.

Following the approval of this research by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Virginia Tech, the potential interviewees were contacted via e-mail and asked if they were willing to participate in an in-person or telephone interview. The initial e-mail contained brief information about the research project and contact information for my faculty advisor. I also attached my resume to give the interviewees more information about my background. The response rate was quite high: eight out of ten individuals in each country agreed to participate in the interviews. As a result, 15 interviews were conducted (8 in the United States and 7 in Russia). The following individuals were interviewed:

United States	Russia
Kettl, Donald - Dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland	Alexandrov, Oleg - General Director of iCEFC and former Consultant for the Government Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of Budget Expenditures
Mihm, Christopher - Managing Director for Strategic Issues at the U.S. Government Accountability Office	Barabashev, Alexei - Dean of the Department of Public and Municipal Administration at the Higher School of Economics
Osborne, David - Senior Advisor to Vice President Gore, co-author of "Reinventing Government"	Dobrolyubova, Yelena - General Director of the Center for Economic and Financial Consulting and former World Bank Task Manager for the Russia Public Administration Reform Work
Posner, Paul - Director of the Public Administration Program at George Mason University	Klimenko, Andrey - Vice-President of the Higher School of Economics and member of the Work Group on the Development of Administrative Regulations, Government Commission on Administrative Reform
Radin, Beryl - Scholar in Residence in the Department of Public Administration and Policy at American University	
Relyea, Harold - Former scholar of American government at the Congressional Research Service	Maslennikova, Yelena - Chair of the Department of Public and Municipal Administration at the Volga State Academy of Civil Service
Stone, Bob - Project Director for the NPR	
Anonymous interviewee working at the legislative branch	Yuzhakov, Vladimir - Director of the Department on Administrative Reform at the Center for Strategic Developments
	Zhulin, Andrey - Director of the Center for Government Activity Analysis and member of the Work Group on Improving Structure and Functions of the Federal Executive Bodies, Government Commission on Administrative Reform

The majority of interviews were in-person - 50 percent in the United States and 100 percent in Russia. The reason for the lower number of in-person interviews in the United States is related to the remote location of two interviewees and personal preference for telephone conversation of two other individuals. The duration of interviews varied from 15 minutes to one

hour and a half. The majority of interviews, however, lasted for 45-50 minutes. The interviews were conducted in the two countries in the fall and winter of 2010. The list of questions (that were primarily related to the two broad themes) was emailed to each interviewee one week before the interview.

With the interviewees' permission, the interviews were recorded on a digital audio recorder and stored in MP3 format on the personal computer. No identifying information was stored on the recording or transcripts. The interviews were later transcribed into the Microsoft Excel documents for analysis. To reduce potential risks to subjects, no information or documents of a confidential nature were requested or used. The permission to quote and identify comments by name was granted by the majority of interviewees. Upon the request of one individual, the identifying information is not used in the text of the dissertation nor associated with the quoted text.

Research Limitations

As in any research study, this research has a number of limitations. One of the important limitations is the focus on a relatively limited time frame in each country: 1993-2001 in the United States and 2000-2008 in Russia. The explanation for selecting these particular periods is related to the research approach – examination of administrative ideologies through the analysis of administrative reform related talk and texts. Although the reform efforts in each country did not stop after the end of the selected periods, I found it important to limit the discussion to the periods of the Clinton and Putin administrations given the important role played by the two Presidents. Also, these are the periods when the new ideologies of administration started acquiring an updated meaning in the framework of one of the most influential international reform movements - the New Public Management (NPM).

Another limitation of this study is related to the research approach. As mentioned earlier in this study, there could be different approaches to explore ideology, including, but not limited to, particular policies or actions of political institutions. This study strives to achieve the goal of understanding new ideologies of administration through the lens of examining administrative reforms. There is a possibility that other approaches may help to uncover additional or emphasize different components of administrative ideologies.

Probably the most significant limitation of this study is related to the methodology used in this research project. There is a well-known concern among scholars that the studies using discourse analysis represent exclusively the researcher's opinion and interpretation. Basically, the point is that if another scholar undertakes a similar effort, the findings and conclusions will be inevitably different. This argument clearly makes sense – the same data can be interpreted differently. To address this issue, I made efforts to justify my interpretations by "evidence" from two sources: the literature review and interviews with officials immediately participating in reforms, as well as scholars and analysts in the two countries. In this research project, interpretation and explanation "are complementary to each other. That is why the discursive "findings" are seen as rigorously produced interpretations, which will be presented in the following two chapters.

Chapter 4:
Administrative Reform in the United States:
The New Vision of the Government and
the Relationship between Government and the Public

Introduction to Chapters 4 and 5

This is the first of two chapters presenting a review and analysis of American and Russian administrative reform related official publications, which are supported and expanded by the elite interview data. The analysis combines descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory approaches and seeks to identify the "systems of ideas" of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia. Chapters 4 and 5 begin with a very brief broader description of administrative reform efforts in the United States (Chapter 4) and Russia (Chapter 5). In each chapter, this discussion is followed by a section that presents the overarching narrative in the official discourse – the utmost urgency of change. The following sections of the two chapters are structured around two broad themes identified in the literature review: the new vision of the government (and its bureaucracy) and the relationship between government and the public. Within the two themes, the discussion in the form a story that combines the findings from the review and analysis of official publications and interview data, is presented around more specific subthemes highlighted in the literature review. Each chapter concludes with a "Summary" section.

Highlights of Reinventing Government

The American version of NPM - President Clinton's reinventing government initiative - was launched by the work of more than 200 federal employees, who under the leadership of Vice President Gore prepared the National Performance Review (NPR). In addition to Osborne and Gaebler's book *Reinventing Government* that provided a programmatic guidance to reform,

reinvention evolved from several other, closely related streams of influence. As Kettl (1998) notes, the NPR "followed the pattern of the much publicized Texas performance review, in which squads of reformers swept through government agencies to identify targets of waste and opportunities for management improvement" (p. 2). Another stream of influence came from the experiences of large high-performance private organizations, which realized the importance of changing cultures and processes to become more competitive (Kamensky, 1996). In addition, the reinventing government initiative was nurtured by international experiences, which were thoroughly studied and applied in American government. For example, reinventors were attracted by the major principles put forward by the UK's citizen's charters that emphasized the importance of quality and timeliness of customer service.

The first NPR report *From Red Tape to Results* (1993) offers recommendations for government reinvention and sets an agenda for making government "work better and cost less" by cutting red-tape, putting customers first, empowering employees to get results, and cutting back to basics (Gore, 1993). According to the report, the reformers intended to invent a government that would put people first by:

- Cutting unnecessary spending

- Serving its customers

- Empowering its employees

- Helping communities solve their own problems

- Fostering excellence. (p. 17)

The reinventing government initiative evolved through three phases (Kettl, 1998). Phase I was largely driven by recommendations from the first NPR report (1993), which set the tone for administrative reform effort in the U.S. federal government and led to the issuance of two

executive orders and the Memorandum on Streamlining the Bureaucracy. Executive Order 12861 directed each executive department and agency to "eliminate not less than 50 percent of its civilian internal management regulations that are not required by law within 3 years." Executive Order 12862 provided for establishing and implementing "customer service standards to guide the operations of the executive branch." The Memorandum on Streamlining the Bureaucracy focused on downsizing the workforce, the effort that was intended to bring substantial savings for the federal government. Elected officials argued that people demanded to reduce the size of the government, which, according to some estimates, in 1980 amounted to 31.4 percent of gross domestic product (Kettl, 1999). Next decade data showed that the federal government employed over "2.1 million civilians (not including the Postal Service) and 1.9 million members of the military" and spends "$1.5 trillion a year" (Gore, 1993, p. 65). As Vice President Gore argued, money was wasted and programs did not work.

The overall savings from the reinvention initiative were expected to reach $108 billion over five years (Gore, 1993). According to the NPR report, spending cuts were to be achieved by simplifying the internal organization of government units. In 1994, following the NPR's request, Congress enacted the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act, which required federal executive departments and agencies to reduce workforce by 272,900 by 1999. The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act passed in the same year became the "first major reform of the government's contracting rules in a decade" (Kettl, 1998, p. 3).

Phase I was also marked by the adoption of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), which directed all executive departments and agencies to engage in strategic planning and performance measurement. The main goal of the GPRA is to improve public confidence in government by making federal agencies responsible for results of their

performance. The GPRA required federal departments and agencies to develop strategic plans, annual performance plans, and annual performance reports. The actual implementation of the GPRA started a few years after it was enacted. As Radin (1998) argues, "Although the legislation was enacted in 1993, 1997 was the first year that its requirements actually came to life and the first year that its requirements for strategic plans as well as the first performance plans became tangible" (p. 307).

Phase II of reinvention involved the beginning of procurement reform (Executive Order 12931), which "sought to reduce bureaucracy in the procurement system" (Kelman, 2005), and the reform of the regulatory system. According to Kamensky (1999), as part of the effort, after five years of reform "agencies eliminated about 640,000 pages of internal rules, about 16,000 pages of Federal Regulations and [were] rewriting 31,000 additional pages into plain language." As Kettl (1999) points out, Phase II also involved initiatives targeted at increasing privatization and devolving functions to state and local governments.

During Phase III, the National Performance Review was renamed for the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, which under the slogan "America @ Its Best" focused on identifying information technology solutions to improve government performance. Another important initiative was associated with the President's Memorandum on Plain Language in Government Writing issued in 1998. According to the Memorandum, "the Federal Government's writing must be in plain language. By using plain language, we send a clear message about what the Government is doing, what it requires, and what services it offers." In addition, Phase III involved programs targeted at advancing customer service reform by means of increasing public awareness of customer service initiatives and monitoring progress in implementation of customer service strategies.

Constructing the Overarching Narrative: The Utmost Urgency of Change

President Clinton who took office with the intention to become a "president of achievement" (Hargrove & Nelson, 1984) was the eleventh president initiating governmental reform in the 20th century. Unlike other "activist presidents," Clinton did not subscribe to the classical tradition in government that was largely represented by the "Weberian organizational model, centered on such values as hierarchy, rationalization, specialization and control" (Kettl & Dilulio, 1995, p. 93). President Clinton's NPM-inspired agenda was quite different; in the opinion of the President it was time for change.

In President Clinton's 1993 Inaugural Address, reinvention emerges as the first item on the agenda, which Bill Clinton set by addressing the American people in a highly metaphorical manner:

My fellow citizens:

Today we celebrate the mystery of American renewal. This ceremony is held in the depth of winter. But, by the words we speak and the faces we show the world, we force the spring. A spring reborn in the world's oldest democracy, that brings forth the vision and courage to reinvent America.

The image of spring coming to America as a symbol of change and renewal is quite powerful. It often creates positive associations with the beginning of a new, better chapter in one's life. By its proponents, reinvention, however, was not expected to bring breezy spring days, but, rather, a strong wind of change gusting against the windows of American government. For American reformers, the linguistic shift away from "public administration" to "public management" and from "citizens" to "customers" went hand in hand with the real-world "historic change in the way the government work[ed]" (Gore, 1993).

The idea of utmost urgency of change runs like a red thread through American official publications; according to reinventors, the reform has to be pursued without delay or hesitation. For example, the first NPR report (1993) states:

We can no longer afford to pay more for--and get less from--our government.

The National Performance Review is about change, historic change. (p. i)

In the first sentence above, the personal pronoun "we" is instrumental in constructing the so-called "ingroup" and "outgroup" identities (van Dijk, 1995), which means that "we" - reformers and the American people ("ingroup") – realize that "they" – "our government"/"bureaucracies" ("outgroup") – require change. The second sentence demonstrates repetition of the word "change" which emphasizes the immediate importance of reform. In the American culture, "change" typically has positive connotation and is often associated with progress and development.

In official documents, the idea of utmost urgency of change is also emphasized in the context of axiomatic propositions, such as, for example, "Our governments are in deep trouble today" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992), "The government is broken" (Gore, 1993), "Your government is changing dramatically" or "The era of big government is over" (Gore, 1996). Axiomatic propositions are rarely supported by adequate data, but, rather, often delivered to the audience as common sense truths. The idea of utmost urgency of change provides a foundation for the advancement of reform related efforts in the United States.

In the new context, the word "revolution" is used quite frequently. In 1992, guided by the motto of "Putting people first," the Democratic presidential candidate Bill Clinton and his vice-presidential running mate Al Gore announced that, among other things, their strategy included "revolutionizing government" (Clinton & Gore, 1992). Likewise, in the first NPR report (1993),

Gore writes about the "quality revolution," "telecommunications revolution," and the "computer revolution" in the federal government. Along the same lines, Executive Order 12862 issued by President Clinton in September 1993 stated: "Public officials must embark upon a revolution within the Federal Government to change the way it does business." In reinventors' view, the revolution is important because it will reduce "overcontrol and micromanagement that now generate "red tape" and hamper efficiency in the Federal Government" (Presidential Memorandum, Streamlining the Federal Workforce, 1993).

In addition to portraying reinvention as a "revolution," reform documents frequently use lexical items from the semantic field of war (e.g., "battle," "fight," "win," "marching orders"). The report *Best Kept Secrets in American Government* (1996) describes reinventing government as "[t]he battle against the old forces of big government, central control, and mistrust," the battle that "isn't won yet, but everything is moving in the right direction" (p. 24). According to the same report, reinvention offers a "strategy to fight waste and red tape in government" (p. 47). The commanders-in-chief Clinton and Gore give "reinvention marching orders" to help "[c]orporate America" reinvent "itself to compete and win" (The Blair House Papers, p. viii and vii).

According to an interview with Donald Kettl, Dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland, in the early 1990s,

There was an overwhelming sense of inefficient government; the government was out of control or wasn't responsive to citizens. There were both examples of what they [reinventors] portrayed as government stupidity and absurdity - they dumped the federal code of regulations and the huge amount of federal personnel manual right into the

dumpster to show how much junk there was in terms of rules and regulations" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

Bob Stone, who served as a Project Director for the NPR and held the title of "Energizer-in-Chief," indicated that when he had worked in the Pentagon, he had "discovered all the dysfunctions of government, all the ways government had been making people do all inefficient and stupid things" (personal communication, September 3, 2010). Within that context, the reform was seen as urgently needed. The new government was to offer solutions to long standing problems in the American government by making it work better and cost less (Gore, 1993).

Shaping the New Vision of the Government

In American official discourse, urgency of change is an important feature at the core of formation of the new vision of the government and the relationship between government and the public. Serving as a narrative backbone, the idea of utmost urgency of change drives ideological messages of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States. Change needs to be introduced to push the system to a new level, where government works efficiently and effectively for the benefit of its customers.

From Old to New Government

Clinton and Gore, who led the reinventing government movement, argued that their major goal was to create a government that would work for people, the government that would be "cleared of useless bureaucracy and waste and freed from red tape and senseless rules" (Gore, 1993). In the reinventors' view, the industrial-age bureaucracy is "nameless" and "faceless," with bureaucrats "blindly" following "the illogical and bizarre rules and regulations" (Gore, 1996, p. 25). In the reinventing government context, the epithets "useless," "senseless,"

"illogical," "bizarre, "nameless," and "faceless" demonstrate negative perception and evaluation of government features. The old government is the one that was constantly getting "bigger and bigger" forming the "assembly line," in which "[m]ost federal workers were trapped" or "imprisoned" (Gore, 1997, p. 7; Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. 25). According to the first NPR report (1993),

> Unfortunately, faced with so many controls, many employees have simply given up. They do everything by the book – whether it makes sense or not. They fill out forms that should never have been created, follow rules that should never have been imposed, and prepare reports that serve no purpose – and are often never even read. (p. 3)

In the passage above, anaphora[1] "they" draws readers' attention and contributes to the development of the collective negative image of the "outgroup" bureaucracy guided by "useless" and "senseless" rules. It is important to "free" the government and its employees from red tape and bureaucratic inefficiencies, which are commonly attributed to the old American government.

As the examples presented above demonstrate, the revolutionary rhetoric of reinventing government is grounded in anti-bureaucratic sentiments. According to David Osborne,

> During the industrial era, bureaucracy was probably the best we could do. But in the information age everything has changed. Bureaucracies are increasingly dysfunctional … They're just assigned to place they have to deal with … Bureaucracy is too slow, it's too stable, it doesn't change fast enough, it's too unresponsive, it's one size fits all solutions, it just doesn't meet the needs of the information age. (personal communication, September 2, 2010)

---

[1] Anaphora is a rhetorical figure of repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive phrases, clauses or lines.

As a member of the legislative staff pointed out in a telephone interview, reinventors "erected the notion that bureaucracy is dysfunctional and operates poorly." At the same time, however, "bureaucratic organization has been the most effective. It has offered a way of establishing accountability and getting things done. Any time you see an organizational chart of a public or private organization you see bureaucratic model at work" (personal communication, September 13, 2010).

In general, many reinventing government texts are structured around the distinct oppositions between old and new, past and present, good and bad, heroes and villains. For example, according to the report *Access America: Reengineering through Information Technology* (1997), "The old way of organizing work is patterned on a factory, a hierarchical system … The factory model has outlived its usefulness. Today's computers and communications let us organize to work in a new way" (p. 1). For reinventors, the notion of a "new way" is synonymous with a good and seemingly the only appropriate way to governing in the changed environment.

Starting with the Clinton-Gore campaign, it was argued that the new administration would get the country out of the trouble created by the Bush-Quayle administration, whose "approach to governing this country [had] badly failed (Clinton & Gore, 1992, p. 209). Within this context, anaphoric pronouns and phrases emerge quite frequently in a variety of reinventing government documents serving the purpose of denouncing the enemy and emphasizing negative characteristics of "them."

They have taxed the many to enrich the few. And it is time for them to go.

They have given us false choices, bad choices, and no choice. And it is time for them to go.

They have ignored the suffering of those who are victims of AIDS, of crime, of poverty, of ignorance, of hatred, and harassment. It is time for them to go (Clinton & Gore, 1992, p. 209).

"It's time for *them* to go" refrain used by Al Gore at the 1992 Democratic National Convention, became a mantra at the heart of the Clinton-Gore campaign. As Clinton wrote in his book "My Life" (2005), after Gore repeated the mantra several times, the delegates took over for him, sending sparks throughout the hall" (Clinton, 2005). The sparks of reinvention spread throughout the government and a few years later, "bonfires [were] raging, ready to sweep entire agencies …" (Gore, 1997a, p. 101).

To keep the fire burning, top political leadership was sought and obtained. The letter that accompanied the first NPR report (1993) emphasized the importance of presidential leadership for successful implementation of reform efforts: "This report represents the beginning of what must be, and -- with your leadership -- will be, a long-term commitment to change." Clinton strongly believed that, "A president ought to be a powerful force for progress" (Clinton, 2005, p. 222). Not surprisingly, for President Clinton, one of the leadership models was Franklin Roosevelt (Burns, 1999). According to McCann (2008),

> In the regime inaugurated by the New Deal, the president would stand at the head of a system of executive administration, acting in theory as the active voice of the nation as a whole; overcoming the resistance and narrow partisanship of other political institutions; and in so doing working to create a more intimate and democratic relation between the nation and its government. (p. 4)

President Clinton promised to give the American people a different kind of government, the government that would "work better and cost less." According to Christopher Mihm,

Managing Director for Strategic Issues at the U.S. Government Accountability Office, Clinton was more involved in the reform efforts than any other American president and "cared deeply" about reinvention (personal communication, September 10, 2010). Likewise, Stone pointed out that Clinton's role was very influential; "some political appointees who did not really like the reinventing government ideas went along with them anyway because that was something Clinton wanted" (personal communication, September 3, 2010). The reinvention initiative was primarily driven by executive orders and presidential memoranda; during his term in office, President Clinton signed 55 directives that guided implementation of "NPR recommendations and initiatives" (History of the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, 2011).

According to some commentators, including Donald Kettl and Beryl Radin, Scholar in Residence in the Department of Public Administration and Policy at American University, NPR was attempting to increase the role of the presidency by redistributing power from Congress to the President (personal communication, September 9 and September 10, 2010). Harold Relyea, a former scholar of American government at the Congressional Research Service, pointed out that during the implementation of reinventing government initiatives "there was no sensitivity or very little sensitivity to the reaction of Congress" (personal communication, September 24, 2010). Along the same lines, Radin argued that reinventors had "totally ignored Congress" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

In the reinventors' vew, the new government would differ significantly from the government that had been shaped through decades. The reformers would make it work efficiently and the American people would see the difference within a relatively short period of time. Within this context, Vice President Gore described his assignment of making government "work better" through such metaphoric associations as "putting the wheels back on the American

government." In one of the NPR reports, Gore alludes to the time when "the wheels were falling off the American auto industry" and compares the eventual successes in American government with the development of the reinvention initiative (Gore, 1997a).

Creating the Prescription of Business-Like/Entrepreneurial Government

According to John Kamensky, who served as a Deputy Director for NPR, an important idea that was at the core of reinventing government was "how to change the culture of the government to be more entrepreneurial" (personal communication, September 10, 2010). The first NPR report provided a clear picture of the new government; the new, good government was depicted as an effective, efficient, non-bureaucratic, entrepreneurial institution.

> (1) Effective, entrepreneurial governments cast aside red tape, shifting from systems in which people are accountable for following rules to systems in which they are accountable for achieving results …
>
> (2) Effective, entrepreneurial governments insist on customer satisfaction. They listen carefully to their customers – using surveys, focus groups, and the like. They restructure their basic operations to meet customers' needs ...
>
> (3) Effective, entrepreneurial governments transform their cultures by decentralizing authority …
>
> (4) Effective, entrepreneurial governments constantly find ways to make government work better and cost less (Gore, 1993, p. 16-17).

The anaphora "effective, entrepreneurial governments" in the excerpts 1-4 emphasizes the importance of making efforts to achieve the ideal of good government that in many areas should follow the lead of the private sector. In American official discourse, the difference

between government and business is rejected. As the *Businesslike Government* report (1997a) maintains, the government

> had to get over a myth that government and business were so different that they had nothing to learn from each other. The truth is, nearly all the tools and techniques that helped American companies get back on their feet could be adapted to make government work better. (p. 9)

In general, in American discourse, the highest quality of service is directly associated with the private sector organizations. The reinventors' vision of post-industrial age government entities is that of "smaller, sleeker organizations" that "will be like private companies" (Gore, 1996, p. 24). Government decision-making process is expected to be guided by principles that make "good business sense" (Gore, 1997a, p. 74).

For reinventors, it is a matter of common (business) sense that the performance of government organizations is inferior to that of private sector organizations, which have been consistently portrayed as significantly more efficient and effective than public organizations. For decades, this common sense has been deeply ingrained in broader American discourse, having some of its roots in the late 1800s – early 1900s. In his famous 1887 essay, Woodrow Wilson argued that "The field of administration is a field of business," while Leonard White (1926) maintained that the study of administration should start from the base of management rather than the foundation of law.

The extensive use of the language of economics and business in American reform texts reveals a significant influence of private sector models and practices on government. Not surprisingly, different kinds of comparisons between government agencies and businesses are quite frequent in official documents. The following excerpt presents an example:

Just as America's corporations realized they had to change their corporate culture in order to compete in a globalized economy where the consumer was the boss, rather than a domestic economy where the producer was the boss, so too must the government shift from a restrictive culture to a responsive culture (Gore, 1998, p. 57).

As this excerpt demonstrates, it is a matter of common sense that the government's culture is restrictive. By contrast, corporate culture is pictured as more responsive, which supports the case for the need of business-oriented approaches in government. Similar polarization dynamics can be traced in the following examples:

(1) Most of what successful businesses, and now government, have learned can be summed up in two principles: focus on customers, and listen to workers. Old-fashioned bureaucracies focus on hierarchy and listen for instructions from the top. Doing otherwise is a big change (Gore, 1997a, p. 3).

(2) Slow responses and busy signals are too often the rule in the public sector, whereas world class organizations answer in less than 15-20 seconds and rarely allow busy signals. Private businesses operate telephone services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year; government generally answers its phone only during regular business hours (Serving the American Public: Best Practices in Telephone Service, 1995, p. 2).

The passages above demonstrate how official discourse is ideologically constructed by means of presenting polarizing structures ("old-fashioned bureaucracies" versus "successful businesses") and axiomatic propositions (for example, "Old-fashioned bureaucracies focus on hierarchy and listen for instructions from the top"). Old-fashioned bureaucracies are slow and inefficient, and inadequate handling of telephone calls is just one of the examples. The new

ideology of administration shows that "old-fashioned bureaucracies" need to be replaced by new arrangements that would allow the government to become more efficient and customer oriented.

Answering the question of why reinventors looked at the private sector for new ideas, Osborne explained that the "best in government was not good enough; in 1993, the federal government was a pretty poor, pretty mediocre institution. It was necessary to make it better, quickly …" (personal communication, September 2, 2010).

Within this context, the influence of business literature and private sector practices on the formation of ideological perspectives was significant. According to Osborne, things like "In Search of Excellence," TQM, business process reengineering were very influential, since "a lot of it applied in the public sector." As Stone argued, "we had a mantra to put customers first, cut red tape and empower employees, and foster excellence. These ideas really came from the business world. The book 'In Search of Excellence' was my Bible and my inspiration" (personal communication, September 3, 2010). The message of running government like a business inevitably influenced the formation of a new civil servant/public manager identity in the United States.

Creating a New Managerial Identity

The vision of the new government embraces the idea of empowering employees and providing them with a significant degree of discretion. According to Paul Posner, the Director of the Public Administration Program at George Mason University, giving employees greater freedom was one of the most important thrusts of reinventing government (personal communication, September 13, 2010). Rhetorically, in the new, entrepreneurial government, administrators are "freed" or "liberated" from existing controls and granted a broad range of

discretion in addressing customer needs (Gore, 1995a). Administrators need to be empowered to make informed choices and decisions to achieve specific results and satisfy customer needs.

In reinventing government texts, empowerment is presented as a new approach that would allow government employees to escape from the bureaucratic "prison," "where they had little power and no one listened to their ideas" (p. 27). The new approach is contrasted with the old system that

> has top management, middle management, and workers, who are seen as cogs in a machine, programmed by those at the top of the pyramid to do simple tasks over and over. This approach forfeits the greatest asset of the organization -- the unused brain power, energy, and creativity of the men and women in the organization. (p. 1)

Discussing empowerment agenda, David Osborne explains,

> Bureaucratic governments are very centralized; the decisions are made at the top and center … and employees are like assembly-line workers … So if you want a high-performing organization in today's world … you have to push some of the decision-making (certainly not all) down, lower in the organization, so that people can make decisions about their own work and their teams' work to improve it. If you want innovation, ever-increasing performance, continuous improvement, you've got to empower your employees. The steering decisions need to stay at the top of the organization with the elected officials and appointed officials … (personal communication, September 2, 2010).

Interestingly, in one reinventing government text, empowerment is metaphorically represented in the context of comparisons with natural events, such as earthquake and storm.

(1) A kind of virtual earthquake is shaking up the comfortable status quo of government hierarchy. It is changing management's perspective on the value and virtue of their employees.

(2) Companies that have empowered employees … have been strong enough to weather storms that sank many of their competitors (Gore, 1997a, p. 26-27).

Apparently, in the reinventors' view, the reform movement is a powerful and unavoidable force that inevitably changes stable landscape of government. Everyone in government will feel this force and will be expected to adjust in order to survive:

Every supervisor needs to get power to the front lines and raise the spirit of the workforce. Every service provider needs to put customers first. Every regulator needs to use the leverage available through partnerships. Everyone in government needs to know all the rules of the road to reinvention, because we need everyone's push to propel us down that road fast enough. (Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. x).

According to Bob Stone, "the basic idea behind reinventing government is that workers know their work" (personal communication, September 3, 2010). Donald Kettl argues that the intention of empowering employees idea was to "allow employees to make smart decisions" by pushing power "out and down." As Kettl explains, it seemed important to invert accountability; instead of being accountable in bureaucratic sense, as operating from the top-down, the government had to be operating from the people and bottom-up (personal communication, September 9, 2010). Along the same lines, Kamensky argued: "We shifted accountability from oversight, from the top-down, to accountability from the bottom-up" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

Interestingly enough, however, according to Mihm, within the general rhetoric of empowering employees and giving them more discretion, authority and tools to provide government services and achieve results, centralizing tendency could be observed (personal communication, September 10, 2010). This tendency is reflected in the context of strategic planning and performance management initiatives. For example, in order to "improve Federal program effectiveness and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction," the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 required government agencies to develop strategic plans and annual performance plans.

In compliance with the GPRA, agencies were required to submit their strategic plans and performance plans to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) by September 1997. The performance plans were to be submitted to Congress in 1999, and full performance reports to Congress, the President, and the public by March of 2000. As Mihm explains, "If you establish categories under which I must report my performance, you basically establish how I have to run my program. You have a complete authority, but I want you to report a, b, c, d …" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

Interestingly and somewhat paradoxically, the idea of empowerment goes hand-in-hand with the reformers' effort to reduce federal workforce by 280,000 people. Commenting on these contradictory intentions, Radin argued: "I don't think you can say in the same breath that you are going to cut the bureaucracy and empower people at the same time." According to Radin, middle-level bureaucrats were the most skeptical about what happened since many of them saw themselves losing their jobs (personal communication, September 10, 2010). Obviously, however, revolutions (including reinventing government) are rarely won without any casualties. And stories that may create a negative impression of revolutionaries are often suppressed by

silence, while voice is given to those that talk about hardly achieved victories and chant the praises to heroes. The stories about ordinary civil servants who make the difference by fighting faithfully with waste and inefficiencies of the outdated government machine serve as essential mediums in conveying the messages of the reinventing government revolution.

The heroes of reinvention are the people in public service who face the customers on a day-to-day basis. Rhetorically, they are the ones whose innovative ideas make all the difference because they know how to improve government operations and customer service. The stories about the heroic people of reinvention are frequently used in reinventing government texts (see, for example, a story featured in *The Blair House Papers* (1997) about Hugh Doran, whose innovative idea led to better VA service in 17 American cities).

Within this context, top leadership recognition of reinvention heroes becomes part of the broader ideological strategy to "empower" and "energize" civil servants, the strategy that "has paid off fabulously in both government and business" (Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. 27). The symbol of achievement – the Hammer Award – was presented to those civil servants who made significant efforts in making government work better and cost less: "Just as top-level recognition has been an essential tool in creating the best private companies, the Hammer Award program has encouraged federal workers to come forward with innovations to improve efficiency" (Gore, 1997a, p. 30).

Empowerment is one of the most important "secrets" that the private sector shared with government organizations: "Instead of blindly following procedural rules, employees are getting flexibility to use their heads to meet customer needs" (Gore, 1997a, p. 13). For reinventors, the idea of empowerment that, among other things, is based on the premise that "[w]ithout satisfied employees, we cannot have satisfied customers" (Clinton, 1995), is one of the important building

blocks of the new vision of the relationship between government and the public, topic of the next section.

The Relationship between Government and the Public

Framing Trust, Confidence, and Faith as the Key Relationship Concepts

According to Kamensky (1997), "In the U.S. federal government, the impetus for [reform] action was an increasing public distrust in the ability of the federal government to do things right." As Kamensky explained in the in-person interview, "In 1993, citizen trust in government was around 17 percent. And so Clinton and Gore said: 'You can't sustain democracy in the long run and you can't deliver an act of government if citizens don't trust it. So the thrust with the reinventing government initiative was restoring trust in government" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

In the official discourse, trust is pictured as a two-way street:

It's often said these days that the American people need to have more trust in the government. That's not all. If the reinvention initiative has taught the government anything (and it has taught it many things), it is that the government needs to have more trust in the American people – including its own employees. It needs to trust that when we say we need something, we're right. It needs to trust that when we say something needs fixing, it does. It needs to trust that when we're given a goal to reach, we'll reach it. (Gore, 1995a, p. 93)

In this excerpt, the new "we" (government) is associated with positive attributes; the new government is not only trusted, but also has trust in the American people. The new government sets clear public policy goals and gets the work done in the "right" way. The American people

are an integral component of the new "we" since they are to become an important part of the trust-based relationship, the relationship that forms the basis of American democracy.

Reinventors axiomatically connected trust with the value of democracy: as Gore points out in *Common Sense Government* (1995a), "Democracy stands or falls on trust" (p. 92). The reinventing government efforts are framed by its proponents as part of the American tradition, while such lexical items as "trust," "confidence," and "faith" become part of a broader political and historical context. For example, in the first NPR report, Gore alludes to the efforts of the Founding Fathers who faced the challenge of creating a new system of government; "Their vision of democracy, which gave citizens a voice in managing the United States, was untried and untested in 1776. It required a tremendous leap of faith. But it worked" (p. 8). Rhetorically, the task of reinventors is of a similar scope as two hundred years ago because the "government is in trouble. It has lost its sense of mission; it has lost its ethic of public service; and most importantly, it has lost the faith of the American people" (Gore, 1993, p. 9). Here, the anaphora "it has lost" emphasizes a critical attitude towards the pre-reinvention government and pictures restoration of the American people's "faith in government" as the main reason for reform.

The reform is needed because "we are suffering the deepest crisis of faith in government in our lifetime" (Gore, 1993, p. 2). Obviously, trust, confidence, and faith are viewed as fundamental for the new relationship between government and the public. In the introduction to *The Blair House Papers* (1997a), Clinton and Gore write: "The need to reinvent was clear. Confidence in government – which is simply confidence in our worn ability to solve problems by working together – had been plummeting for three decades. We either had to rebuild that faith or abandon the future to chaos" (p. vii). In these excerpts, the necessity of rebuilding faith is emphasized through the use of overstatements "deepest crisis" and "chaos," which are intended

to attract the reader's attention and, once again, highlight the idea that change in the American government and the relationship between government and the public is a matter of urgency.

According to reinventors, chaos is unavoidable unless trust, confidence, and faith are restored. Paradoxically, in the reinventing government context, restoration should be achieved through "revolution," which itself is often associated with chaos. As reinventors maintain, "The stakes in this revolution are high: confidence in our ability to resolve serious national issues like crime, education, and the environment by working together through government. Without that confidence, we abandon the future to chaos" (Gore, 1997a, p. 2). As Aya (1979) suggests, "[R]evolution is an extreme form of popular discontent - the greater the discontent, therefore, the greater the potential for revolt" (p. 52).

The revolution is important because "waste and inefficiency in Federal programs undermine the confidence of the American people" (GPRA, 1993). Along the same lines, Gore writes that "Faith in government is at a low point, and that lack of faith threatens the nation's future" (Gore, 1996). Rhetorically, the nation's future is in the hands of leadership and the American people who have to unite and work collaboratively:

Not long ago, most Americans believed that we could do practically anything by working together -- defeat communism, go to the moon, you name it. We can have that faith in unity again. We can have the strength of unity again. We need it for the 21st Century. (Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. xi).

From another perspective, in the opinion of a member of the legislative staff, reinventing government was not exclusively about rebuilding trust, confidence, and faith in government, but also a matter of political success or failure and an important part of the Democrats' rhetoric. Reinventing government was an "effort to show the public - see we are not just tax-and-spend

liberals, we want government to do better, to do more with less" (personal communication, September 17, 2010).

Kettl suggests that for Clinton reinventing government was an effort to deal with Ross Perot's voters, who "succeeded in tapping into a powerful force in the electorate." According to Kettl, Ross Perot "was able to create this kind of foxy conversation about government and its performance and its effectiveness, all based on a premise that we really can take the government back and make it work better" (personal communication, September 9, 2010). Similar conversation was initiated by President Clinton who spread the belief that the way for government to win back the faith of the people is "one customer at a time" (as quoted in Gore, 1995a).

Constructing a New Customer Service Contract

According to reinventors, successful restoration of trust, confidence, and faith in government is largely dependent on the development and effective implementation of a "new customer service contract with the American people" (Gore, 1993). The idea of a new contract holds a particular prominence in American official discourse. The "contract" defines the relationship between government and the public as the relationship between service providers and customers.

As Schachter (1997) points out, "In Vice President Gore's National Performance Review, the customer metaphor pops up everywhere" (p. 7). According to Fairclough (1992), "The word "customer" [is] a key figure in its projection of the new ideology" (p. 187). The term establishes particular configurations of meaning that associates "discredited public sector with culturally valued private sector qualities." One of the important reasons why the public sector has been

discredited is attributed to an unquestionable assertion that "[i]n the past, too many Americans have found a deaf ear when trying to complain about a problem" (Gore, 1996b, p. 3).

Like in a number of other examples discussed in this chapter, a metaphorical technique - in this case applied through the use of synecdoche[2] "deaf ear" that carries a pejorative meaning - highlights negative features of the old government; according to reinventors, the old government was unresponsive to the needs of the American people. In the reinventing government era, the situation is or will be quite different. In a good business fashion, a number of reports present quotes from customer feedback, where ordinary people express their gratitude to the reinvented government service providers. For example, the report *Putting Customers First'97* begins with the following feedback from a happy customer: "I want to compliment your staff … this service is so much better than the old way" (p. 1).

As the NPR report makes clear, "By "customer" we do not mean "citizen." A citizen can participate in democratic decision-making; a customer receives benefits from a specific service …" (Gore, 1993, p. 6). Commenting on the difference between the terms "customer" and "citizen," Osborne argued that,

Citizen in a democracy means he has the right to vote for their elected leaders and for their government. A customer is somebody who is the beneficiary of a public service. I can't effect everything by just being a citizen. Both roles are important" (personal communication, September 2, 2010).

Following this line of reasoning, Stone made an interesting comment on differences between citizens' and customers' roles:

_____

[2] Synecdoche is the figure of speech that provides for the substitution of part for whole.

Some academics made a big deal about this. And I think it's pretty simple ... A customer is somebody who, ideally, has a choice. So we wanted to empower customers. Now, for the most part, our customers were also citizens. And we never said that citizenship should be replaced by customership. They were just two different roles for the same people. In a same way, a stock-holder of a corporation could also be a customer. You can own stock in Ford Motor Company that means you own the company. But you can also buy Ford cars. You didn't have to choose between being a citizen and a customer. Citizens have to be both. (Bob Stone, personal communication, September 3, 2010)

According to a number of other interviewees, however, the extensive use of customer vocabulary in the reinventing government talk and texts brings to the table a range of other, often conflicting, attitudes and beliefs. For example, Relyea pointed out that the view of people as customers is quite "abstract" because unlike in the market, with government services "you can't shop around." Another point Relyea made was that the "concept of customer is a little demeaning" since "it doesn't give credit to a citizen as the holder of power" (personal communication, September 24, 2010). Similarly, Mihm pointed out that, "Citizens are not the customers of government. They are the owners of government. They don't come to government and ask them for the service; government has the responsibility to give it to them" (personal communication, September 10, 2010)

Posner argued that reinventors viewed the public "much as the public of Wal-Mart. How to find a better value for money. Find a better deal. They saw the public as deserving better service as customers" (personal communication, September 13, 2010). According to Mihm, reinventors used market-type language that implied that the interaction between citizens and government is a market and transactional relationship (personal communication, September 10,

2010). Kettl suggested that in the opinion of reformers, citizens were to become government's customers; by using the term "customer" they were trying to say that "private companies were doing a much better job of connecting with citizens than government was" (personal communication, September 9, 2010).

According to Executive Order 12862 – *Setting Customer Service Standards*, the Federal Government "must be customer-driven," which means that executive departments and agencies 'should figure out who is their customer and what do they want, what are their priorities and how can we better serve them, how can we structure ourselves to serve their needs rather than our internal needs" (Clinton, 1993c; Osborne, personal communication, September 2, 2010). All executive departments and agencies were required to identify and survey their customers' opinions, make service standards and customer service-related systems easily accessible, and measure results against particular standards. In addition, they were made responsible for publishing customer service plans that would include the standards and identify future plans for customer surveys.

The Presidential Memorandum *Improving Customer Service* of March 23, 1995 expands on the Executive Order 12862 and requires that agencies, following the lead of private organizations, "measure results achieved against the customer service standards and report those results to customers at least annually." As the report *Putting Customers First '97* suggests, "[D]irect customer feedback is one of the highest performance measures any agency can obtain" (Clinton & Gore, 1997b). According to reinventors, the key principles of a customer-driven organization were to include the following:

- Identify your customers — start with the reason your organization was set up in the first place.

- Continuously ask your customers what they want — skip this step and you'll get it wrong.

- Set standards so people know what to expect.

- Measure and publicize results. (Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. 7)

To ensure high quality of customer service, executive departments and agencies were required to benchmark performance against the best in business: "The standard of quality we seek from these actions and the Executive order is customer service for the American people that is equal to the best in business" (Clinton, 1993c). To achieve this standard, government is to "treat the public the way top companies treat their customers" (Clinton & Gore, 1997a, p. ix).

Lessons from business form the core of thinking about the new, service provider-customer relationship. The source of inspiration is in business "best practices" in "customer-driven" strategic planning, telephone service, and performance management, to name just a few. Executive departments and agencies should learn from the best run companies and management gurus/motivators because they are the "real experts" who know the ropes (Cavanagh & Livingston, 1997; Gore, 1995a).

In business, the "customer is paramount" (Cavanagh & Livingston, 1997, p. 32). Customer satisfaction or "delight" (Gore, 1995b, p. 29), however, is unlikely to be viewed as the end goal of businesses. Although not often stated explicitly, achieving customer satisfaction/delight is the means to maintain survival, achieve efficiency, and gain substantial market share advantages.

For example, according to the report *Serving the American Public*: *Best Practices in Customer-Driven Strategic Planning* (1997), "Survival was identified as one of the driving forces behind the institution of a more customer-focused approach to planning. For several

organizations, the marketplace dictated the change" (Cavanagh & Livingston, 1997, p. 12). Taking things one step further, efficiency enters into the focus of attention. Dealing with customer complaints in a timely fashion is not only a matter of customer satisfaction, but also a matter of cost savings. As the report *Serving the American People: Best Practices in Resolving Customer Complaints* (1996) indicates, "resolving a complaint on the first contact reduce[s] the cost by at least 50 percent" (Gore, 1996b, p. 3). Quick efficient response is not sufficient, however; it needs to be coupled with proactive planning and implementation in order to find and maintain a competitive advantage: "… the need to be first in the marketplace means that companies cannot wait to be told what customers want; they have to figure it out for themselves and earlier than anyone else" (Cavanagh & Livingston, 1997, p. 32).

Like best in business, among other things, government is expected to develop and implement effective communication strategies that would be targeted at the broader audience. First, key government documents, including customer service standards, have to be easily accessible by the public. For example, according to the Presidential Memorandum on Improving Customer Service (1995), "Agencies shall, by September 1, 1995, complete the publication of customer service standards, in a form readily available to customers, for all operations that deliver significant services directly to the public" (Clinton, 1995). Similarly, according to the Memorandum on Electronic Government, "data should be identified and organized in a way that makes it easier for the public to find the information it seeks" (Clinton, 1999).

Second, government messages are to be delivered to customers in a clear and articulate way. According to the so-called "plain language initiative", the documents were expected to have "logical organization, easy-to-read design features, and use:

- common, everyday words, except for necessary technical terms;

- "you" and other pronouns;

- the active voice; and

- short sentences" (Memorandum on Plain Lang in Gov Writing, June 1, 1998).

According to the report *Businesslike Government*, "Poor use of the English language leads to confusion, duplication, and error. Many businesses are discovering the benefits of writing in plain English" (Gore, 1997a, p. 58). Following the business lead, many reinventing government documents are written in plain English and use a variety of techniques, including those mentioned above, to make the texts more understandable and appealing to the public. The written presentation of information is compelling and easily moves the reader through text with the help of various tables and bulleted lists of reinventors' accomplishments.

The language itself is quite informal. For example, many documents use contractions (e.g., "isn't," "doesn't," "wasn't,") that are usually used in spoken English, but not in formal written English. Stories and anecdotes help to create an atmosphere of personal relations between the government and the public. For example, an anecdote featured in the report *Businesslike Government* provides an ironic critique of the non-reinvented government: "Contrary to rumor, the government doesn't actually have a form for requesting a drink of water. Never did" (Gore, 1997a, p. 45). The same report features Dilbert comic strips to make "the story of government reinvention more fun" (p. 4). Ideologically, the new government is no longer detached from the people but, rather, understands their problems and willingly accepts their role in the changing environment.

According to Stone, reinventors wanted to involve the public as much as possible: "We invited public comment, we held public events, we held town meetings, and we encouraged

communication of our intentions and our customer service standards, etc. … We certainly advocated the role of customers in the service delivery." According to Stone, from the very beginning of the reinvention initiative, President Clinton asked the public for suggestions: "If you have any ideas on how to make government work better, just write a letter to Al Gore, Reinventing Government Washington, D.C. And we got tens of thousands of letters from the public. And some of them were very useful, not very many" (personal communication, September 3, 2010).

The Memorandum on Regulatory Reform (1995) directed executive departments and agencies to engage in conversations with the American people. To achieve this goal, departments and agencies were expected to "promptly convene groups consisting of frontline regulators and the people affected by their regulations. These conversations should take place around the country—at our cleanup sites, our factories, our ports." Along the same lines, the Presidential Directive on Conversations with America (1998), directed agencies to "engage customers in a discussion about how to improve Government service by determining the kind and quality of services they want and their level of satisfaction with existing services."

At the same time, however, it was a common assumption that citizen engagement was not the major thrust of reform efforts – "it was customer service, not citizen engagement" (Kamensky, personal communication, September 10, 2010). Accordingly, as Mihm indicated, reinventors were "really good about publishing everything, but there wasn't lots of 'let's look at citizen participation in generating ideas." Mihm argued that the GPRA had a potential for increasing citizen participation; the GPRA attempted to instill the idea of "do something more than send out an albeit final draft of the strategic plan. Give public an opportunity to help shape your strategies. They are gonna be partners in the achievement of your results. So you want them

to understand what you're trying to do, and you want to understand their needs" (personal communication, September 10, 2010).

Speaking about citizen engagement, Osborne argued that in quite a few situations, especially those related to process improvement efforts, citizen engagement was not needed: "You can try as you like to engage them but you're not gonna succeed 'cause it's inside baseball. You don't really need to engage them. If you're doing something controversial like charter schools then public buy-in becomes very important" (personal communication, September 2, 2010). Similarly, Stone explained that reinventors believed that citizens had the right to know what to expect from government service and how the government was responding to their demands.

According to the majority of interviewees, the citizens' role in reform efforts was relatively insignificant. As Posner argued, "The public doesn't really get excited about management" (personal communication, September 13, 2010). According to someone who works at the legislative branch, an important reason to get the public involved was to foster approval ratings and to demonstrate the public that the Clinton administration was seeking a third way, not political, not right-wing, not left-wing way. In general, however, the public was not largely part of the process.

Summary

Through the review and analysis of reinventing government documents and interview data, this chapter presented a range of ideas expressed in official publications and interviews. In their combination, these ideas form the ideational systems or the "systems of ideas" of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States (van Dijk, 2006). In present research, these ideas are clustered around two broad themes identified in the literature review.

The discussion presented a variety of ideological markers primarily observed in such discourse structures as lexicon, rhetoric, syntax, and semantics. Based on the analysis, it appears that the content of the new American administrative ideology is largely consistent with the findings from the literature review. A brief review of the official publications, as well the investigation of discursive structures and interview data, confirmed these findings and uncovered additional shades of meaning of administrative ideology.

As this chapter demonstrates, in the NPM era, American administrative ideology, developed within the narrative of change, presented a new vision of the government and the relationship between government and the public. Efficiency and effectiveness, couched in terms of customer satisfaction outcomes, are at the core of the new administrative ideology. The new government is seen as a business-like, entrepreneurial institution, where empowered public managers exercise discretion to achieve results in an efficient and effective manner.

According to reinventors, big old bureaucratic government is no longer capable of solving complex problems that face public organizations. The new vision increases the power of the executive branch with the President providing overall leadership and public managers having greater freedom to perform their tasks. The relationship between government and the public is structured around the concepts of trust, confidence, and faith, as well as the idea of a new customer service contract with the American people.

Chapter 5. Administrative Reform in Russia:
The New Vision of the Government and
the Relationship between Government and the Public

Highlights of Administrative Reform

As in the United States, Russian administrative reform was influenced by the components of international experience that advanced the new ideology offered by NPM. Logunov (2006) argues that, "Russia chose to adopt the reform ideology of those countries, where Public Administration visibly melded into the New Public Management" (p. 5). Similarly, Kapoguzov (2007) maintains that Russian administrative reform was largely based on international experience with administrative reforms, more specifically, NPM.

The new course was shaped with the participation of experts and consultants selected by or responsible to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Bank, the U.K. Department for International Development (DFID), and the European Commission. Foreign experts were prepared to assist the Russian Government in making an informed choice about the reform tools that might be useful for Russian decision-makers.

In 2001, in response to a request of the Russian Government, task managers for the World Bank's program of support to the Russian Government Nick Manning and Neil Parison prepared a paper *Modernization of the Federal Civil Service: Methodology for Functional Reviews*. According to the World Bank experts, functional reviews were to become the most effective tool to reform the Russian Government. The same idea was advanced by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which, according to the Agreement with the Russian Government, provided technical assistance in development projects. According to international experts, the functional review is mainly associated with the practice of revising functions of government departments and eliminating redundant, obsolete and overlapping functions and/or transferring some of them to the non-governmental sector.

In the same year, President Putin issued Decree No. 1496 approving the *Concept of Reform of the Russian Civil Service*. The Concept gave particular attention to the "establishment of an integral and uniform system of civil service; regulation of civil servants' activities on the basis of job descriptions; introduction of standards for delivery of services to people; interaction of civil service with civil society; removal of conditions conducive to corruption; improving staff training programmes, etc." (Kotchegura, 2008, p. 84). As Kotchegura points out, from the outset, civil service reform "was conceived as part of a wider administrative reform" (p. 83).

According to the World Bank:

In the Russian context, *administrative reform* denotes reforms connected to the structure, machinery and functions of government; approaches to managing government performance (strategic planning, performance management, internal accountability), and approaches to improving service delivery and responsiveness (transparency, service quality programs and external accountability). (Dobrolyubova et al., 2005, p. 15)

In 2003, President Putin issued Decree No. 824 *On Measures for Implementation of Administrative Reform in 2003-2004* that identified key areas of reform, which included limiting government intervention in economy and state regulation, eliminating duplicative functions, delineating government functions, and dividing responsibilities between the federal and regional executive agencies. The newly created Commission on Administrative Reform was charged with advancing reform initiative.

The first and foremost project the Commission had to implement in the short run was the review of government functions. The review was conducted by several working groups with hundreds of experts from federal and regional governments, as well as academic and business communities. The Commission analyzed 5,634 government functions out of which 1,468 were

considered redundant, 263 duplicative, and 868 requiring changes of various kinds (*Concept of Administrative Reform in the Russian Federation, 2006-2010;* hereinafter, the *Concept of Administrative Reform*).

The results of the functional review performed by the Commission on Administrative Reform were used when the decision on the new structure of the Russian Government was made. According to Presidential Decree No. 314 of March 9, 2004, the Russian federal executive branch was to be represented by a three-tiered system: ministries, services and agencies. Federal ministries were assigned responsibility for policy-making, including strategic planning, developing federal programs, regulatory acts, and budget. Federal services were to become in charge of control, supervision, law-enforcement, and implementation of policies developed by the ministries and approved by the Government. Federal agencies were required to manage state-owned assets, implement government programs, and provide public services.

In 2005, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade introduced a draft *Concept of Administrative Reform*. The Russian Government approved the Concept in the fall of the same year. According to the Concept, the major goals of administrative reform in Russia were to include:

- improving the quality of and access to government services;
- decreasing business costs resulting from state regulation of the economy; and,
- improving government performance.

To achieve these goals, key reform initiatives were to focus on performance management, the adoption of administrative regulations[3] and standards of government services, optimization of

---

[3] Administrative regulations or "administrative standing orders" (*reglamenty*) outline "in some detail how services are to be provided, including the rights and obligations of citizens and officials" (OECD, 2006, p. 129).

government functions, development of measures to increase government transparency and anti-corruption strategies.

In 2006, a group of experts, representing the All-Russian Public Organization of Small and Medium Business ("OPORA Russia"), the Russian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, reviewed 253 proposals from the federal and regional governments seeking funds to launch or expand administrative reform projects in Russia (Sharonov, 2007). Experts approved 102 project proposals submitted by 19 federal and 29 regional governments.

Among the projects, almost 50 percent were to involve the development of administrative regulations, 23 percent of projects focused on the development and implementation of performance management mechanisms, while other projects focused on adjudication, outsourcing, and anti-corruption. In 2007-2008, the Russian Government continued the focus on efforts related to administrative regulations and standards of public services. These efforts were expanded to include developing one-stop centers to customers and establishing the Internet presence to deliver government information and services over the Internet (Popova, 2007).

Constructing the Overarching Narrative: The Utmost Urgency of Change

Like his American counterpart, the Russian President made administrative reform a priority. Shortly before taking office, Vladimir Putin, the then Prime Minister, published an article *Russia at the Turn of the Millennium* (1999), where he argued that Russia needed "strong state power as well as strong government that would assume responsibility for the rights of the individual and take care of society as the whole." This argument (that in many respects shaped

the political leadership's vision of the "strong state"[4]) was clearly in line with the new 1993 Russian Constitution, in which an individual, individual rights and freedoms were proclaimed to be of the highest value, while the role of the state was to promote and protect these rights and freedoms.

In official publications, the necessity of administrative reform – a catalyst for change – is explained through polarizing rhetoric, which places the notions of "strength" and "weakness" of the state at the center of attention. Reform is an immediate response or an adequate solution to "weakness" (both social and economic) of the state, which is considered as the cause for a variety of problems in society. According to Putin (1999), "weakness of the state will cancel out the effects of economic and other reforms." In a related vein, the *Concept of Administrative Reform*, points out that administrative reform in Russia was expected to become one of the most important ways to accelerate social and economic development and to increase Russia's competitiveness in the international arena.

Through the persuasive power of numbers that constructs "the way the world really is" (Weldes, 1999) and drives Russian reform documents, calls for administrative reform in Russia became more saturated and persistent. Reformers brought to light negative Russia's international rankings in quality of governance, transparency, and corruption. In terms of the quality of governance, World Bank rankings placed Russia together with less developed countries in the last third of 209 countries with the Composite Governance Indicator of 31 (out of 100) with the

---

[4] According to Solomon (2005), in Putin's Russia the notion of the strong state related to the President's efforts "to strengthen the state to make Russia governable," "to curb the dominance of personal networks" through administrative reform, and, eventually, achieve the "perfection of a system of power … in which the various players, be they governors, oligarchs, or even judges could be relied upon to cooperate with the President in the crunch" (p. 4).

Confidence Range of 22-40.[5] The Corruption Perceptions Index developed by Transparency International ranked Russia in 126-129th place (together with Albania, Niger, and Sierra Leone) out of 159 countries surveyed.

A new, "strong state," that needs to be built by those who do not accept current state of affairs in the country, is intolerant of bureaucratic obstacles to development. According to Yelena Maslennikova, Chair of the Department of Public and Municipal Administration at the Volga State Academy of Civil Service, "corruption, disorder in government, and poor quality of public administration confirmed the urgency of reform in Russia" (personal communication, January 3, 2011). Within this context, the role of public authorities was seen by the Russian President as protecting citizens from internal threats facing the nation. In Putin's words:

> International experience demonstrates that the major threat to the individual rights and freedoms, democracy in general, stems from the executive branch … Around the world, there is a tendency towards strengthening the executive branch. That is why it is not by chance that the society strives to strengthen control over the executive branch to preclude arbitrary behavior and abuse of discretion (Putin, 1999).

The passage above presents a "topos of threat" (Wodak & Meyer, 2001) that is used to provide a good reason for reform and identify the source of the threat, the executive branch. The Prime Minister makes reference to international experience - although not mentioning specific countries - to emphasize the scope of the problem and to strengthen the argument by referring to experiential knowledge shared (in the President's view) by communities around the world.

---

[5] According to the World Bank, Composite Governance Indicator is the average of percentile rankings for the six governance components: voice and accountability, political stability, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law and control of corruption). Confidence Range "refers to the percentile confidence interval for *Average of Rankings of All Six Indicators*, calculated at 90% significance level. The percentile rank estimate for a country ought to be reviewed in conjunction with its confidence interval" (http://info.worldbank.org/governance/kkz2004/worldmap.asp#map).

Change is needed to protect "ingroup" members (the citizens) from the "outgroup" arrangement (bureaucracy) (van Dijk, 1995). Rhetorically, protection comes or will come from the political leaders who care about citizens. At the same time, the authorship of the idea of change in government (in this case, associated with strengthened control over the bureaucracy) is attributed to the public, rather than political leaders and decision-makers.

Despite a broad recognition of the importance of reform, there is no revolutionary rhetoric in Russian official discourse. It should be noted that in general, in different periods of the Russian history, the very word "change" has not always been associated with the ideas of progress and development. For Russian citizens, "change" can be associated with hardship, while "stability" is often viewed as the foundation for progress. There is an old saying, "Do not look for a new Tsar," which means that the new Tsar may be worse than the previous one. After the post-Soviet transition (which was painful in many respects), the rhetoric grounded in the idea of stability dominated Russian official discourse.

> Yes, some accomplishments of previous years allowed us to speak about some stabilization … But, we are still facing serious threats … Our political system needs to be improved. The state apparatus is inefficient … (Putin, 2002).

In this passage, the "topos of threat" is merged with the idea of stability or stabilization: the resolution of the threat to stability is in improving the political system and the way government works. The government needs to become more efficient. At the broader level, stability is one of the key components of the strong state represented by the nation capable of countering existing threats. The ability to come together and work toward common goals, however, is limited by public discontent with bureaucracy. The important ideological markers in this passage are pronouns "we" and "our," which serve a variety of functions, including the

creation of a single unified identity, legitimization of the argument, and creation of common sense (Weldes, 1999). Administrative reform is urgently needed to increase Russia's international competitiveness, improve social and economic situation in the country, and restore public trust in government by strengthening control over the bureaucracy (Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly, 2002; Concept of Administrative Reform).

Shaping the New Vision of the Government

Like in American official discourse, the utmost urgency of change serves as an overarching narrative that provides the foundation for the formation of the new vision of the government and the relationship between government and the public. Change is instrumental in reconsidering the ways government works in the new environment shaped after the end of the Cold War and disintegration of the Soviet Union.

From Old to New Government

According to President Putin, the country's "colossal potential had been constrained by an unwieldy, clumsy and ineffective mechanism of public administration" (Putin, 2002). The bureaucracy is described as "largely an exclusive and often arrogant caste considering state service as an alternative form of business" (Putin, 2005). The *All-Russian Monitoring of Introduction of Administrative Regulations* (2009) uses similar lexical associations: "The public views Russian bureaucracy as a consolidated and independent caste distanced from the society, which cannot be tuned to the effective service to the society" (p. XIV).

As Putin argued, Russian bureaucracy has "enormous power," but proved itself "poorly prepared to develop and implement the decisions our country needs today. At the same time, it has proved itself good at obtaining benefits and revenues through the use of its powers and

106

position" (Putin, 2003). According to Putin (2005), "Our plans do not include handing over the country to the inefficient rule of the corrupt bureaucracy."

In the excerpts above, the epithets "unwieldy," "clumsy," "ineffective," "inefficient," "arrogant," and "corrupt" as well as the word "caste" represent "negative other-presentation" (van Dijk, 1995). The bureaucracy pictured in the official discourse is dysfunctional, self-interested, and incapable of serving people and adjusting to changing demands. The bureaucracy is seen as the major obstacle to progress and development, since it does not follow the course chosen by the leadership and the people. Ideologically, there is a significant distance between the political leaders and citizens (who together represent "our country") on the one side and bureaucracy on the other. The political leaders and citizens, however, will not allow the bureaucracy to sabotage the national efforts. In the excerpts above, the ideology is organized by the "ingroup-outgroup polarization" (van Dijk, 1995), which is represented by the possessive pronoun "our."

In Russian official discourse, bureaucracy is often portrayed metaphorically as an "inefficient mechanism" or a "machine" that has only a distant connection with human class of objects and needs modification. This comparison offers interesting parallels with Max Weber's view of bureaucracy as a machine the parts of which – the individuals – are responsible for performing particular functions. Interestingly, it is not the civil servants or the citizens, who have to fix the "machine." As the President of the Higher School of Economics and one of the ideologues of reform in Russia Yaroslav Kuzminov stated, "If the machine needs to be fixed, this must be done by the mechanics, rather than drivers or passengers."

In Russia, the "mechanics," including such organizations as the Center for Strategic Developments and the Higher School of Economics, have played an important role in shaping

the reform direction. According to Andrey Klimenko, Vice-President of the Higher School of Economics and member of the Work Group on the Development of Administrative Regulations, Government Commission on Administrative Reform, "In terms of reform outsourcing, we are the first in the world;" a number of institutions, other than government, were asked to prepare the *Concept of Administrative Reform*, reform-related legislative bills, and other important documents. Klimenko believes that this is a wrong approach: "Yes, they pay us money, … but it should be a bureaucrat who writes these documents and assumes responsibility" (personal communication, January 18, 2011).

Large, inefficient, and often unworkable bureaucracies are under attack from many directions: drivers, passengers, and mechanics. For example, according to a report of the Higher School of Economics, one of the flagships of administrative reform in Russia:

> The upper tiers in the structure of bureaucracy are overloaded and often paralyzed by the number and variety of everyday issues with which they have to deal … Delegation-of-authority systems as well as horizontal interactions at the lower tiers are inefficient. Outdated tools of public administration create a 'field of uncertainty' for citizens and organizations, as well as within the system of public administration itself (Higher School of Economics, 2004, p. 1).

In this example, instead of machine or mechanism features, the rhetorical structure of discourse ascribes characteristics of a living organism to bureaucracy. The personification of bureaucracy as a living organism that is seriously ill (introduced by the word "paralyzed") conveys an attitude of necessity to undertake immediate measures to prevent the progression of illness that makes the system deteriorated. In official discourse largely shaped by anti-

bureaucratic sentiments, it is a matter of common sense that bureaucracy is outdated and dysfunctional.

According to Yelena Dobrolyubova, General Director of the Center for Economic and Financial Consulting and former World Bank Task Manager for the Russia Public Administration Reform Work, during the 2000 presidential election campaign, one of the key topics on President Putin's agenda was that bureaucracy and corruption presented major obstacles to political, economic, and social progress (personal communication, January 17, 2010). For the President, administrative reform was "one of the mandatory initiatives, which had to deal with burdensome, extensive, and intrusive bureaucracy" (Klimenko, personal communication, January 18, 2010). Not surprisingly, administrative reform in Russia was initiated by the President.

According to Andrey Zhulin, Director of the Center for Government Activity Analysis and member of the Work Group on Improving Structure and Functions of the Federal Executive Bodies, Government Commission on Administrative Reform, administrative reform was a top-down initiative with the President taking the lead. The initial reform efforts were discussed by a small group of individuals, including the President and representatives of the Ministry of Economic Development, Ministry of Finance, and Presidential Administration (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

In Russia, the head of state has historically had a charisma of a political leader devoted to the Motherland, the leader protecting the people from bureaucratic excesses (Okunkov, 2001). For decades, many Russians have tended to expect decisive actions from the country's leadership; in many cases, "true" leaders were the ones guiding and protecting the nation with a strong hand. And this was something President Putin was offering the nation. The identity

constituted for President Putin by the discourse is strong and "tough" political leader capable of making decisions and protecting citizens from administrative abuses:

> In the working out of a great national program which seeks the primary good of the greater number, it is true that the toes of some people are being stepped on and are going to be stepped on. But these toes belong to the comparative few who seek to retain or to gain position or riches or both by some short cut which is harmful to the greater good (Putin, 2006, using F. Roosevelt's words, 1934).

The passage above presents a quotation from the speech of Franklin Roosevelt, who, in America of 1933, "took the role of national father, of bipartisan leader, of President of all the people" (Burns, 1956, p. 182). President Putin uses Roosevelt's words in his Address to the Federal Assembly to ideologically reinforce the formation of the new political agenda that will no longer include acceptance of bureaucratic inefficiencies.

The intertextual representation through a direct quotation serves the purpose of strengthening the argument and, in the context of the President's address, becomes a warning to corrupt bureaucrats and business leaders involved in illegal activities, who pose a threat to the state. Interestingly, the comparisons of President Putin and FDR are quite frequent. As one of Putin's top-ranking colleagues argued:

> In the 20th century, Roosevelt was our military ally. In the 21st century, he is our ideological ally. Like Roosevelt during his presidency, Putin has to consolidate administrative control and use presidential power to the maximum. The ideas and emotions that are putting our society in motion seem surprisingly similar to those that moved America in Franklin Roosevelt's epoch (Osborn, 2010).

In Russia, presidential documents, including but not limited to the addresses to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and presidential decrees, have played an important, if not the major, role in the development of a strategic course of action in the country. The beginning of administrative reform in Russia is largely associated with the Presidential Decree No. 824 of July 23, 2003 *On Measures for Implementation of* Administrative Reform *in 2003- 2004* that draws upon the 2003 President's Address to the Federal Assembly. In their turn, further administrative reform documents and decisions build upon the key concepts and ideas offered by the President.

In the context of administrative reform, the general thrust of presidential documents is that control over the bureaucracy is a shared, consensus-based priority of the political leaders and citizens. As the national leader and the guarantor of the Constitution, the President must ensure that this priority is carried out by the government. Although structured as a shared aspiration of the nation as a whole, control over the bureaucracy is the issue of particular importance to Russian political leadership. For example, as Zhulin argued,

> Typically, for the President, administrative reform is associated with an intention to control implementation of his own orders. We started administrative reform in the situation when the share of presidential orders implemented on time was estimated at 2 percent. Control and controllability of bureaucracy were among the most important unspoken goals of reform (personal communication, January 18, 2011).

Along the same lines, Dobrolyubova noted that for the President administrative reform was a "tool to ensure implementation of his orders" (personal communication, January 17, 2011). According to Oleg Alexandrov, General Director of iCEFC and former Consultant for the Government Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of Budget Expenditures, in addition to

the controllability issue, in the broader context, the effective implementation of reform may be seen as immediately connected to the President's approval ratings from voters (personal communication, January 17, 2011).

As mentioned earlier, in general, Russian official publications borrow ideology outlined in presidential documents, which can be observed at the level of selection of topics and choice of words in official publications used to advance reform efforts and achievements. For example, the official web-site of administrative reform in Russia that in addition to multiple documents and publications presents a history of reform, plays on the widely accepted and shared motif of "strong state" (with government and its bureaucracy being an important constituent part of it) by providing lexical items from the semantic field to which this notion belongs: there has been a "*decisive* structural change in government," in the new system "*strong* accountability for results is required," the goal of reform is to "*establish order* in the area of service delivery," administrative regulations "*protect* the rights of the citizens." The general belief that was shaped in Russian official discourse is that with the President providing leadership and protection, the government and citizens will be able to fight bureaucratic abuses and ensure a stable and predictable environment for social and economic development.

Creating the Prescription of Rule-Oriented Rational Government

In the view of Russian political and bureaucratic actors, the state apparatus has to become compact and efficiently operating. For example, as Gaman-Golutvina (2008) argues, "Changing the role of state management in the direction of greater efficiency was proclaimed by Putin to be one of the key tasks of his presidency. This objective became one of the main initiatives of his administrative reform" (p. 38). The growing perception of public bureaucracies as being

inefficient, corrupt, and unresponsive to citizens is presented in the official publications as one of the important reasons for the rise of administrative reform movement in Russia.

In official discourse, the mobilization of anti-bureaucratic sentiments is immediately related to the idea of rule-oriented rationality. Within this context, lexical choices favoring rational expectations, structures, and actions serve as pointers to ideological preferences of Russian political and bureaucratic actors. For example, according to a report of the Higher School of Economics (2002), a "strong state requires rationally developed laws combined with efficient mechanisms to carry out these laws as well as political decisions …" (p. 1). In a related vein, the World Bank report stated that,

> Any assessment of the current functioning of the public administration in the Russian Federation points towards the need for a basic set of reforms that provide an underpinning of discipline and formality. Developing a strong, legally defined civil service is perhaps the most pressing. (Manning & Parison, 2004, p. 54)

The World Bank report comes up with the prescription of rule-oriented rationality that emphasizes the importance of governing by a set of specific rules grounded, among other things, in the principles of "formality" and "discipline." The new Russian bureaucracy is viewed as the entity that needs to be rule based, formalized, and disciplined. Commenting on the reasons for initiating reform in Russia, Klimenko argued that, "The need for order in government was the key thing" (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public services, the initial administrative reform efforts included steps to rationalize administrative system, functions, and decision-making processes. With the purpose of improving government performance, increasing citizen satisfaction, and ensuring greater accountability, the review of government functions and

reorganization that followed, in a significant degree drew upon international experiences and expert recommendations.

Within this context, expert consultation strengthened ideological grounding and served as a resource for rationality through offering, among other things, elements from the United States' Federal Enterprise Architecture initiative (Zhulin, personal communication, January 18, 2011) and Osborne and Gaebler's steering-rowing aspects that emphasized the importance of separating "policy decisions (steering) from service delivery (rowing). According to Osborne and Gaebler (1992), "successful organizations" concentrate policy-making responsibilities in the hands of top-management, while staff should be in charge of operations or policy-implementation. In Russia, the metaphorical "steering" – "rowing" distinction is reflected in the Presidential Decree No. 314 of March 9, 2004, which set a new structure of the Russian federal government. According to the Decree, the Russian federal executive branch was to become a three-tiered system. The new structure of the government was to be represented by ministries ("setting the rules"), services ("enforcing the rules"), and agencies ("implementing the rules") (Kotchegura, 2008).

The idea of rule-oriented rationality immediately embraces the concept of efficiency. As identified in a range of documents, including the *Concept for Reforming Budgeting Process in the Russian Federation for 2004-2006*, one of end goals of administrative reform in Russia is to improve efficiency of public services. As President Putin (2002) noted:

The immediate responsibility of the state is to create adequate conditions for the development of economic freedoms, establish strategic goals, provide quality public services, and efficiently manage public assets. To achieve this task, the structure of the

executive branch must be organized logically and rationally, while the bureaucracy has to serve as a practical tool for implementing economic policy.

According to another document, Government Resolution No. 679 of November 11, 2005, federal executive agencies are required to "optimize (improve quality of) performance of government functions (provision of public services) … Administrative regulations are developed on the basis of requirements of quality and accessibility developed and approved in accordance with the laws of the Russian Federation …"

Administrative regulations are described by reformers as the "rules of the game," which form the basis of the dialogue between government and the public on the quality of public services, as well as the "algorithm to perform public functions," which allows for implementation of the new model of the state as service provider (Panov & Filipovich, 2004). The word "algorithm" and the phrase "rules of the game" demonstrate that reformers attempted to offer a new, clear-cut framework of the government that was believed to be instrumental in shaping the new practice of governance based on logical and rational approaches.

According to Popova (2007), the purpose of developing administrative regulations is to improve the quality of public services, to decrease the amount of time to provide public services, to eliminate redundant administrative procedures, and to simplify the whole process of service delivery. Government Resolution No. 679 of November 11, 2005 details the meaning of administrative regulations in a very logical and deliberate manner through a syntactically complex construction:

Administrative regulations set a timeline and sequence of administrative procedures and administrative actions of a federal executive agency, order of interaction among its structural divisions and officials, as well as interaction of the federal executive agency

with physical and legal persons (further – "applicants"), other federal and municipal authorities, as well as institutions and organizations in the process of implementation of government functions (delivery of government services).

The process of developing administrative regulations is expected to be consistent with specific step-by-step guidelines that need to be followed by the executive agencies. These guidelines are thoroughly presented and explained in detail in the official publications. For example,

> The section on administrative procedures has to contain subsections that correspond to a number of administrative procedures (logically separate sequences of administrative actions to perform a government function (deliver a public service) having the end result and determined during the implementation of a government function (Government Resolution No. 679).

In addition, according to Government Resolution No. 679, for the purpose of process visualization and understanding of logically precise messages, block diagrams that outline key points related to the implementation of the government function were to accompany administrative regulations. As these examples demonstrate, in the new model, government operations were perceived as ones conforming to logical and predictable behavior patterns that were to be followed by bureaucrats with the purpose of improving efficiency.

Creating a New Bureaucratic Service-Provider Identity

According to Vladimir Putin, one of the goals of administrative reform is to orient the state apparatus to satisfy the needs of citizens and the economy. In President Putin's view, his own job as the president is to provide services to the Russian people. In Russian official discourse, the term "public services," defined as "services provided to physical persons and

organizations upon their request" (Draft Federal Bill on Public Services No. 254940-5) became widely used by the proponents of administrative reform.

According to Tereschenko (2004), in Russia the notion of "public services" emerged with the introduction of reform initiatives. Public services were expected to be immediately connected with implementation of government functions; the provision of services to the public was to be based on these functions. Within this context, civil servants are viewed as service providers who are expected to achieve specific results that would be appreciated by the clients of government. The client-oriented approach was intended to provide guidance to civil servants.

At the same time, in the new system constructed by Russian reformers, civil servants have to become immediately responsible for performing particular functions within an elaborate framework of rules. The whole process of delivering a service or performing a function is spelled out in administrative regulations, which describe all steps that need to be taken by a government employee involved in the process of service delivery. Within this context, as Klimenko (2005) argues, "At the stage of implementing goals and objectives set by politicians, bureaucrats have to ensure their implementation with complete loyalty ..." Along the same lines, Zhulin pointed out that like previously, in the new system, bureaucrats are expected to continue playing a subordinate role (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

According to the Federal Law on State Civil Service in the Russian Federation, a civil servant is to follow the principle of neutrality that would preclude him or her from "being influenced by the decisions of political parties, public associations, religious and other organizations"[6] (Article 18, 7). The Law on State Civil Service also forbids civil servants to exercise activities in the interest of political parties and other organizations (Article 17). The

---

[6] The same idea was previously emphasized in the Presidential Decree on General Principles of Conduct issued in August 2002.

decision-making power of civil servants needs to be limited; it is not the discretionary choices that should guide the Russian civil servant, but rules and regulations.

The report of the Higher School of Economics (2004) points out that in Russian government there has been an "unmeasured increase of administrative discretion in all tiers of the administrative hierarchy" (p. 1). The hyperbole "unmeasured" creates an emphasis on negative aspects associated with the behavior of Russian bureaucrats and makes the matter of limiting administrative discretion appear as the one of special significance in the context of administrative reform.

According to Vladimir Yuzhakov, Director of the Department on Administrative Reform at the Center for Strategic Developments, the purpose of administrative regulations and standards is to prevent discretionary actions of bureaucrats (personal communication, January18, 2011). Russian and international experts share a strong belief that one of the most important reasons of inefficient performance of government functions is the excessive discretion exercised by bureaucrats, which needs to be limited or removed. The idea of limiting or removing discretion can be found in earlier official publications; for example, the *Concept of Civil Service Reform* of August 15, 2001 maintains that the "possibility of taking subjective and arbitrary actions in civil service should be ruled out." Civil servants are directed to perform all administrative procedures in accordance with administrative regulations.

According to Zhulin, one of the ideas that guided reformers was that it was necessary to "eliminate opportunities for administrative discretion. The ideology was that administrative discretion would be removed if administrative regulations were properly developed, agreed upon, and approved. Administrative discretion causes corruption, the problem that is to be solved by administrative regulations and standards" (personal communication, January 18, 2011).

In the view of Klimenko, there are two ways to solve the problem of administrative discretion. The first way is to limit the set of choices open to the bureaucrat. The second way is to create a system of incentives and disincentives. In many cases, incentives, such as performance-based pay do not work, while administrative standing orders and standards do work (Klimenko, personal communication, January 18, 2010). In the longer run, however, performance-based pay is expected to become one of the important mechanisms to induce employees to act in accordance with the existing rules.

Russian reformers view monetary increase in salary as the key tool to reward those civil servants who contribute meaningfully to reform efforts. Moral incentives, such as, for example, certificates of merit, which were widely used in Soviet times, are no longer considered as an appropriate way of rewarding performance. As Alexei Barabashev, Dean of the Department of Public and Municipal Administration at the Higher School of Economics, argued, "one should not overestimate the value of moral incentives in present-day Russia" (personal communication, January 18, 2010). According to reformers, performance-based pay is one of the components that might help stimulate the development of effective service delivery systems equivalent to those developed by the leading businesses.

Interestingly, in Russian official discourse, businesses are portrayed in two different ways. On the one hand, businesses linked with bureaucracies are presented as a source of a threat to the state: "Sustainable linkages between managerial teams in business and state authorities change their form … these linkages still serve private interests rather than the public interest" (Higher School of Economics, 2004, p. 1). It is argued that corporations may have an upper hand in decision-making, since the "quality of management" in the leading private organizations is typically higher than in government.

This is one of the reasons why state authorities are sometimes presented with the help of such lexical item as "defenseless": state authorities are "defenseless" in the face of corporations' "dishonest lobbying" (Higher School of Economics, 2004). In this example, polarization between "us" and "them" is taken to a new level. Unlike in the examples discussed earlier in this chapter, where "we" and "us" are represented by the political leaders, reformers, and citizens, while "they" and "them" are inefficient and corrupt bureaucracies, here state authorities ("us") are portrayed as defenseless victims of corporate interests ("them") that need protection from business.

On the other hand, businesses and entrepreneurs are pictured as an important target group of administrative reform and, at the same time, as the source of "best practices" (including those of service delivery) which, according to Russian reformers, should be applied in the public sector and used by civil servants/service providers. In the new environment, government role in the market economy is expected to become limited, which would increase independence of private organizations (Presidential Decree *On Measures for Implementation of* Administrative Reform *in 2003-2004*). According to Dobrolyubova, in the context of reform, "Representatives of private organizations, including the Russian Chamber of Trade and Industry, the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, and Business Russia had the leverage of influence, not the citizen groups" (personal communication, January 17, 2011).

Given the belief that the quality of management is higher in private organizations, business optimization processes and techniques should be learned by service providers. For example, business/administrative process reengineering is expected to help improve "socially significant public services" (Nabiullina, 2010), while "best practices" in service delivery are to

be studied and considered for implementation both at the federal and regional levels (Ministry of Economic Development, 2007).

The Relationship between Government and the Public

Framing Citizens' and Business Trust as the Key Relationship Concepts

Ideologically, the President and the people are united in their commitment to ensure a sustainable future for their country. Within this context, "trust" is an important concept that acquired particular significance at least as early as 2000. In his first Address to the Federal Assembly (2000), Vladimir Putin stated that the federal executive departments and agencies, among other things, had a "constitutional responsibility to ensure a state-wide mandate of trust secured by means of the democratic election of the President."

Regaining public trust in the state is one of the important goals that Russia needs to achieve. The *Concept of Administrative Reform* is quite persuasive in these terms. The Concept provides quantitative data to highlight the existing problems and to emphasize the importance of restoration of trust. As the Concept indicates, according to public opinion surveys conducted by the Russian Public Opinion Foundation in the early 2000s, 71 percent of Russian citizens were not satisfied with the performance of civil servants and 76 percent of respondents reported they had faced corruption. Only 14 percent of respondents expressed satisfaction with the quality of services provided by the Russian government.

In Russia, lack of trust in government is not a new phenomenon, but rather has some of its roots in the historical context of the Tsarist Russia, where bureaucrats, serving the Tsar, were not excessively concerned with the "third class," the people: "More than in any other country, officials in Russia considered themselves a superior species, appointed to drive the herds of

121

human cattle" (Hugh Seton-Watson in Richmond, 2002, p. 74). An old Russian proverb says: "Those who serve the Tsar cannot serve the people."

In new Russian official discourse, the notion of trust is surrounded by a negative linguistic environment. Trust appears to be "undermined" by "inefficient mechanisms" of the executive power and requires restoration (*Concept of Administrative Reform*). The inefficient mechanisms are out of order, which leads to declined public trust. As the World Bank report (2006) suggests:

> State institutions (and government in general) are supposed to serve their people and protect their citizens. State institutions provide services such as education, health care, security (in the police and military), welfare services, judicial services, etc. These institutions are required to fulfill their obligations to the citizenry by following the rules and regulations, adhering to oversight arrangements and practices accountable for. When such mechanisms break down and government institutions fail to fulfill their obligations, public trust is eroded, and the integrity in government is weakened. (p. 6)

The creation of the negative linguistic environment conveys the message that the relationship between government and the public is in great danger since the foundation of this relationship – trust – is "undermined" or "eroded." One of the attributes of the inefficient system is the high level of corruption, which is the problem that needs to be urgently solved.

In the broken system, the executive departments and agencies do not interact efficiently among each other and with the citizens. The Report *On Priority Initiatives of the Government Commission on Administrative Reform* (2008), points out the problem of inefficient information exchange between government and the public by using the expression "information and technological separatism." In Russian official discourse, the word "separatism" has pejorative

meaning and in the context of the document serves the function of emphasizing negative characteristics of the current system. The problem of information and technological separatism is described in economic terms as an important reason why citizens and entrepreneurs incur "time, financial, and moral costs" (Report *On the First Stages of Administrative Reform*, 2007).

To receive a service, citizens need to go to different offices, which are often not adequately equipped to offer a service and where it is impossible to find required information. As the Report *On the First Stages of Administrative Reform* states in a rather complex manner:

> It is often the case that when a citizen is applying for a public service provided by a public agency, he or she gets only an intermediate document … that needs to be submitted to another public agency in the process of public service delivery; this means that the citizen needs to submit identical information when applying to different public agencies getting only intermediate results.

According to the Report, these unfavorable conditions also increase the risk of corruption. To emphasize the problem of "information and technological separatism" in relation to the possibility of corrupt practices, the report embeds a metaphor "whip up": information exchange problem "whips up the risk of corruption." It is expected that government efforts to address this issue and fight a related problem of corruption would result in the increased level of public trust (Anti-Corruption Program of July 27, 2007 approved by the Government Commission on Administrative Reform).

In Russian official discourse, in addition to achieving citizens' trust, it was expected that reform would increase the trust of businesses in government. According to the *Concept of Administrative Reform*, administrative reform was initiated for the benefit of citizens and

entrepreneurs. From the very beginning of administrative reform in Russia, business (not citizens) is presented as the major target group of administrative reform.

Presidential Decree No. 824 *On Measures for Implementing the Administrative Reform in 2003-2004* is targeted at "improving efficiency of executive bodies and creating favorable conditions for business entities in their realization of rights and interests." The liberal economic strategy that prescribes limiting government intervention in economy and state regulation becomes one of the key components of administrative reform in Russia. The effective realization of this strategy largely depends on trust of businesses, which cannot be built on inefficient executive mechanisms; these "mechanisms" serve as the "barrier" to the development of business (*Concept of Administrative Reform*).

As far as the public is concerned, the concept of trust is defined in Russian documents in rather "tangible" terms. In 2004, the Draft Federal Target Program *Administrative Reform* highlighted improved public trust as one of the goals of administrative reform in Russia. The *Concept of Administrative Reform*, that largely builds on the Draft Federal Program, defines the concept trust in terms of "quality of public services" that needs to be increased and the "measures of citizen satisfaction" that need to be improved dramatically (from 14 percent to 50 percent by 2008, and to 70 percent by 2010). According to reformers, one of the key goals of administrative reform is to increase the quality and accessibility of public services. Public trust is one of the "measures" to identify the achievement of the goal of increasing the quality and accessibility of public services.

Constructing a New Contract on the Delivery of Public Services

Like in the United States, Russian administrative reform brought new terminology to define an updated vision of the relationship between government and the public. In the web of relationships between the government (and its employees) and non-government actors, government identity was constructed as that of a "service provider." The belief shared by Russian decision-makers was that bureaucrats had to start realizing that the citizen is their most important client. As Klimenko (2005) argues, "The institutions of civil society and citizens are the clients of the executive branch …"

Since the early 2000s, the discussion that had received increased attention in Russia was structured around such lexical items as "clients," "consumers," "recipients," and "users" – citizens and non-governmental organizations to whom the government was to provide services. As Maslennikova argued,

> The social orientation of the state has always been emphasized, but when a citizen becomes to be considered as a client identifying the direction of activities, it's probably the most novel approach … We basically started looking at the other side of the counter (personal communication, January 3, 2011)

Individuals that were to deal with government agencies were also referred to as "applicants for public services." The term "applicant" was included in the language to define "a physical or legal person interacting with public officials in the process of implementation of a public function (delivery of a public service)" (Government Resolution No. 679, 2005). According to the report On Priority Initiatives of the Government Commission on Administrative Reform, "applicants for public services were to receive necessary and adequate information on the delivery of public services."

According to Alexandrov, the new vision of the relationship between government and the public is the relationship "between clients and those who perform particular functions and provide services to address the client's needs. In fact, this is an attempt to build a service-oriented state" (personal communication, January 17, 2010). In a related vein, as Maslennikova indicated, service provider-client interpretation of the relationship between government and the public has been predominant in Russian official discourse (personal communication, January 3, 2010). This interpretation is viewed as providing a solution to government problems, such as public trust and corruption.

According to Zhulin,

Improved interaction with citizens was identified as one of the key goals of reform. For example, the Law On the Procedure of Considering Applications from Citizens of the Russian Federation [Federal Law No. 59-FZ of May 2, 2006] was passed. In addition, public expertise of administrative regulations became one of the important instruments" (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

The Law On the Procedure of Considering Applications from Citizens of the Russian Federation establishes "legal relationships related to the enforcement of the right of the citizen … to apply to state and municipal institutions, as well as the procedure to consider the applications by state and municipal institutions, and public officials." In the text of the Law, the definition of the term "application" is the following:

Citizen's request for assistance in exercising his/her constitutional rights and freedoms or constitutional rights and freedoms of other individuals; or notification about the violation of laws and other normative legal acts, deficiencies in operation of state and municipal institutions, and public official; or critical evaluation of the performance of these

institutions and public officials.

The term "application" appears to play an important role in understanding the new vision of "legal relationships" established by this document. The relationship "begins" with the citizen initiating a public encounter, when his/her (or other individual's) interests are affected. The role of government is not to initiate this process, but to address the citizen's concerns and deliver a service or product in an appropriate manner.

At the level of information access, the relationship between government and the public is viewed as more of a two-way process with both government and citizens initiating the effort. The underlying "service provider – client" vision, however, is the same. Government Resolution No. 98 *On Guaranteeing Access to Information on the Activities of the Government of Russian Federation and Federal Bodies of Executive Power* of February 12, 2003 and the Federal Law No. 8-FZ *On Ensuring Access to Information on the Activities of State and Municipal Bodies* of February 2, 2009 require government entities to inform citizens about their activities through a variety of communication vehicles. According to the latter document, citizens, referred to as the "users of information," have the right to utilize the information provided and to request other information from the state and municipal bodies.

To improve the quality of public services and increase transparency in government operations, the government also introduced two Federal Bills – *On Administrative Regulations and On Standards of Public Services*. The bills were drafted by the Center for Strategic Developments and the Higher School of Economics.

According to the draft version of the Federal Bill *On Administrative Regulations*, all regulatory acts related to the implementation of public functions were to be accompanied by administrative regulations. Administrative regulations, developed for each public service of

every single government entity, are to ensure unification and universalization of the process to perform government functions. In addition, administrative regulations have to help to eliminate redundant administrative activities and inappropriate actions burdened by extensive administrative discretion, simplify administrative procedures, increase transparency in government operations, and reduce costs and time for service delivery.

In the draft version of the Federal Bill *On Standards of Public Services*, public services are defined as regulatory established services provided by the state to the "users," seeking services from the government, while standards are understood as "a sequence of actions to deliver a public service and accompanied by examples and diagrams explaining the key points of the text." "Users" are expected to have the final say in identifying public services, determining if a delivery standard is needed, and, if it is, establishing a mechanism for its development. Standards of public services were to become part of administrative regulations.

According to Dobrolyubova, administrative regulations are rather complex documents that, to a significant extent, focus on internal processes:

> Probably, it was not the best thing that we technocratically focused on administrative regulations, practically hiding standards within them so that those who do not know that the standards are there, would never be able to find them. Administrative regulations are lengthy, sometimes 200-page, documents, so one really needs to know where to look for standards … Administrative regulations are related to internal operations. If one goes to a restaurant, it does not really matter *how* the meal is prepared, while the quality is the main thing" (personal communication, January 17, 2010).

Within this context, despite the predominance of the "client-consumer-user-recipient-applicant" vocabulary that to a significant extent conveyed an expression of the view of limited

128

role of the public in policy-making, government action is presented in some official publications as democratic in nature, while people are constructed as having the characteristics of active citizenship since they are expected to participate in formation of pro-reform policy agenda.

According to Government Resolution No. 679, executive agencies are required to publish information on draft administrative regulations on their official web-sites, consider suggestions received from organizations and citizens, and organize public discussions of draft administrative regulations. Public discussions are to be organized for the purpose of "taking into consideration suggestions from the recipients (potential recipients) of public services, other citizens and organizations, interests, rights and freedoms of whom were to be effected by the standards to deliver public services" (Draft Law On the Standards of Public Services). This example gives an ideological impression that citizens are among the key actors participating in reform efforts.

In the reformers' view, significant lack of transparency in operation of the executive agencies is one of the key challenges facing Russia: "One of the main problems of the executive and local agencies is their informational opacity and the absence of feedback from the citizens" (*Concept of Administrative Reform*). Klimenko argued that, "the idea of citizens' feedback was actually included in the Concept of Administrative Reform. It was, however, a sort of a passive feedback; we just measure if citizens are satisfied or unsatisfied. In terms of active participation, it is mainly experts, representatives of academic institutions, who participate" (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

According to Dobrolyubova, in the course of administrative reform, although major documents and timelines to offer comments and suggestions have been published and made available to the public, it has been unclear what comments were really accepted. There was also a question of openness of the Commission on Administrative Reform …" (personal

communication, January 17, 2010).

All interviewees emphasized the importance of establishing a constructive dialogue with citizens. According to Barabashev, "none of the reforms will work unless there is an established dialogue with the civil society. The dialogue not with selected citizens, but with unhappy, outraged citizens." It is believed, however, that a dialogue with citizens cannot be established and maintained without adequate financing. As Zhulin argued,

> The major players in reform are a few large organizations, including the Higher School of Economics, the Russian Non-Governmental Organization for Small and Medium Entrepreneurship (OPORA Russia), the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs (RSPP), and the Russian Chamber of Trade and Industry (TPP) work exclusively under contract with the federal government, when the government is willing to pay – for expertise, for documents … because everyone is swamped with work. Expert community is very small.

In addition, the common view is that with the effort to optimize rationality in decision-making, "broader citizen engagement is impossible" because of such factors as time constraints and quantity of documents (e.g., administrative regulations) to consider (Zhulin, personal communication, January 18, 2010). Moreover, according to Klimenko, citizens participate in decision-making when they vote for their representatives; in other issues, such as, for example, budget, they do not have competence to make policy choices:

> If it is a budget decision – what do I [citizen] understand about it? … People make decisions when they vote for their representatives … Many individuals, even those who have worked on these issues for a long time, do not understand all the details (Klimenko, personal communication, January 18, 2010).

Also, according to reformers, feedback mechanisms do not work due to lack of citizens' interest. As Alexandrov argued, one can hardly expect anything from the broad mass of citizenry (personal communication, January 17, 2010). In a related vein, Klimenko indicated that both the government and citizens underestimate the importance of collaborative action: "Citizens like to talk, but do not really like to invest their soul in solving problems. Because their hands were bound for years and the institutions of civil society are not being established" (personal communication, January 18, 2010). According to Yuzhakov, in many situations, people do not think that their opinion would be heard (personal communication, January 19, 2010).

In general, according to Klimenko, "citizens are distanced, they do not care. We conducted an assessment of the quality of public services – 47 percent of citizens said: "Yes, we are happy with everything." Why are they happy? Because they got used to everything. A person does not expect anything. Bring 10 documents - nobody would even think that it's a nonsense …" Ordinary citizens think about decision-making only when there is a pressure from local authorities. They do not need an additional headache. Civil society is nonexistent" (personal communication, January 18, 2010).

Summary

This chapter presented a review and analysis of Russian official publications and interview data that helped to identify a set of ideas of the key political and bureaucratic actors. Like the previous chapter, this chapter was structured around two broad themes identified in the literature review. The NPM/Reinventing Government model was used as the yardstick against which comparable discussion was outlined. The majority of ideological markers were identified and presented at the level of lexicon, syntax, and semantics, and, to a lesser degree, at the level of rhetoric.

As this chapter demonstrates, in the broader narrative of change, the formation of new ideology of administration in Russia was guided by an integrated set of ideas that shaped the new vision of the government and the relationship between government and the public. As a backbone of a strong state, the new government is viewed as a rule-oriented rational institution that embraces the ideals of efficiency and effectiveness. Ideologically, rules and regulations provide the basis for ensuring efficiency and effectiveness, as well as for achieving and maintaining order, stability, trust, and political control. In addition, the new vision reinforces the importance of the President's role in shaping the ideological direction and ensuring control of the bureaucracy.

Within this context, civil servants play a strictly subordinate role, and, at the same time, assume a new role of service providers. The new ideology of administration favors a client-oriented approach to the relationship between government and the public. Although in some of the documents citizens are presented as the participants in government decision-making process, the general patterns of the documents as well as interviewees comments point in a different direction emphasizing the primary importance of informing citizens and, in some cases, listening to their opinion.

Chapter 6:
Discussion and Conclusions

General Remarks

The purpose of this study was to determine what comparisons can be made between American and Russian ideologies of administration with the advent and adoption of the NPM-related reforms. As the research demonstrates, concepts and ideas of "generic management" (Christensen & Laegrid, 2001) – the New Public Management (NPM) – brought by the "global revolution in public management" (Kettl, 1997) have been influential both in the United States and post-Soviet Russia.

In light of the propositions put forward in this study (see p. 23), the following general conclusions have been reached. The new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia share significant characteristics reflecting a number of similar core ideas. At the same time, however, important differences between the two ideologies of administration have been found. With a particular attention focused on language in use, the analysis of reform-related official publications and elite interviews showed that there is no uniform convergence between the two cases at the discursive level and the level of translation of NPM ideas in the two countries under analysis (Pollitt, 2001; Moynihan, 2006).

In American official discourse, the language of economics and business, underpinning NPM, plays a dominant role, in many respects replacing the "old" language of public law and bureaucracy. The official publications that were issued in the reinventing government period are good examples of simple and concise business writing. Many official publications are written in a persuasive, elevated style to share inspirational stories that feature commanders-in-chief and heroes of reinvention fighting with bureaucratic inefficiencies, as well as happy customers, in an attempt to empower employees and establish personalized contact with citizens.

Frequent inclusion of rhetorical devices/figures of speech in American official publications help reformers to achieve a desired effect of persuasion in specific areas of interest (e.g., shaping the "old-fashioned" inefficient bureaucracy as an ideological opponent). The official publications embrace conversational, promotional, and advertising features borrowed from the private sector by American reformers to market new reinventing government commodities. The meaning of new marketing messages is shaped and delivered through very clear syntactic forms that make understanding easy for diverse audiences.

In Russia, only selected elements from the NPM vocabulary and rhetoric became part of the official language. Like in the United States, the new lexicon of Russian government includes such lexical items as "service provider", "client," "consumer," "costs," and "measures," to name just a few, which became key in structuring managerial and political arguments. The inclusion of these elements, however, did not supplant traditionally accepted ways of communicating official messages. Russian official discourse reveals a mixture of the language of economics and business and legal language. In many cases, the legal language of bureaucracy predominates, which is typically demonstrated through the formal, official style of presenting information.

Unlike in the United States, in Russia, many official publications may be considered mainly as the products for internal, government consumption significantly lacking conversational genre (one of the characteristics of many American texts, including, but not limited to, government reports) and being loaded with professional language, which is understood within government organizations, but may be unclear to non-members.

In Russia, the discussion about administrative regulations that embrace new, NPM related concepts and approaches related to service delivery, quality, and accessibility is mostly shaped by legal language that details administrative procedures and actions. At the same time, the

standards of public services, that are part of administrative regulations, sometimes may be difficult to uncover. The vocabulary, form, and content of many documents suggest that they were written largely from a stance of impersonal distance. The majority of documents use formal vocabulary that include many technical terms as well as complex syntax that may seem overwhelming.

In both countries, major linguistic and ideological patterns are shaped by particular trends dictated by the government leaders, along with a variety of historical, political, institutional, and social factors. In many respects, those trends and factors have been quite different in the United States and Russia. For example, American discourse is constructed on the common sense basis of superiority of the private sector approaches and values over the ones of the public sector. For decades, this common sense was highly respected in different spheres of American social life and, in the reinventing government era, was immediately confirmed and reinforced. By contrast, in Russia, business has not been necessarily associated with positive impacts on the public sector or with traditionally accepted values.

The closer look at the language in use was instrumental in uncovering and understanding the "sets of ideas" of the key political and bureaucratic actors in the United States and Russia. In the United States, NPM ideas were deposited on a highly "fertile soil" (Lynn, 2008) of managerialism that for decades had been well nurtured for cultivation of business approaches. At the broader level, in American context, NPM served as an additional building block perfectly suited for the existing ideology of administration.

By contrast, in Russia, NPM was accepted with a degree of caution even despite the fact that, like in the United States, the country's administrative practices are rooted in the managerial tradition that for decades was at the core of a science of administration. In some important

135

respects, the fundamental ideas offered by the NPM/Reinventing Government model were translated differently and acquired a new meaning in post-Soviet Russia lacking well-developed regulatory structures and facing multiple challenges after the disintegration of the Soviet Union (e.g., corruption). Based on the analysis of reform-related official publications and elite interviews, the following sections will highlight commonalities and differences between the new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia that were formed with the advent and adoption of NPM ideas.

Research Findings: Commonalities between the New Ideologies of Administration

As the two cases demonstrate, the ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia share particular commonalities that are woven into the fabric of administrative reform. Through the review and analysis of reform-related official publications and interview data, the following commonalities were found.

First, both the United States and Russia view change in government as a centerpiece for solving a variety of problems associated with government performance, including, but not limited to, citizens' evaluation of the quality of public services. The grand narrative of change serves as a unifying thread running through many materials analyzed in this study. At about the same time in history, leadership in the United States and Russia emphasized the importance of changing the fundamentals of government and the relationship between government and the public. As the central feature of American and Russian official discourse, the narrative of change is shaped around polarizing structures presenting clear oppositions between past and present, old and new, good and bad. Change breaks with the past and brings a new (good and appropriate) vision of the government and the relationship between government and the public.

Second, as the analysis revealed, the major ideological drive for change results from the anti-bureaucratic rhetoric, which has dominated official discourse and played a special role of consolidating all discursive ideas in both the American and Russian cases. In the American case, it is mostly the bureaucratic system that is under attack, while in Russia it is both the system and individuals, whose behavior has to be constrained. Within the "bureaucracy bashing" context, official discourse is constructed by incorporation of arguments, concepts, and ideas that shape "ingroup-outgroup polarization" (van Dijk, 1995).

In both cases, official discourse presents and establishes a difference between two major camps: one camp is represented by political leaders and/or reformers and the people ("us"), while the other camp is occupied by bureaucrats ("them"). By leveraging historically negative attitudes towards government and its bureaucracies, the "old" government is portrayed by "us" (the "good" camp) as inefficient, untrustworthy, and unresponsive to public demands. The general shared belief is that the government machine is no longer capable of solving increasingly complex social and economic issues in an efficient and effective manner. In both cases, the view of government as a machine that needs to be fixed in a certain way has become a widely accepted metaphor.

Third, in both countries, the beliefs associated with presidential priorities take precedence and find reflection in other stakeholders' attitudes they produce. The overall image that is created is that presidential priorities are a product shaped by multiple stakeholders, including citizens. The successful implementation of presidential priorities, however, is a matter of power, control, and political gain. This brings into play the back-stage political dimension of administrative reform that surrounds the managerial processes. As Klimenko (2005) argues,

> Politicians … are interested in gaining popularity among voters … At the same time, politicians try to strengthen their administrative resources - to have the opportunity to control the executive branch on a regular basis to ensure implementation of presidential programs and loyalty of officials.

In the United States, the 1993 NPR report camouflaged a significant transfer of power from Congress to the executive branch. This is consistent with American conventional wisdom that one of the key functions of presidents is to preside over administrative agencies, which are supposed to be "creatively employed by presidents to promote their agenda" (Rose, 1997). Similarly, the Russian President, who according to the Constitution is the head of state, set the tone and shaped attitudes toward the roles of the state, government, and the public. The advancement of the President's priorities related to the establishment of the strong state was seen under threat because of the failure of public bureaucracies to implement presidential directives. Within this context, both President Clinton and President Putin emerge in the official documents as the "center[s] of energy, direction, and administrative management" (PCAM, 1937), FDR-like figures leading the nation through hard times.

Fourth, the research demonstrates that ideologically in both countries the "new logics of appropriate action" (Newman, 2002) is largely based on market-driven solutions advancing economic way of thinking and judgment. In both countries, although in different degrees, there is marketization of official discourse, which has imposed a new language at the level of nation-state (Fairclough, 1993). As the analysis shows, especially in the American case, the distinction between the public and private sectors becomes less clear-cut. As one Russian commentator noted, in the new environment,

One should not be afraid to note similarity in regulation of services provided by businesses and governments; in any case a service is considered as a result of immediate interaction between a provider and a consumer as well as a result of individual activity of the provider to satisfy the needs of the consumer. (Nozdrachev, 2005)

Within this context, efficiency and effectiveness are shaped as important (if not the key) attributes of good government. In both countries, the shared belief is that new "rational organizations" (Urban, 1982), should be represented by "smaller and sleeker" government entities performing their functions in an efficient and effective manner. The general view is that these organizations are capable of achieving positive outcomes and satisfying the needs of customers/clients. The ideal of government reflects the values of efficiency and effectiveness, and relates these values to customer/client orientation.

Fifth, in both countries, ideological orientation is formed by connecting some of the major arguments with the growing popular discontent with and decreased levels of trust in government. The contract with the public is intended to fix these and other government-public relationship issues. Rhetorically, government and the public need to unite and work together toward achieving common goals, one of them being the restoration of public trust in government. Negative linguistic attitudes, which surround the discussion about public trust, persuasively emphasize the urgency of collective action to change the fundamentals of the relationship between government and the public.

The "new customer service contract with the public" component of the new American ideology of administration finds reflection in Russia's ideological orientation on the provision of public services. As the analysis suggests, the relationship between government and the public is mainly to revolve around two major frameworks: information and consultation (OECD, 2001),

while the idea of active citizenship plays a relatively marginal role. In both countries, government is expected to provide the public with relevant information, and, in a number of cases, to seek their consultation (for example, through surveys). The general belief is that citizens are not interested in the "inside baseball" (Osborne, personal communication, September 2, 2010) and should be engaged only when (if) their interests are affected. Government reserves to itself the authority to determine the necessity and type of engagement.

In general, both in the United States and Russia, the contract with the public does not reveal substantial commitment to advancing the relationship between government and the public beyond delivering services and listening to "what customers want" (Gore, 1993). For example, American official discourse demonstrates that government leaders have embraced the idea of "increasing the role and voice of customers in the service delivery (but not the policy making) process" (Kamensky, 1996, p. 252). Similarly, in Russia, although some documents construct citizens as active participants in policy-making, the majority of documents do not reveal strong commitment to engaging citizens as equal partners.

In Russian official discourse, the question of increasing the citizens' role in shaping policies or strategies appears to be rarely addressed primarily because of the common belief in sufficiently powerful knowledge of "expert community," represented by selected government employees, international consultants, and domestic external organizations, under the general guidance of the President. Similarly, in the United States, government leaders, including the President, and pro-reform government employees operating in close connection with the "best in business" are the ones who "set the basic policy framework within which customer satisfaction can be pursued" (Aberbach & Rockman, 2000, p. 145).

Research Findings: Differences between the New Ideologies of Administration

The analysis demonstrated that despite the existence of particular commonalties in new administrative ideologies in the United States and Russia, important differences are quite apparent.

First, although in Russian official discourse change in government appears to be important, this change is not about "sweeping everything in its path" (Lenin, 1905). Change is ideologically accepted and advanced as a response not only to the issue of public trust, but also to the need to resolve the threat to the strength, stability, and development in the country. Rhetorically, the threat comes from the bureaucracy that has accumulated excessive power, breeds and sustains corruption, and creates inefficiency.

In a significant degree, in Russia, change is ideologically constructed as the means to protect citizens from administrative abuses and to achieve stability in the country. Traditionally valued "stability" is one of the keywords for understanding broader ideological perspectives in Russia; post-Soviet Russia does not need revolutions or wars - it needs to become a strong state capable of advancing internal social and economic vitality and enhancing international competitiveness. By contrast, American reinventing government initiative is a "revolution" or "war" that dismantles the existing system anchored in rules and regulations and offers new ways for the government to work better and cost less.

Second, the vision of government as a business-like/entrepreneurial institution is significantly more powerful in the United States than in Russia. In the American case, these findings can be explained, at least partially, by the conventional wisdom that holds that private organizations are more efficient than government organizations. Therefore, following the lead of

the "best in business," government should be entrepreneurial and run in a manner similar to that of private sector organizations, which the official publications present in a very positive light.

By contrast, Russian official discourse presents a certain degree of ambiguity associated with the idea of business-like/entrepreneurial government. On the one hand, businesses are viewed as a target group of reform and as a source of best practices. Business networks are also included in the reform process as experts. On the other hand, Russian new administrative ideology is reluctant to accept the view of government as a business-like institution. Moreover, rhetorically, civil service is pictured as requiring protection from "dishonest lobbying" of private corporations. This ambiguity is one of the important examples that demonstrate Russian interpretation of NPM ideas; while the ideal NPM/Reinventing Government model is solidly grounded in business values and beliefs, the Russian model accepts some of the key "ideal" components, and at the same time, combines them with those rejected in new American official discourse.

In Russia, the general thread of rationalizing allocation of government functions and responsibilities promotes the idea of rule-based government and provides for strengthened subordination of civil servants to legal norms, rules, and regulations. Unlike in the United States, in Russian context, maximization of efficiency and effectiveness is expected to occur within a rigid bureaucratic framework ensuring control, discipline, and formality. Administrative regulations and standards of public services are viewed as the most appropriate means to lay out a logical, specific, and detailed roadmap for constructing a new government and shaping the relationship between government and the public. Both American and Russian ideologies of administration embrace the "attributes of efficiency and effectiveness" (Urban, 1982), but their vision of how these attributes can be acquired differ in important respects.

Third, the identities of a civil servant constructed by American and Russian official discourses are quite different. The identity of a new Russian civil servant is constructed as the one of a servant to particular rules and, at the same time, to the public. Ideologically, this is the context within which the civil servant will work both efficiently and effectively. In Russia, administrative discretion is viewed as the major source of corruption and inefficiency. It is important to define the scope of civil servants' responsibilities for performing particular functions in order to limit their decision-making authority and avoid arbitrary administrative behavior.

By contrast, as the official publications demonstrate, the identity of the American civil servant, often referred to as the "public manager," is structured around discretionary characteristics (rather than the characteristics related to routinized compliance with rules and regulations) that are perceived as having a positive effect on achieving results and satisfying customer needs. Rules and regulations need to be cut and hierarchical ties loosened. Employees are expected to become results- and customer-oriented, and exercise broad discretion. They also need to be empowered. Within this context, American civil servant is portrayed as a decision-maker exercising entrepreneurial leadership.

Fourth, certain divergent ideological orientations are evident at the level of the relationship between government and the public. While in the U.S. case the relationship between government and the public is structured along the lines of "service provider" – "customers," in Russia the relationship is between the "service provider" and "clients," "recipients," "users" or "applicants for public services." Interestingly, one of the NPM/Reinventing Government keywords – "customer" – is not part of Russian official vocabulary. In new Russian context, an individual may be viewed from two perspectives: as a relatively passive consumer of existing

services provided by the government or as the one who can request the government to deliver a service to him/her. In both cases, individuals appear to play a dependent role.

The vision of citizens as applicants for public services, demonstrates an argument diametrically opposite to the idea expressed by one of the American interviewees: "They [citizens] don't come to government and ask them for the service; government has the responsibility to give it to them" (Christopher Mihm, personal communication, September 10, 2010). The power is concentrated in the hands of government that decides on the provision of services, while the notions of clients/users/recipients/applicants seem fairly distant from that of customers who have multiple choices for the same item.

In addition, the questions related to clarity and readability of a number of official publications are still relevant for Russian citizens because of the texts' format, syntactic and lexical complexity, and technical jargon. This leads to an argument that it is not necessarily the citizens who are the primary audience of official publications. Unlike in the United States, in Russia there is an impression that certain official documents talk at people, not with people. Persuasion is mainly achieved through official statements of facts and numbers, as well as the appeal to traditionally shared ways of apprehending the world. These questions highlight the issue of ideological inconsistency in attitudes towards the very notion of citizen-oriented government, which first and foremost needs to reduce the distance between government and the public.

Reflections

As this study shows, new ideologies of administration in the United States and Russia demonstrate both commonalities and differences. It appears that the biggest difference between the two cases lies in Russia's effort to reconcile selected NPM components with classic Weberian ideas. On the one hand, Russia has embarked on the path of building a strong law-based state, where bureaucracy is expected to operate within an elaborate framework of rules and regulations. On the other hand, following NPM prescriptions, the vision of government as a compact, efficient, customer-oriented service provider has not been foreign to Russian decision-makers.

The research shows that despite important commonalities in new ideologies of administration, Russian political and bureaucratic actors are not fully supportive of joining the club of the "core NPM group," which includes the United States, while the group of the "Continental European modernizers," represented by such countries as Belgium, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Italy, Sweden, and Germany (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004) might be more appealing. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004), describe these countries as the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) countries, which "continue to place greater emphasis on the state as *the* irreplaceable integrative force in society, with a legal personality and operative value system that cannot be reduced to the private sector discourse of efficiency, competitiveness, and consumer satisfaction" (p. 98).

Russia, however, has never been a Weberian state. For decades, formal rules and regulations, as well as the principle of political neutrality, provided little to no guidance to Russian civil servants. In the late nineteenth – early twentieth century, while the United States demonstrates the ideological shift away from the traditional Weberian model of public

145

bureaucracy, post-Soviet Russia accepts it as the model for which to strive. This model is complemented by particular NPM concepts and ideas that have become part of the new Russian ideology of administration.

In general, it appears that Russian ideology of administration is not in contrast with the American version of administrative ideology, but rather is inclusive of a broad range of ideas from the NPM and Weberian models, which might seem contradictory. The contradiction becomes even more intense if the external factors or the context are taken into consideration – as mentioned earlier in this study – formal rules and regulations historically played a "decorative role" in Russia (Jakobson, 2001). This creates significant ambiguity and raises questions about the "purity of intent" of Russian key political and bureaucratic actors to make the real change in the way the government works.

In Russia, the general view is that a number of classic Weberian principles are of particular importance in the country struggling with the problems of inefficiency and corruption in government. In the United States, the Progressive Era's "assault on corruption" (Cigler, 1990) helped to solve one of the problems the present-day Russia faces (that of corruption), while the quest for efficiency and effectiveness does not seem to end. This supports and reinforces Michael Urban's conclusion that rationality may be considered as the gravitational center of administrative ideology in the two countries. Government organizations in the United States and post-Soviet Russia have the same ideal – efficiency and effectiveness.

Another important example that demonstrates a significant degree of continuity of Urban's findings about "old" American and Russian administrative ideologies is related to "the nature of the link between population and government" (Urban, 1982). The new vision of the relationship between government and the public is built around "new" ideas of providing

146

services to customers or clients. This relationship is unquestionably significant because it helps to increase public awareness of available services and gives voice to individuals or citizen groups willing to contribute to service improvement. It is especially significant for post-Soviet Russia, which realized the importance of shifting the role of government "from governor of the people to servant of its citizens" (Rice, 2006).

These important aspects, however, do not really change the "nature" of this relationship. It is still a big question if the two countries are willing to accept and encourage the role of truly democratic processes, where the citizens' role is not limited to voting, awareness, and consultation at the intermediate stage of the policy-making process. As the Russian case indicates (supporting Urban's argument), although recognizing the importance of a constructive dialogue with citizens, practitioners continue to view citizen engagement as a problem that is primarily linked with efficiency considerations. There is also a shared belief that citizens do not really want to become active participants and are unable to contribute meaningfully to policy-making because they lack expert knowledge in the Russian case.

Finally, the results of this study indicate a pattern of convergence in basic American and Russian ideas, but divergence in some of the important arguments and ideals used to support these ideas, demonstrates a complexity underneath the propositions guiding this study. Whipped by the wind of change brought by the "public management for all seasons," the two countries are driving in the same direction shaped by the ideational systems of the key political actors. The routes they have chosen, however, are quite different and only time can tell where these routes will further converge and diverge.

References

Aberbach, J. D. (2001). The United States federal government and new public management: How good a fit? *Public Policy and Administration, 16*, 4-23.

Aberbach, J. D. & Rockman, B. A. (2000). *In the web of politics: Three decades of the U.S. Federal Executive*: Brookings Institution Press.

Appleby, P. H. (1953). Government is different. In D. Waldo (Ed.), *Ideas and issues in public administration*. New York: Greenwood.

Arnold, P. E. (1995). Reform's changing role. *Public Administration Review*, 55(5), 407-417.

Aya, R. (1979). Theories of revolution reconsidered: Contrasting models of collective violence. *Theory and Society*, *8(1)*, 39-99.

Barabashev, A., & Klimenko, A. (2010). Retrospektivnyi analiz osnovnyh napravleniy modernizacii sistemy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya I gosudarstvennoi sluzhby [Retrospective analysis of the main directions for modernizing the system of public administration and public service]. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i municipal'nogo upravleniya, 3,* 36-73.

Barabashev, A. & Straussman, J. D. (2007). Public service reform in Russia. *Public Administration Review, 67*(3), 373-382.

Barrett, M., Oborn, E., Komporozos-Athanasiou, A., & Chan, Y. (2010). Policy development and service innovation: An ideological discourse analysis. Retrieved from http://wiki.uiowa.edu/download/attachments/42023349/Barrett_Oborn_Health_Policy_Conference_paper.pdf

Barzelay, M. *Breaking through bureaucracy: A new vision for managing government*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Battistelli, F. & Ricotta, G. The rhetoric of management control in Italian cities: Constructing new meanings of public action. *Administration & Society, 36*(6), 661-688.

Beissinger, M. R. (1988). *Scientific management, socialist discipline and Soviet power*: I. B. Tauris.

Box, R. C., Marshall, G. S. Reed, and Reed, C. M. (2001). New public management and substantive democracy. *Public Administration Review 61*(5), 608-619.

Box, R. C. (2009). *Public administration and society: Critical issues in American governance*. Second Edition. M. E. Sharpe.

Boykov, V. (1996). Gosudarstnennye sluzhaschie: shrihi kollektivnogo portreta. [Civil servants: The strokes of a collective portrait], *Sotsis*, *6*.

Bremner, C. (1995). Picturing contemporary management. In S. Rees & R. Gordon (eds). *The human costs of managerialism: Advocating the recovery of humanity*, Leichardt: Pluto Press Australia Limited.

Brodkin, E. Z. (2006). Bureaucracy redux: Management reformism and the welfare state. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 17*, 1–17.

Bouckaert, G. (2007). Cultural characteristics from public management reforms worldwide. In K. Schedler & I. Proeller (Eds.), *Cultural aspects of public management reform: Research in public policy analysis and management, 16* (pp. 29-64): Elsevier.

Brudney, J. L. & Wright, D. S. (2002). Revisiting administrative reform in the American states: The status of reinventing government during the 1990s. *Public Administration Review, 62*(3), 353-361.

Burns, J. M. (1956). *Roosevelt: The lion and the fox*: New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Burns, J. M. (1999). *Dead center: Clinton-Gore leadership and the perils of moderation*. Simon and Schuster.

Burton, F., Carlen, P. (1979). *Official discourse: On discourse analysis, government publications, ideology and the state*: Routledge.

Caiden, G. E. (2007). *Administrative reform*: Aldine.

Carmel, E. (1999). Concepts, context and discourse in a comparative case study. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology 2*(2): 141-150.

Carroll, J. D. (1995). The rhetoric of reform and political reality in the National Performance Review. *Public Administration Review*, *55*(3), 302-312.

Carroll, J. D. (1996). Editor's introduction to reinventing public administration. *Public Administration Review, 56*(3), 245-247.

Cavanagh, J. J., & Livingston, D. J. (1997). Serving the American public: Best practices in customer-driven strategic planning. Benchmarking Study Report, National Performance Review.

Christensen, T. (2006). Smart Policy?, In Moran, M. et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. (pp. 448-468). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Christensen, T. (2011). *The Ashgate research companion to New Public Management*. Ashgate Publishing.

Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2001). *New public management: The transformation of ideas and practice*. Ashgate.

Christensen, T & Laegreid, P. (2002). New public management: Puzzles of democracy and the influence of citizens. *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 10*(3), 267-295.

Cigler, B. A. (1990). Public administration and the paradox of professionalization. *Public Administration Review, 50,* 637-653.

Clinton, W. J. (1993a). First Inaugural Address. Retrieved from http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres64.html.

Clinton, W. J. (1993b). Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies. Subject: streamlining the bureaucracy. Presidential memorandum. 09-11-93.

Clinton, W. (1993c). Executive order #12862: Setting customer service standards. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. (2005). *My life*. Random House.

Clinton, W. J. (1995). *Improving customer service*. Presidential memorandum, March 23, White House Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC.

Clinton, W. J. (1998). Plain Language in government writing. Presidential memorandum, June 1, White House Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC.

Clinton, W. J. (1998). Conducting "Conversations with America" to further improve customer service. Presidential directive. White House Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC.

Clinton, W. J. (1999). White House memorandum on electronic government. White House Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC.

Clinton, W. J., & Gore, A. (1992). *Putting people first: How we can all change America*. Crown Publishing Group.

Clinton, W. J. & Gore, A. (1995). *Putting customers first '95. Standards for serving the American people, National Performance Review*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. & Gore, A. (1997a). *The Blair House Papers. The National Performance Review*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. & Gore, A. (1997b). *Putting customers First '97. Standards for serving the American people, National Performance Review*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Clinton, W. J. (1998). The President's Memorandum on Plain Language in Government. Retrieved from http://www.plainlanguage.gov/whatisPL/govmandates/memo.cfm.

Collier, D. (1993). The comparative method. In A. W. Finifter (Ed.), *Political science: The state of the discipline* (Vol. 2, pp. 105-119). Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

DeFelice, G. E. (1980). Comparison misconceived: Common nonsense in comparative politics. *Comparative Politics, 13*(1), 119-126.

Denhardt, R. B. & Baker, D. L. (2006). Five great issues in organization theory. In J. Rabin, W. B. Hildreth, & G. J. Miller (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Administration*. Edition 3. (pp. 121-149). Taylor&Francis, Inc.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. (2000). The new public management: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review, 60*(6), 549–559.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48,* 147-160.

Dimock, M. E. (1960). Management in the USSR - comparisons to the United States *Public Administration Review, 20*(3), 139-147.

Dobrolyubova, Y., Evans, G, Manning N., Parison, N., & Shirokova, Y. (2005). Increasing Government Effectiveness: Approaches to Administrative Reform in the Russian Federation. Moscow: World Bank. Retrieved from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2006/05/17/000160016_20060517151847/Rendered/PDF/361420ENGLISH01fectiveness01PUBLIC1.pdf.

Dunn, W. N. & Miller, D. Y. (2007). A critique of the New Public Management and the Neo-Weberian State: Advancing a critical theory of administrative reform. *Public Organization Review, 7*, 345–358.

Edwards, C., Jones, G., Lawton, A., & Llewellyn, N. (2002). Public entrepreneurship: Rhetoric, reality, and context. *International Journal of Public Administration, 25*(12), 1539-1554.

Fainsod, M. (1949). Recent developments in Soviet public administration. *The Journal of Politics, 11*(4), 679-714.

Fainsod, M. (1963). *How Russia is ruled*. Harvard University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993a). *Discourse and social change*. Wiley,John & Sons.

Fairclough, N. (1993b). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 133-168.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. Volume 2. (pp. 258-285). SAGE.

Farmer, D. J. (1995). *The language of public administration: Bureaucracy, modernity and postmodernity*. University of Alabama Press.

Federal Bill No. 254940-5. Ob obschih principah organizacii predostavleniya gosudarstvennyh (municipal'nyh) uslug I ispolneniya gosudarstvennyh (municipal'nyh) funkciy. [On general principles of provision of state (municipal) services and performance of state (municipal) functions]. 11-24-2010.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (ed.) *Untying the text*. London, Routledge.

Fountain, J. E. (2001). Paradoxes of public sector customer service. Governance, 14(1), 55-73.

Fox, W. & Meyer, I. (1995). *Public administration dictionary*: Juta & Company.

Frederickson, H. G. (1996). Comparing the reinventing government movement with the new public administration. *Public Administration Review,56*(3), 263-270.

Fry, B. R. (1989). *Mastering public administration*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Gasper, D. & Apthorpe, R. (1996). Introduction: Discourse analysis and policy discourse. *European Journal of Development Research*, 8(1), 1-15.

Gaman-Golutvina, O. (2008). The changing role of the state and state bureaucracy in the context of public administration reforms: Russian and foreign experiences. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics, 24*(1), 37-53.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*: Anchor.

Goodsell, C. T. (1993). Did NPR reinvent government reform? *Public Manager, 22*, 7-10.

Gore, A. (1993). *From red-tape to results: Creating a government that works better and costs less: Report of the National Performance Review*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gore, A. (1995a). *Common sense government: Works better and costs less*: Random House Publishing Group.

Gore, A. (1995b). *Putting customers first: Serving the American public: Best practices in telephone service*. National Performance Review, Federal Consortium Benchmark Study Report.

Gore, A. (1996a). *A report to President Bill Clinton: The best kept secrets in government*. National Performance Review, Washington DC: Vice President Al Gore.

Gore, A. (1996b). *Serving the American public: Best practices in resolving customer complaints*. National Performance Review, Federal Consortium Benchmark Study Report.

Gore, A. (1997a). *Businesslike government: Lessons learned from America's best companies*. Washington, D.C.: National Performance Review.

Gore, A. (1997b). *Access America: Reengineering through information technology*. Washington, D.C. National Performance Review.

Gore, A. (1998). *Common sense government: Works better and costs less*: DIANE Publishing.

Gulick, L. (1937). Notes on the theory of organization. In L. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the science of administration*. Institute of Public Administration, New York.

Haque, S. (2001). The diminishing publicness of public service under the current mode of governance. *Public Administration Review, 61*(1), 65-78.

Haque, S. (2007). Revisiting the new Public Management. *Public Administration Review, 67* (1), 179-182.

Hardy, C., Harley, B., Phillips, N. Discourse analysis and content analysis: Two solitudes? *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods 2*(1), 19-22.

Hargrove, E. C. & Nelson, M. (1984). *Presidents, politics, and policy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Herrera, Y. M. & Braumoeller, B. F. (2004). Symposium: Discourse and content analysis. *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods 2*(1), 15-19.

Higher School of Economics. (2002). Organy ispolnitel'noy vlasti: Funkcii, tipy, ekonomicheskiy mechanism. [Executive branch: Functions, Types, Economic Mechanism]. Moscow: Higher School of Economics.

Higher School of Economics. (2004). Metodicheskie rekomendacii po sozdaniyu reestrov gosudarstvennyh uslug I razrabotke standartov gosudarstnennyh uslug. [Methodological recommendations on the development of registers of government services and standards of government services]. Moscow: Higher School of Economics.

Holzer, M. & Illiash, I. (2009). Russian bureaucracy as an alternative model of leadership. In J. A. Raffel, P. Leisink, & A. E. Middlebrooks (Eds.), *Public sector leadership: International challenges and perspectives*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hood, C. (1989). Public administration and public policy: Intellectual challenges for the 1990s. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *48*(4), 346-358.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration 69*(1), 3-19.

Hood, C. (1995). Emerging issues in public administration. *Public Administration, 73*(1), 165-183.

Hood, C. (2000). *The art of the state: Culture, rhetoric, and public management*: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, O. E. (1998). *Public management and administration: An introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hyde, A., Lohan, M, & McDonnell, O. (2004). *Sociology for health professionals in Ireland*: Institute of Public Administration.

Jakobson, L. (2001). Public management in Russia: Changes and inertia, *International Public Management Journal, 4*(1), 27-48.

Jakobson, L. (2005). Reforma gosudarstvennoy sluzhby: zamysly, interesy I prioritety. [Public service reform: Ideas, interests, and priorities]. *Upravlencheskoe konsul'tirovanie, 4,* 8-31.

Jenssen, S. (2001). Transforming politics: towards new or lesser roles for democratic institutions. In T. Christensen and P. Laegreid (Eds.), *New public management: The transformation of ideas and practice* (pp. 289-300). Ashgate.

Jones, L. R. & Kettl, D. F. (2003). Assessing public management reform strategy. *International Public Management Review, 4*(1), 1-19.

Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*: SAGE.

Jreisat, J. E. (2002). *Comparative public administration*: Westview Press.

Kamensky, J. M. (1996). Role of the "Reinventing Government" movement in Federal management reform. *Public Administration Review, 56*(3), 247-255.

Kamensky, J. M. (April 6, 1997). The U.S. reform experience: The National Performance Review. Presentation Notes, Plenary Session. Conference on Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspectives. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. Retrieved from http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/papers/bkgrd/kamensky.html.

Kamensky, J. M. (1999). National Partnership for Reinventing Government (formerly the National Performance Review): A brief history. Retrieved from http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/whoweare/history2.html

Kapoguzov, E. A. (2007). Predposylki i klyuchevye kharakteristiki reformy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya v zarubezhnyh stranah [Preconditions and key characteristics public administration reform in foreign countries]. *Ekonomicheskiy Vestnik Rostovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 5*(4), 31-37.

Kellough, J. E. (1998). The Reinventing Government movement: A review and critique. *Public Administration Quarterly, 22*(1), 6-20.

Kelman, S. (2005). *Unleashing change: A study of organizational transformation in Government*. The Brookings Institution Press.

Kettl, D. F. (1994). Beyond the rhetoric of reinvention: Driving themes of the Clinton administration's management reforms. *Governance, 7*(3), 307-314.

Kettl, D. F. (1997). The global revolution in public management: Driving themes, missing links. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 16*(3), 446-462.

Kettl, D. F. (1998). *Reinventing government: A fifth year report card*: Brookings Institution Press.

Kettl, D. F. (1999). Global reinvention: Basic issues, questions ahead. Background paper for Vice President Gore's Global Forum on Reinventing Government, 14-15 January. Washington, DC: State Department. Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/papers/1999/0114governance_kettl.aspx.

Kettl, D. F. (2005a). Reforming the executive branch of the U.S. Government. In J. D. Aberbach and M. A. Peterson (Eds.), *The executive branch* (pp. 344-378). Oxford University Press.

Kettl, D.F. (2005b). *The global public management revolution*. The Brookings Institution.

Kettl, D. F. & DiIulio, J. J. (1995). *Inside the reinvention machine: Appraising governmental reform*: Brookings Institution Press.

Khademian, A.M. (1998). Review: What do we want public managers to be? Comparing reforms. [Review of the books The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective and Public Management: The New Zealand Model]. *Public Administration Review, 58*(3), 269-273.

Kickert, W. J. M. (1996, July). Public management in the United States and Europe. Paper prepared for the conference on the New Public Management in International Perspective, Institute of Public Finance and Fiscal Law, St Gallen, Switzerland.

Klimenko, A. V. (2005). Mehanizmy novogo gosudarstvennogo upravleniya I modernizirovannoy byurokratii v koncepcii administrativnoy reformy. [Mechanisms of the New Public Management and modernized bureaucracy in the concept of administrative reform]. Retrieved from http://www.law.edu.ru/doc/document.asp?docID=1223342.

Kotchegura, A. (2002). Administrative reform: Problems and prospects of transformation of the Russian state administration. Policy paper, Russian European Centre for Economic Policy, Moscow: RECEP.

Kotchegura, A. (2008). *Civil service reform in post-communist countries*: Amsterdam University Press.

Kramer, F. A. (1975). Policy analysis as ideology. Public Administration Review, 35(5), 509-517.

Krasilnikov, D. & Troickaya, E. (2009). Novyi gosudarstvennyi menedgment I administrativnaya reforma v Permskom krae. *Ars Administrandi, 1,* 74–84.

Kurennoy, V. (2004). V poiskah dostoinstv: Smysl I logika administrativnoi reform. [In search for advantages: The essence and logics of administrative reform]. *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, 2(16), 1-18.

Kuzminov, Y. (2006). Tupiki i perspektivy administrativnoy reform. [Dead-ends and perspectives of administrative reform]. Retrieved from http://www.srvl.nasledie.ru/wind.php?ID=295639

Kuznetsov, Y. (2004). Nekommercheskoe gosudarstvo. [The non-profit state]. *Otechestvennye Zapiski, 2*(16). Retrieved from http://www.strana-oz.ru/2004/2/nekommercheskoe-gosudarstvo

Lenin, V. I. (1905). The advice of the conservative bourgeoisie. Retrieved from http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/jun/03.htm.

Liegl, B. (2001). New public management from a theoretical and Austrian perspective. In B. G. Peters and J. Pierre (Eds.), *Politicians, bureaucrats and administrative reform*. (pp. 69-78). Routledge.

Light, P. (1998). *The tides of reform: Making government work, 1945-1995*: Yale University Press.

Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative politics and the comparative method. *The American Political Science Review, 65*(3), 682-693.

Logunov, A. B. (2006). Administrativnaya reforma v Rossiayskoy Federatsii: Osnovnye etapy realizatsii. [Administrative reform in the Russian Federation: Main stages of implementation]. *Analiticheskiy Vestnik 22*(310).

Lutjens, S. L. (2001). State administration in socialist Cuba: Power and performance in A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Handbook of comparative and development administration*. Volume 94. (pp. 617-631). Taylor & Francis.

Luton, L. S. (2004). The relevance of U.S. public administration theory for Russian public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 26*(2), 213-232.

Lynn, L. E. (2001). Globalization and administrative reform: What is happening in theory? *Public Management Review, 3*(2), 191–208.

Lynn, L. E. (2006). New public management comes to America. Harris School Working Paper prepared for resentation at the International Conference on Public Management in North America, El Colegio de Mexico, Mexico City, October 27-28, 2005.

Mandel, W. (1944). Democratic aspects of Soviet government today. *American Sociological Review, 9*(3), 257-266.

Manning, N. & Parison, N. (2001). Modernization of the federal civil service: Methodology for functional reviews. Paper produced for the Russian Federation Government. Retrieved from http://www.allamreform.hu/letoltheto/kozfeladatok/kulfoldi/func_reviews_eng.pdf.

Manning, N. & Parison, N. (2004). International public administration reform: Implications for the Russian Federation, Washington DC, World Bank.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*: Simon & Schuster Adult Publishing Group.

Marston, G. (2004). *Social policy and discourse analysis*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

Mashaw, J. L. (1996). Reinventing Government and regulatory reform: Studies in the neglect and abuse of administrative law. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 57*, 405-441.

McCann, S. (2008). *A pinnacle of feeling: American literature and presidential government*. Princeton University Press.

McGuire, L. (2001). Service charters – global convergence or national divergence? A comparison of initiatives in Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States. *Public Management Review, 3*(4), 493-524.

McKenna, C. D. (2006). *The world's newest profession: Management consulting in the twentieth century*. Cambridge University Press.

Merkle, J. A. (1980). *Management and ideology: The legacy of the international scientific management movement*: University of California Press.

Milliken, J. (1999). The study of discourse in international relations: A critique of research and methods. *European Journal of International Relations, 5*(2): 225-254.

Moe, R. C. (1994). The "Reinventing Government" exercise: Misinterpreting the problem, misjudging the consequences. *Public Administration Review, 54*(2), 111-122.

Montgomery, J. D. (1967). "Sources of Bureaucratic Reform: Problems of Power, Purpose and Politics", Bloomington, Indiana, Comparative Administrative Group Occasional Paper.

Mosher, F. C. (1968). *Democracy and the public service*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moynihan, D. D. (2006). Ambiguity in policy lessons: The agencification experience. *Public Administration*, *84*(4), 1029–1050.

Munck, R. (2000). *Marx@2000: late Marxist perspectives*. London: Macmillan.

Naryshkin, S. (2007). Administrativnaya reforma: pervye shagi I perspektivy. [Administrative reform: First steps and perspectives]. *Voprosy gosudarstvennogo I municipalnogo upravleniya, 1*.

Nozdrachev, A. F. (2005). Administrativnaya reforma: rossiyskiy variant. [Administrative reform: The Russian version]. *Zakonodatel'stvo I ekonomika, 8*.

Obolonsky, A. V. (1999). The modern Russian administration in the time of transition: new challenges versus old nomenclature legacy. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 65,* 569-577.

Okunkov, L. A. (2001). The President and the Government. *Journal of Russian Law*. Retrieved from http://www.juristlib.ru/book_2581.html.

Olsen, J. P. (2004). Citizens, public administration and the search for theoretical foundations.*PS: Political Science & Politics, 1*, 69-79.

Olsen J. P. (2008). The ups and downs of bureaucratic organization. *Annual Review of Political Science 11*, 13–37.

Ongaro, E. (2010). Public management reform and modernization: Trajectories of administrative change in Italy, France, Greece, Portugal and Spain. London: Edward Elgar.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2006). *OECD Economic Surveys*: *Russian Federation*. OECD Publishing.

Osborn, A. (2010). Vladimir Putin's obsession with Roosevelt is more than a little sinister. Retrieved from http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/andrewosborn/100053126/vladimir-putin%E2%80%99s-obsession-with-roosevelt-is-more-than-a-little-sinister/.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Osborne, D. (2007). Reinventing government: What a difference a strategy makes. Paper presented at the 7h Global Forum on Reinventing Government: Building Trust in Government, 26-29 June 2007, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan025253.pdf.

Ospina, S. M., Dodge, J. (2005). It's about time: Catching method up to meaning – The usefulness of narrative inquiry in public administration research. *Public Administration Review, 65*(2), 143-157.

Otenyo , E. E. & Lind, N. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Comparative public administration: The essential readings*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Panov A, & Filipovich, L. (2004). Administrativnyi reglament: kakim byt' novomu zakonoproektu? [Administrative standing order: What should the new bill be?]. *Chinovnik, 3,* 22-31.

Panova M. N. (2006). Yazyk gosudarstvennogo upravleniya i "slovar' vremeni." [The language of public administration and the "time dictionary"]. *Russkaya Rech', 5*, 58-67.

Peters, B. G. (2008). *Mixes, matches, and mistakes: New public management in Russia and the former Soviet republics*. Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative.

Peters, B. G. (2011). Steering, rowing, drifting, or sinking? Changing patterns of governance. *Urban Research & Practice, 4*(1), 5-12.

Peters, B. G. & Pierre, J. (2000). Citizens versus the new public manager: The problem of mutual empowerment. *Administration & Society, 32*(1), 9-28.

Peters, B. G. & Savoie, D. J. (1994). Civil service reform: Misdiagnosing the patient. *Public Administration Review, 54*(5), 418-425.

Peters, B. G. (1994). Theory and methodology in the study of comparative public administration. In R. Baker (Ed.), *Comparative public management: Putting U.S. public policy and implementation in context* (pp. 67-91): Greenwood Publishing Group.

Peters, B. G. (2001) *The Future of Governing* (2nd ed.). Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Peters, B. G. (2001). From change to change: Patterns of continuing administrative reform in Europe. *Public Organization Review, 1*, 41-54.

Peters, B. G. (2009). Still the century of bureaucracy?: The roles of public servants. *Viešoji politikair administravimas*, *30*, 7‑22.

Pierre, J. (1995). The marketization of the state: Citizens, consumers, and the emergence of the public market. In B. G. Peters and D. J. Savoie (Eds.), *Governance in a changing environment* (pp. 55-82). Canadian Centre for Management Development

Pierre, J. (1998). Public consultation and citizen participation: Dilemmas of policy advice. In B. G. Peters and D. J. Savoie (Eds.). *Taking stock: Assessing public sector reforms* (pp. 137-163). Canadian Centre for Management Development.

Pollitt, C. (2001). Convergence: The Useful Myth? *Public Administration, 79*, 933–947.

Pollitt, C. (2004, November). *From there to here, from now till then: buying and borrowing public management reforms*. Paper presented at the IX Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C. (2005). Decentralization: A central concept in contemporary public management. In E. Ferlie, C., Lynn, L. E., & Pollitt, C. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public management* (pp. 371-397): Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C. (2007). Convergence or divergence: What has been happening in Europe? In C. Pollitt, S. van Thiel, & V. Homburg (Eds.), *The New Public Management in Europe: Adaptation and alternatives* (pp. 10-25): Palgrave Macmillan.

Pollitt, C., van Thiel, S., & Homburg, V. (2007). *The New Public Management in Europe: Adaptation and alternatives*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis* (2 ed.): Oxford University Press.

Popova, A. V. (2007). O prioritetnyh napravleniyah deyatel'nosti Pravitel'stvennoy komissii po provedeniyu administrativnoy reform v 2008 godu. [Priorities of the Government Commission on Administrative Reform in 2008]. Retrieved from http://www.smb.ru/analitics.html?id=td_Popovoy.

President's Committee on Administrative Management. (1937). *Report of the Committee: With studies of administrative management in the Federal Government. Part I, "Report of the President's Committee"*. Washington, D.C.

Przeworski, A. & Teune, H. (1970). The logic of comparative social inquiry. New York: John Wiley.

Public Law 103-62. Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Aug.3, 1993.

Purvis, T. & Hunt, A. Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology … *The British Journal of Sociology 44*(3), 473-499.

Putin, V. V. (1999). Rossiya na rubezhe tysyacheletiy. [Russia at the Turn of the Millenium]. Retrieved from http://www.panorama.ru/works/putin/programm.html.

Putin, V. V. (2002). Annual Address to the Federal Assembly. Retrieved from http://www.intelros.ru/2007/02/05/poslanie_prezidenta_rossii_vladimira_putina_federaln omu_sobraniju_rf_2002_god.html.

Putin, V. V. (2003). Annual Address to the Federal Assembly. Retrieved from http://www.intelros.ru/2007/02/05/poslanie_prezidenta_rossii_vladimira_putina_federaln omu_sobraniju_rf_2003_god.html.

Putin, V. V. (2005). Annual Address to the Federal Assembly. Retrieved from http://www.intelros.ru/2007/02/05/poslanie_prezidenta_rossii_vladimira_putina_federaln omu_sobraniju_rf_2005_god.html.

Putin, V. V. (2006). Annual Address to the Federal Assembly. Retrieved from http://www.intelros.ru/2007/02/05/poslanie_prezidenta_rossii_vladimira_putina_federaln omu_sobraniju_rf_2006_god.html.

Radin, B. A. (1998). The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA): Hydra-headed monster or flexible management tool? *Public Administration Review, 58*(4), 307-316

Radin, B. (2006). *Challenging the performance movement: Accountability, complexity and democratic values*. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: SAGE.

Rees, E. A. (2004). Politics, administration and decision-making in the Soviet Union, 1917-1953. In E. V. Heyen (Ed.), *Administrative reforms in the Baltic Sea Region* (Vol. 16, pp. 259-290).

Richmond, Y. (2002). *From nyet to da: Understanding the Russians*: Intercultural Press.

Ridley, F. F. (1995). Civil service and democracy: Questions in reforming the civil service in eastern and central Europe. *Public Administration and Development, 15*(1), 11-20.

Riggs, F. W. (1991). Guest editorial: Public administration: A comparativist framework. *Public Administration Review*, 51(6), 473-477.

Riggs, F. W. (1963). Bureaucrats and political development: A paradoxical view. In J. La Palombara (Ed.), *Bureaucracy and political development*. (pp. 120-167). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rohr, J. A. (1986). *To run a Constitution: The legitimacy of the administrative state*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Rohr, J. A. (1989). *Ethics for bureaucrats: An essay on law and values*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Rose, G. L. (1997). *The American presidency under siege*. State University of New York Press.

Rosenbloom, D. H. (1993). Editorial: Have an administrative? Don't forget the politics. *Public Administration Review, 53*(6), 503-506.

Rosenbloom, D. H. (2001). History lessons for reinventors. *Public Administration Review, 61*(2), 161-165.

Rosenbloom, D. H., & O'Leary, R. (1996). *Public Administration and Law* (2 ed.). New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.

Rosenbloom, D. H., & Piotrowski, S. J. (2005). Outsourcing the Constitution and administrative law norms. *American Review of Public Administration, 35*(2), 103–121.

Rosenbloom, D. H., & Yaroni, A. (2001). The transferability of new public management reforms: Caveats from Israel. *Israel Affairs 7*(4), 81-100.

Ryavec, K. W. (2005). *Russian bureaucracy: Power and pathology*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. *(*2001*).* National, international and transnational constructions of New Public Management. *In* T. Christensen *and* P. Lægreid *(Eds.) New Public Management. The transformation of ideas and practice*. *(pp.* 43-72*).* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Saint-Martin, D. (2001). How the reinventing government movement in public administration was exported from the U.S. to other countries. *International Journal of Public Administration, 24*(6), 573-604.

Savoie, D. J. (2006). What is wrong with the New Public Management? In E. E. Otenyo and N. S. Lind (Eds.) *Comparative public administration: Research in public policy analysis and management* (pp. 593-602). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Sayre, W. S. (1958). The unhappy bureaucrats: Views ironic, hopeful, indignant. [Review of the books *Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration* by C. Northcote Parkinson, *Personality and Organization: The Conflict between System and the Individual* by Chris

Argyris, *The Organization Man* by William H. Whyte]. *Public Administration Review*, 18(3), 239-245

Schachter, H. L. (1995). Reinventing government or reinventing ourselves: Two models for improving government performance. *Public Administration Review, 55*(6), 530-537.

Schachter, H. L. (1997). *Reinventing government or reinventing ourselves: The role of citizen owners in making a better government*. State University of New York Press.

Shafritz, J. M. & Hyde, A. C. (2011). *Classics of public administration*. Cengage Learning.

Sharonov, A. V. (2007, March). *Ob itogah realizacii federal'nymi organami ispolnitel'noy vlasti I vysshimi ispolnitel'nymi organami gosudarstvennoy vlasti sub'ektov Rossiyskoy Federacii programm, planov I proektov v ramkah administrativnoy reform v 2006 godu.* [The results of implementing programs, plans, and projects by the federal and regional executive agencies in 2006]. Report presented at the Conference Administrative Reform in Russia: Results and Prospects for the Future. Retrieved from http://www.adm.yar.ru/a_center/admref/sbor/2007/140307/saron.pdf

Singh, N. (2006). *Making government work*. Mittal Publications.

Smith, G. E., & Huntsman, C. A. (1997). Refraining the metaphor of the citizen-government relationship: A value centered perspective. *Public Administration Review, 57*(4), 309-318.

Solomon, P. H. (2005). Vladimir Putin's quest for a strong state. *International Journal on World Peace, XXII*(2), 3-12.

Stewart, D. W., Sprinthall, N. A., & Kem, J. D. (2002). Moral reasoning in the context of reform: A study of Russian officials. *Public Administration Review, 62*(3), 282-297.

Stilwell, F. (1995). Reworking Australia. In S. Rees & R. Gordon (eds). *The human costs of managerialism: Advocating the recovery of humanity*, Leichardt: Pluto Press Australia Limited.

Stivers, C. (1999). Between public management and post-modernism: The future of public administration. Paper prepared for the 1999 National Conference of the American Society for Public Administration.

Stepashin, S. (2002, June). Report contributed to the 3rd session of the Council of State Financial Control, CIS, Tbilisi. Retrieved from http://viperson.ru/wind.php?ID=304312&soch=1.

Stone, B. (2003).*Confessions of a civil servant: lessons in changing America's government and military*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Suleiman, E. (2003). *Dismantling democratic states*: Princeton University Press.

Tereschenko, L. K. (2004). Uslugi: gosudarstvennye, publichnye, social'nye. [Services: government, public, social]. *Zhurnal rossiyskogo prava, 10*. Retrieved from http://www.adm.yar.ru/a_center/admref/napravlenie/standart/012.htm.

Terry L. D. (1998). Administrative leadership, neo-managerialism, and the public management movement. *Public Administration Review, 58*(3), 194-200.

Thompson, J. (1991). *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Stanford University Press.

Thompson, F. & Riccucci, N. (1998). Reinventing government. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1, 231-257.

Toonen, T. (2001). The comparative dimension of administrative reform: Creating open villages and redesigning the politics of administration. In Peters, B. G. and Pierre, J. (Eds.). *Politicians, bureaucrats and administrative reform* (pp. 177-193). Routledge.

Toonen, T. (2008). Promising wine in international bottle. [Review of the book *Public Management: Old and New*, by L. E. Lynn Jr]. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27(1), 222-225

Urban, M. (1982). *The ideology of administration: American and Soviet cases*: State University of New York.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and society, 4*(2), 249-283.

van Dijk, T. A. (1995a). Ideological discourse analysis. *New Courant, 4*, 135-161.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse and interaction in society. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 1-37). London: SAGE.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115-140.

Vann, J. L. (2004). Resistance to change and the language of public organizations: A look at ''clashing grammars'' in large-scale information technology projects. *Public Organization Review, 4*, 47–73.

Waldo, D. (1948). *The Administrative state: A study of the political theory of American public administration*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Wamsley, G. L., & Dudley, L. S. (1998). From reorganizing to reinventing: Sixty years and we still don't get it. *International Journal of Public Administration, 21*(2-4), 323-374.

Weber, M. (1991). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Weber, M. (1997). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Schuster Adult Publishing Group.

Weldes, J. (1999). *Constructing national interests. The United States and the Cuban missile crisis*. University of Minnesota Press.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*: Columbia University Press.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (2001). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*: The Open University Press.

White, L. D. (1926). *Introduction to the study of public administration*. New York: Macmillan.

Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly, 2*(2), 197-222.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*: SAGE.

World Bank. (2006). Russian Federation. Administrative and regulatory reform in Russia: Addressing potential sources of corruption. Poverty Reduction and Economic Management unit: Europe and Central Asia. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRUSSIANFEDERATION/Resources/anti-corruption_pn_9_26_06_eng.pdf.

Wright, V. (1994). Reshaping the state: The implications for public administration. *West European Politics, 17*(3), 102-137.

Appendix A: Key Interview Questions

- What do you see as the new ideas and directions that reformers established?

- What were the expected advantages of these ideas and directions over the ones offered under previous models (e.g., the bureaucratic model)?

- What could you say about the reform ideas from the perspective of distribution of power over important decisions in government? Did the reformers try to create a new scheme of power distribution in government?

- What efforts were made to generate buy-in among all parties effected by the change process? I am especially interested in learning more about such parties as government and the public.

- What was the role of the public in reforms?

- Much of reform rhetoric is built around the idea that it is the people who want change, smaller government, can no longer afford to pay more for less, etc. Could you comment on this?

- How did reformers see the role of public administrators and the public?

- Could you comment on the question of administrative discretion?

- How did reformers see the relationship between government and the public?

- How do you see the differences among the concepts of citizen, client, and customer?

- Could you comment on the following statement: NPR reports advocated 'increasing the role and voice of customers in the service delivery *(*but not the policy making process)"?

- Could you talk about the development of customer service standards/plans (in Russia: administrative regulations and standards)?

- What was the influence of international experiences on reforms?

- What was the influence of ideas from the private sector organizations and management literature on reform efforts?

- In the United States: what was the reasoning behind the decision to require executive departments and agencies to benchmark performance against the "best in business" in order to ensure high quality of customer service in government?

- What was the role of the President in shaping reforms?