

Public Management Forum

par

CARL W. STENBERG, *Editor*

SELECTING AND TRAINING PUBLIC MANAGERS: BUSINESS SKILLS VERSUS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Howard E. McCurdy, *The American University*

Government administration differs from all other administrative work to a degree not even faintly realized outside.¹

Paul Appleby

The doctrine that "government is different" has been mainstream public administration for thirty years, serving as a guide to the selection and training of public managers and suggesting that a background in public affairs—not business administration—is the best preparation for public management.

The business approach, as reflected in B-schools around the nation, tends to emphasize specific skills (such as accounting, finance, statistics, data processing, and management control) and a much more technical approach to administration than most P.A.'ers are comfortable with. P.A. schools, by contrast, have acquired a reputation for teaching attitudes—in particular, an awareness of the political process.²

The emphasis on P.A. training for public management received a symbolic boost by President Carter's recent decision to exclude business majors from his Presidential Management Intern Program. Carter apparently forgot that the "government is different" doctrine extends to performance on the job as well as selection, for he proposed as part of his civil service reform that productive public servants be rewarded, in business-like fashion, with increased pay. An employee of the National Park Service rose at a presidential town meeting to remind him:

Unlike much of private industry, the work of government can only rarely be evaluated on profit and loss statements, or in the products of an assembly line. Most of the career people . . . draw their principle rewards from highly intangible, albeit deeply felt, satisfactions of helping to try to make a difference in the quality of national life. . . . How will it be possible to borrow from private industry a rewards and bonus system that seems to basically be at odds with the concepts of public service?³

Although the doctrine has lots of support from the profession of public administration, it is under fire from other quarters. Efficiency advocates still yearn to make government more businesslike. A more serious challenge comes from the business administration profession itself, which has the audacity to suggest that business training better prepares a person, both intellectually and emotionally, for the management of government programs. One commentator, after comparing business and public administration education, concluded that the MBA is ahead of the MPA "on clout and acceptability" for jobs in the public service.⁴

What emerges is a picture of public management that is much more businesslike than . . . first imagined, and a wide range of activities where neither public nor business management approaches quite fit.

The most serious challenge, however, comes from within the government. Government operations have become big business, in the sense that many government programs either resemble business-type operations or are run like big corporations. As evidence, consider the fact that in fiscal year 1976 the federal government earned \$48.7 billion "through business type operations."⁵ As a point of comparison, the Exxon Corporation, America's richest corporation, reported earnings of \$52.6 billion that year.

What does this suggest to the personnel officer or public manager making hiring or training decisions, or the educator trying to decide how many business skills to emphasize

Howard E. McCurdy is a professor and director of public administration programs in the College of Public Affairs at the American University in Washington, D.C. He is the author of *Public Administration: A Synthesis*, a textbook on the field.

in a public administration program? Should they emphasize the skills of business management or accept the doctrine that "government is different"?

The answer, like the title to one famous practitioner's book, is that "it all depends." The factors upon which it depends, and the relative weight of business management in public administration, will be examined here in light of the size of government operations and the major activities being performed vis-a-vis corporate operations. What emerges is a picture of public management that is much more businesslike than I first imagined, and a wide range of activities where neither public nor business management approaches quite fit.

Is Government Different?

The argument that "government is different" is often based on comparisons of scale. Appleby pointed out that "in relation to the United States government even the very largest corporation is small and simple."⁶ He felt that largeness and complexity bred a need for public executives who possessed "a special competence in handling relationships among all the varied and powerful forces, activities, and elements in the country," and in part let this argument lead him to the conclusion that persons "with excellent records in private business will not necessarily make competent government officials."⁷

In the aggregate, the facts seem to confirm Appleby's impression. In 1976, the last year for which a complete set of figures was available, the public work force of the federal government (military plus civilian) numbered 4,965,000. The top fourteen private corporations in America did not directly employ as many people that year as did the federal government. If one also includes persons working on government contracts and state and local employees whose salaries are paid through federal grants, the true federal payroll swells to at least 8,300,000 individuals.⁸

Impressive as well are aggregate figures for state and local governments, where 12,169,000 persons work. California alone employed 1.33 million persons in 1976, while all governments in New York State employed 1.04 million. By comparison, the largest corporation in America—the telephone company—mustered 927,000 persons onto its payrolls that year.⁹

In the aggregate, such figures are impressive—but also misleading. If one breaks the government down into the units being managed, the aura of scale is partially dispelled.

Big government organizations, it turns out, are about the same size as big industrial corporations. (See Table I) The mammoth Department of Health, Education and Welfare—often cited as one of the most unmanageable federal institutions—would rank only nineteenth on a combined list of the largest federal and corporate employers, between Westinghouse Electric and the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company.

The largest state or local conglomerate—the California state system of higher education—employed in 1976 about 75,500 persons, about the same as the Caterpillar Tractor company of Peoria, Ill.

Table I
Combined Listing of U.S. Government
and Corporate Organizations
Number of Employees — 1976

1. <i>Department of Defense</i>	3,092,171
(<i>Department of the Army</i>)	(1,147,636)
(<i>Department of the Navy</i>)	(1,032,962)
2. American Telephone & Telegraph	927,200
(<i>Department of the Air Force</i>)	(838,103)
3. General Motors	748,000
4. <i>U.S. Postal Service</i>	675,653
5. Ford Motor Company	443,917
6. Sears, Roebuck	394,600
7. General Electric	380,000
8. International Telephone & Telegraph	375,000
9. I.B.M.	291,977
10. Chrysler	244,865
11. <i>Veterans Administration</i>	222,313
12. F.W. Woolworth	200,000
13. Mobil	199,500
14. General Telephone & Electronics	194,000
15. S.S. Kresge	191,000
16. J.C. Penny	183,661
17. U.S. Steel	166,645
18. Westinghouse Electric	160,945
19. <i>Department of Health, Education and Welfare</i>	155,096
20. Goodyear Tire & Rubber	151,263
21. Marcor	146,477
22. United Technologies	133,383
23. Safeway Stores	133,035
24. Dupont	132,737
25. <i>Department of Agriculture</i>	128,052
26. Eastman Kodak	127,000
27. Exxon	126,000
28. <i>Department of the Treasury</i>	125,600
29. Rockwell International	119,119
30. Union Carbide	113,118

Only the U.S. Department of Defense is significantly larger than the largest American corporation, the telephone company, although Ma Bell is larger than the Department of the Air Force, military personnel included.

Nor has this situation changed dramatically since 1939, when Appleby sat in the Department of Agriculture and formulated his theory. (See Table II) Despite all the talk about growth of big government, the actual standing of federal departments and agencies relative to business firms of similar size has not advanced. In fact, viewed from one perspective, the relative standing of the largest federal institutions has actually declined. Four of the six federal institutions on the 1939 list slipped to lower places, with one (the Department of the Interior) moving off altogether. Only two federal institutions moved up to take their place.

Table II
Combined Listing of U.S. Government
and Corporate Organizations
Number of Employees — 1939

1. <i>Department of the Post Office</i>	314,478
2. <i>Department of War</i>	300,043
3. <i>Department of the Navy</i>	230,427
4. General Motors	223,844
5. U.S. Steel	220,434
6. Standard Oil	134,000
7. Ford Motor Company	117,000
8. <i>Department of Agriculture</i>	108,045
9. Bethlehem Steel	95,029
10. General Electric	69,797
11. Armour & Company	69,000
12. <i>Department of the Treasury</i>	68,007
13. United Fruit	67,800
14. F.W. Woolworth	66,672
15. Swift & Company	60,000
16. Sears & Roebuck	57,029
17. Dupont	54,800
18. <i>Department of the Interior</i>	51,193
19. Westinghouse Electric	48,487
20. Goodyear Tire	47,000

The next ten organizations are business firms.

To the extent that problems of management can be traced to size, government institutions are not far removed from the situation in the business world.

The Business of Government

If scale is not a distinguishing characteristic, what about the tasks and activities performed within public agencies? Are they not substantially different than those performed in the private sector, encouraging a style of management different than business administration?¹⁰

Let us look at the facts. To begin with, 87 per cent of all federal personnel and the managers who manage them are employed in six federal institutions, which are analyzed below.¹¹ The remaining 13 per cent, if included in the analysis, would not significantly alter the conclusions that follow. Uniformed military personnel are included in the totals since they, like their civilian counterparts, also must be managed.

It is also possible to group 96 per cent of all state and local personnel into broad functional categories, based on data collected by the Bureau of the Census.

The facts are not too encouraging for those who insist that "government is different," especially at the national level. Fifty-nine per cent of the federal personnel whose agencies were examined, or 2.4 million employees, worked in operations that resembled private sector operations or were run as a business would be run. More than half of these were support personnel, both uniformed and civilian, employed to run the military bases, supply depots and

training facilities, staff the military hospitals and clinics, and operate the central repair depots or base maintenance shops.

One-fourth of these 2.4 million employees worked for the U.S. Postal Service which, at least since its reorganization in 1970, is supposed to be operating with business-like efficiency. Veterans hospitals and medical administration activities employed more persons than the entire direct payroll of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Other business functions in the federal government included activities such as the U.S. Mint and the 51,000 employees who run the defense department's highly sophisticated telephone and communications system.

Public administrators typically respond to such facts by pointing out political characteristics in the agencies involved, as if these characteristics set the management style. The Veterans Administration is a good example.

Textbooks on the politics of administration commonly cite the V.A. as a political agency since it deals with a specific, well organized clientele (veterans) to whom it distributes benefits.¹² Undoubtedly this affects the managerial skills needed by executives in the office of the administrator and the staff that contracts for construction projects. These activities, however, account for only 1.2 per cent of the total V.A. work force. Eighty-four per cent of the 222,000 V.A. employees work for V.A. hospitals, which are run more or less along the lines of private health care facilities. The next largest group of V.A. employees—20,529 persons—administer the agency's elaborate benefit system. The fact that they distribute benefits to veterans, who are organized into pressure groups, does not mean that the work of these V.A. employees is highly political.

In fact, the reverse is true. The V.A. benefit program is run through a centralized bureaucracy whose elaborate rules and regulations are designed precisely to reduce the opportunity for administrative discretion, group politics, and coalition building in an attempt to make the operation more business-like.

The veterans' benefit program (like the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service) is a nearly perfect model of the ideal bureaucratic state in which there is little discretion, little judgment, and less politics; in short, an operation where everything is worked out according to preestablished formulas, and the main job of the bulk of the employees is to inform the recipients about the formulas and make sure that agency rules are strictly adhered to.

A lot of public managers in the federal government, it would seem, spend time dealing with business management problems. Lest the reader still believe that the business of government is insignificant, I have drawn some comparisons between federal activities of a business nature and similar operations in the private sector.

- The federal government as a whole employs 506,000 blue-collar workers, which is 103,000 more than the total wage-hour employment at General Motors, America's largest industrial corporation. The defense department alone employs 331,000.¹³
- Federally created or sponsored lending institutions, if placed on the *Fortune* magazine 1976 list of private

commercial banking companies, would rank (by assets) as the fourth, fifth, sixth, and tenth largest banks in the United States.¹⁴

- The federal government manages four and one-half times more assets (in equipment, buildings, military hardware, land, case and receivables) than the telephone company. Federal assets in buildings, structures, and facilities alone exceed the total assets held by Ma Bell, \$92.5 to \$86.7 billion.¹⁵
- In 1976, more than \$113 billion was authorized to be paid to private citizens through federally administered retirement, unemployment, and health insurance funds (to say nothing of the money used to pay the pensions of retired federal personnel). America's largest private insurance company (the Prudential Corporation) paid out \$5.1 billion in benefits that year—a miniscule sum compared to the swelling federal insurance business.

The magnitude of business management activities is not as pronounced at the state and local level, for a number of reasons. First, proportionately fewer state and local employees work on activities classified as business-like. Second, the basic administrative units engaged in these activities are smaller than those at the federal level. Smaller does not automatically mean less business-like—the educational bureaucracy that runs the District of Columbia school system, for example, contains 4,000 employees, not counting teachers. Four thousand employees is enough to put an industry on the *Fortune* magazine list of America's 500 largest industrial corporations. Small is significant, however, if the average employee, even those working in a strictly bureaucratic or technical capacity, is placed closer to the center of policy making (such as a local school board) than a counterpart employee in a larger federal institution.

Activities at the state and local level in which the tendency toward business management seems most pronounced are grouped at the bottom of Table IV. These include public utilities, such as the electric company; functions commonly organized into public enterprises, such as airports and transit authorities; and activities such as garbage collection that are so susceptible to business management that they are often contracted out to private firms. These public businesses employ 584,000 persons. Highway departments, which are essentially engineering and construction operations, employ nearly again as many and public hospitals employ more than one million. Public colleges and universities, increasingly run along business lines in an era of shrinking enrollments, employ more than one million administrative personnel (compared to the 581,000 persons who do the teaching).

Altogether, these business-like functions employ 3,251,000 persons, which is one-third more than the number of persons grouped into federal business-like activities, but proportionately only 28 per cent of all state and local employees studied. If one is willing to include the 1.6 million persons who make up the educational bureaucracy for local schools, the percentage jumps to 42 per cent, still not a majority of state and local employees, but closer to the federal proportion.

What about the remaining functions, the ones for which the doctrine that “government is different” still holds? The political model of administration, which holds that public managers exercise policy discretion, build political support for their programs, and engage in group politics by building coalitions with interest groups and legislative committees, is most pronounced in the Group 1 activities on Tables III and IV.

Here one finds the top-level public executives, whose political and managerial responsibilities are often used as a model for training all public administrators. One also finds the public managers who administer the major grant-in-aid programs and who possess considerable policy discretion in approving state plans, enforcing federal guidelines, withholding funds, or deciding the distribution of federal grants—features that encourage these public managers to bargain with their clientele over federal policy.

Counterpart activities at the state and local level range from top-level political executives all the way down to street-level human welfare bureaucrats whose jobs require the sort of personal flexibility and sensitivity to human needs that the public approach to administration provides.

What is striking about these functions is the relatively small number of persons involved in them. The top-level executive corps in the federal bureaucracy, so often held up as an example of how politics infuses public management, constitutes only one-half of one per cent of the federal employees studied, and it is necessary to include all of their clerical help and support personnel to push the percentage that high. The entire class of Group 1 employees make up less than two per cent of the federal employees studied and only ten per cent of the state and local personnel.

The vast bulk of employees for which the “government is different” doctrine holds work on programs where the political model of public management does not quite fit. The approaches to management which guide these areas have tended to grow up around the function itself and the schools and professions that support it. Military combat operations are a fine example.

In general, the profession of public administration has not been terribly interested in the management of military operations, a bias reflected in the persistent attempt to omit military personnel from federal employment figures. More attention has been lavished by the profession of public administration on single domestic programs, such as the War on Poverty, than on the whole 1.1 million uniformed and civilian personnel who work at military combat activities in the nuclear age. There is no direct counterpart to military combat activities in the business world, and the management of combat functions is certainly “different,” yet one cannot say that the political awareness approach pushed by public administration is a primary qualification for management here.

Public administration has left military management to the military professions and their own colleges and faculty, such as the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The same can be said for other twilight zone operations:

- Regulation, where public management is still dominated by lawyers;

Table III
Distribution of Selected Federal Personnel
1976
(thousands)

Group 1: Activities in which the tendencies toward political styles of management are most pronounced				Group 5: Law Enforcement and Military Combat			
Public Health Grant Programs	19.7			U.S. Customs	15.1		
Education Grant Programs	4.0			Secret Service	3.5		
Social Welfare Grant Programs	8.5			Other Treasury Programs	4.7		
Agricultural Crop Subsidy & Food Programs	5.4			Strategic Military Forces	115.7		
Military Foreign Assistance Programs	5.1			General Purpose Military Forces	995.1	1134.1	
Agricultural Grant Programs	.5			Group 6: Taxation and Income Redistribution			
Departmental Management	22.2	65.4		Social Security Administration	87.7		
Group 2: Regulation				Veterans Benefit Programs	20.5		
Food and Drug Administration	7.2			Internal Revenue Service	85.9	194.1	
Plant, Animal, & Stockyards Inspection	16.4			Group 7: Activities in which the tendencies toward business management are most pronounced			
Agricultural Marketing Service	5.1			Postal Service	675.7		
Comptroller of the Currency	3.0	31.7		V.A. Hospitals and Medical Services	186.9		
Group 3: Rural Development and Public Lands				Military Base Support Operations	503.8		
Soil Conservation Service	16.5			General Defense Support Activities	953.2		
Farm Credit & Rural Development	11.0			Defense Communications Systems	51.1		
Forest Service	51.9	79.4		Defense Geophysical Activities, eg. mapping	21.3		
Group 4: Research and Intelligence Gathering				Fiscal Management of Treasury Funds & Debt	5.4		
Military Research & Development	113.4			Printing and Minting of Money	6.5		
Military Intelligence	50.1			Agricultural Corporations & Banks	2.7		
Medical Research	21.7			V.A. Special Funds & Activities	6.4	2413.0	
Agricultural Research & Statistical Services	13.3	198.5		Total Personnel in Listed Activities		4116.2	

- Government research activities, where the special field of research and development management holds sway;
- Law enforcement management, currently dominated by special schools of criminal justice;
- The motivation and management of teachers, who are the largest single group of government employees, outnumbering military combat personnel three-to-one, which is left up to college departments of education.

Prescription or Description?

How could the profession of public administration develop an approach to public management that pays so little attention to the work of so many government employees? One explanation suggests itself, and it is best revealed by examining shifts over time within a single gov-

ernment department. I have chosen the U.S. Department of Agriculture for this illustration, not only because it has remained relatively intact since the New Deal, but also because it was here that Paul Appleby worked as a top-level executive during the 1930's and formulated the theory of political administration that became the basis for the "government is different" doctrine.

During the 1930's, the Department of Agriculture was the queen of the New Deal and the leading social welfare agency of its day. Out of this era came the concept of "grass roots democracy," which was a catch phrase for the attempt to increase political accountability among managers in the field.

In the already political subsidy programs for crops such as wheat, tobacco, cotton, and peanuts, USDA field officials were instructed to sit down with local committees of farmers and determine local agricultural policy, such as the distribution of acreage allotments which determined

Table IV
Distribution of State and Local Personnel
1976
(thousands)

Group 1: Activities in which the tendencies toward political or public styles of management are most pronounced			Group 5: Police, Fire and Corrections		
Public Welfare	353		Police Protection	613	
Health Services	202		Local Fire Protection	292	
Housing & Urban Renewal	86		Corrections	213	1118
State Department of Education	92		Group 6: Income Maintenance and Taxation		
Political & Executive Control	477	1210	Employment Security	113	
			Financial Administration	293	406
Group 2: Regulation			Group 7: Activities in which the tendencies toward business management are most pronounced		
Not significant enough to warrant separate listing			Educational Administration: Local	1581	
Group 3: Parks and Natural Resources			Educational Administration: Higher	1068	
Parks & Recreation	208		Highways	582	
Natural Resources	204	412	Hospitals	1017	
Group 4: Education			Sewerage	87	
Local Schools Instructional Personnel	2986		Sanitation	127	
Higher Education Instructional Personnel	581		Airports	18	
Local Libraries	90	3657	Water Transport & Terminals	14	
			Transit	122	
			State Liquor Stores	16	
			Public Utilities: Water	129	
			Public Utilities: Electric	61	
			Public Utilities: Gas	10	4832
			Total Listed State & Local Personnel		11,635

how much each farmer could produce. These and other grass roots mechanisms ensured that the crop subsidy programs would be administratively politicized at both top and bottom.

Crop subsidy programs, however, accounted for less than nine per cent of all full-time USDA employees. Most of the USDA New Deal employees were employed in operations which, on the surface, seemed quite businesslike or technical. The farm credit program, with more than 17,000 full-time employees, was essentially a national bank with branch offices in most rural counties. The Soil Conservation Service, with nearly 14,000 full-time employees, was basically a land-engineering operation offering technical assistance to local farmers whose topsoil was being blown or washed away.

Rather than manage programs such as these along business lines, USDA executives (including Appleby) worked to extend the mechanisms of grass roots democracy to these agencies, setting up local citizen governing boards to which local USDA managers were told to report. In the farm credit program, county managers were instructed to meet with local boards before

arranging loans to low income farmers for land or equipment. Technically, local soil conservation agents worked for their local boards. Similar requirements for grass roots participation were also extended to the Agricultural Marketing Service, a regulatory agency set up to influence the prices paid for fruits, vegetables, and dairy products.

Through such methods, USDA executives were able to extend their philosophy of public management to 58 per cent of all full-time USDA employees by 1939. (See Table V)

By 1976, despite growth in marketing and food distribution activities, these politicized programs accounted for only 43 per cent of all full-time USDA employees. The real growth centers in the department were centered in agricultural research and the more conventional regulatory inspection programs.

Readers are free to draw their own conclusions, but it would appear that public administrators have ascribed to government as a whole concepts that USDA executives were fighting to extend to regulatory and business-like programs in their own department. Such trends have never

Table V
Distribution of Full-Time Personnel
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1939 & 1976

1939		1976
	Activities in which the tendencies toward political or public styles of management were most pronounced	
1902	Departmental Management	3296
6159	Crop Subsidy Programs	2420
173	Food Distribution Grant Programs	2514
<u>449</u>	Other Grant Programs	<u>474</u>
8683		8704
	Business-like, technical, or regulatory activities with significant requirements for local clientele participation	
17074	Farm & Rural Development	
	Loan Programs	6797
13720	Soil Conservation Service	13503
660	Rural Electrification	770
<u>285</u>	Marketing Service	<u>4565</u>
31739		25635
	Traditional regulatory activities	
8984	Inspection Programs (Animal, Dairy, etc.)	14222
<u>212</u>	Commodity Exchange Authority	<u>—</u>
9196		14222
	Management of Public Lands	
15250	Forest Service	19185
	Research	
371	Agricultural Research	8382
1563	Economic Research	1023
—	Statistical Reporting	1139
<u>190</u>	Other	<u>169</u>
2124		10713
	Business-like programs	
581	Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	557
154	Commodity Credit Corporation	1284
<u>2261</u>	Farm Credit Administration	<u>238</u>
2996		2079
69,988	Total Full-Time Personnel	80,538

been as significant in the government as a whole as they were then in USDA, and they have even dwindled in importance in that department.

Lessons for Public Managers

What lessons does this hold for public managers, personnel officers, and educators trying to decide whether

to emphasize business skills or public approaches to management?

As a statement of fact, the doctrine that “government is different” applies with unequal force to different operations. Public managers need to decipher conditions in their own agency and determine the suitability of business versus public administration on the basis of factors such as these:

- The primary task of the agency, including the basic technology or profession upon which it relies, eg. engineering. Agencies whose style of operations tends to resemble those of industries, banks, insurance companies, financial companies (eg. American Express), retailing firms, transportation companies, or utilities will show the highest tendency to rely upon business management techniques. Those that perform a uniquely “public” service will tend to rely upon public administration or other approaches.
- The amount of discretion that managers throughout the agency possess in applying and reinterpreting public policy. The idea that public managers “make policy” is indispensable to the political model of administration, and the need for “political awareness” in management is sacrificed where discretion is reduced to a minimum.
- The proximity of the greater number of managers in the operation to the locus of policy making, or the presence of special requirements that force managers to bargain with clientele, seek political support for their programs, or otherwise engage in administrative politics. The closer such managers are to demands for political accountability, the more public-like its style of management will likely become, even though the agency task may be business-like in character.

As things stand, a fairly straight-forward business management approach is probably appropriate for a large number of government activities. The management problems involved in mail delivery, defense logistics, hospital administration, highway construction, electric power generation, and similar activities are problems amenable to the technical and managerial style embodied by the business approach.

Outside of these areas, it is important that public managers recognize that they are not always dealing with an “either . . . or” situation. There are plenty of activities in government that do not resemble business operations where a style of management other than public administration has grown up around the particular function. The existence of a separate field of management, such as R & D management, or separate schools teaching administration, as in the field of education, is a good sign that one has entered the twilight zone between business management and public administration.

Finally, public managers ought to be aware that the “government is different” doctrine will retain considerable moral force in public administration, no matter what the facts are. After all, that is how it began in the mind of its most famous oracle, Paul Appleby—as a prescription for administrative reform to bring grass roots democracy to the Department of Agriculture during the New Deal.

Many good arguments, especially from the citizen's point of view, still exist for making governmental administration less technical, incomprehensible, and business-like by changing the institutional rules of the game so as to produce a more responsive and democratic public service.

Moral proclamations aside, for the immediate future business approaches will continue to have no little relevance in public management. The profession of public administration and the public managers that propel it cannot afford to ignore business management because so much of government tends to be business-like, nor can the profession continue to be preoccupied with those public managers whose political discretion supports the doctrine that "government is different."

Notes

- * I would like to thank Mitchell Mutnick and Carolyn Carmack, students of mine who are also public servants in the Washington bureaucracy, for their help in the difficult job of collecting and interpreting the figures used in this paper.
1. Paul H. Appleby, *Big Democracy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945), p. 7.
 2. NASPAA, in its standards for M.P.A. programs, lists as its first four "common curriculum components" the ethical, political, institutional, cultural, legal and economic environment of government. Management concepts get second billing.
 3. U.S., Office of the White House, Press Secretary, "The White House Roundtable Discussion with the President," Fairfax High School, August 3, 1978, p. 3.
 4. Andrew J. Smith, "MBA vs. MPA: No Resolution in Sight," *MBA Magazine* (November, 1977), p. 61.
 5. The fact that so few of my colleagues can name those activities is indicative of the lack of attention that business-type activities in the federal government receive. The figure is taken from U.S., Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Government Financial Operations, *Consolidated Financial Statements of The United States Government* (Washington: Department of the Treasury, 1977), p. 8.
 6. Appleby, *Big Democracy*, p. 9.
 7. *Ibid.*, pp. 9 and 1.
 8. Spencer Rich, "U.S. Payroll Exceeds 6 Million," *Washington Post* (July 18, 1978), pp. 1 and 4.
 9. Figures used in this paper are drawn from many sources, including the agencies or corporations themselves. Some of the major sources are U.S., Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Manpower Information Systems, *Federal Civilian Manpower Statistics: Monthly Release* (Washington: Civil Service Commission, selected dates); U.S., Department of Defense, OSD, Office of Manpower and Reserve Affairs, *Manpower Requirements Report for FY 1978* (Washington: Department of Defense, March 1977); U.S. Department of Defense, OASD (Comptroller), Directorate for Management Information Operations and Control, *Selected Manpower Statistics* (Washington: Department of Defense, May 1977); *Fortune Magazine*, vol. 95 (May 1977) pp. 364-89; vol. 95 (July 1977) pp. 160-75; and U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Public Employment in 1976* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1977). Unless otherwise noted, the figures used in the paper include both full-time and part-time personnel employed by the agency.
 10. The literature on the relationship between task and management style is fairly well developed. See, for example, James D. Thompson, *Organizations In Action* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967); Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, *Organization and Environment* (Homewood, Ill.: Richard Irwin, 1969); Morley Segal, "Organization and Environment," *Public Administration Review* 34 (May/June 1974) pp. 212-20; or Theodore J. Lowi, "Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice," *Public Administration Review* 32 (July/August 1972) pp. 298-310.
 11. Aggregate totals, including unassigned personnel, are counted in the 87 per cent. In Table III unassigned personnel, mainly military personnel in training, hospitals, or between assignments, are omitted. That accounts for the difference in totals, should anyone ever bother to check my math.
 12. See, for example, Francis E. Rourke, *Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), p. 19.
 13. For a breakdown of federal blue collar workers, see the September 1976 monthly release of the Civil Service Commission, *Federal Civilian Manpower Statistics*, cited in note 9. That issue covers 1975; my figure covers 1976 and is taken from a Civil Service Commission staff paper. For an analysis of the defense department, see U.S., Senate Committee on Armed Services, *Shaping the Defense Civilian Work Force*, 95th Congress, 1st Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 13.
 14. They are, in order, the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Federal Financing Bank.
 15. Treasury, *Consolidated Financial Statements*, p. 6.

Copyright of Public Administration Review is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.