

- Reeves, A. E. (1992). Enhancing local self-government and state capabilities: the U.S. Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations program. *Public Administration Review*, 52(4).
- Scicchitano, M. J. and D. M. Hedge. (1993). From Coercion to Partnership in Federal Partial Preemption: SMCRA, RCRA and OSH Act. *Publius*, 23.
- Welborn, D. M. (1988). Conjoint Federalism and Environmental Regulation in the United States. *Publius*, 18.
- Zimmerman, J. F. (1991). *Federal Preemption: The Silent Revolution*. Ames: Iowa State University.

<http://www.assembly.go.kr> 의안정보시스템

<http://www.dpla.go.kr>

<http://www.momaf.go.kr>

---

**정주택** : 1990년 미국의 American University 에서 박사학위를 취득하고, 현재 한성대학교 행정학과 부교수에 재직중이며, 주요관심분야는 정책평가, 지방정부론 등이다.  
E-mail : jtchung@hansung.ac.kr , 연구실 ☎ : 02-760-4073

# Public Planning Agency's Work-productivity and Administrative Settings at Local Government

## 미국 지방정부의 기획관련 업무생산량과 행정환경

Sungsoo Won(Kongju National Univ.)

Hyugkeun Ahn(Kyunghee Univ.)

본 연구에서는 지방자치 정부들의 구조적 성격 및 주변(환경)여건에 따른 동일업무의 생산성 비교를 위해 미국의 자치 시정부들(city governments)과 군정부들(county government) 내에 속해 있는 계획담당 부서들을 상대로 업무의 생산성에 대한 경험적 검증이 실시되었다. 본 연구에 사용된 설문조사는 1,490명의 계획업무 책임 담당자들이 대상이 되었으며, 이들은 미국 계획가 협회(AICP)에 등록된 회원명부 중에서 층화표본추출방법을 사용하여 선발되었다. 연구에 사용된 주요 변수들은 업무의 생산성과 관련하여 계획담당 부서의 행정구조(조직 구성원 수, 리더십 스타일, 참여도), 정부형태, 시와 군의 인구통계학적 차이점 등이 중심이 되었다.

통계분석의 결과 본 연구는 계획담당 부서가 속한 행정조직의 구조와 기타 주변의 여건들(주요 변수들)은 행정업무의 생산성에 의미 있는 영향을 끼치고 있음을 발견하였다. 다시 말해, 행정조직의 구조, 인구의 규모, 관리자의 리더십 스타일, 주민과 위원회 및 담당자들의 정책과정 참여 등은 각각 업무의 생산성과 의미 있는 연관이 있음을 발견할 수 있었으나, 정부의 형태(시/군 정부)와 업무의 생산성간에는 의미 있는 차이를 발견할 수 없었다.

Key words: Productivity, Planning, Local Management, Forms of Government, Organizational Environment.

## I. Introduction

### 1. Background

Contemporary administrative practices promoting efficiency and effectiveness may well mean good management for a planning agency. As government increasingly face fiscal stress during their attempts to avoid excessive spending, maximizing productivity is an important goal. Since fiscal stress is so common, concerns with plan making are high; and "efficient and effective public planning agencies" have been key components in planning practice (McClendon, Becker, and Catanese, 1996).

Efficiency is mainly concerned with input cost relative to output (economics of productivity). Effectiveness is mainly concerned with the degree to which a social subsystem achieves its goals and objectives. Public sector productivity, by contrast, often refers to a combined measure of efficiency and effectiveness (Morley, 1986).

When productivity is measured alone (without effectiveness considered), the results can be quite helpful as a guide to improve that organization's productivity. For example, studies of productivity can be useful in locating areas where improvement is needed, or in providing insights from feedback to the organization (Morley, 1986). The manners in which efficiency and effectiveness are translated to the workings of different governmental departments vary greatly. Due to this variation, there have been few studies comparing, reporting, or developing standard indicators.

By examining the literature of local government management, a number of structural and functional analyses can be noted in work by Maslow (1943), McGregor (1960), Argyris (1970), and others. Their studies discovered how employees could be motivated toward higher productivity, and how worker satisfaction could be increased in organizations. Other studies about those subjects focused on individual planner's political attitudes, values, and personal concepts of the profession (Howe and Kaufman 1979, 1981; Vasu 1979; Howe 1980; Edwards and Galloway 1981; Sabatier and Mazmanian 1980).

Inter-jurisdictional studies had not been performed in the literature reviewed, nor were studies of ways to increase planning productivity; administrative characteristics specific to planning under the different forms of city government; unusual organizational environments; different city population sizes; or under unusual executive management (leadership) styles (Wright 1970; ICMA 1974; Dalton 1985 & 89; Thomas 1988; Ravitz 1988; Whitaker and Kurt 1995).

In summary, there is need to empirically examine city and county agencies in order to devise more sound methods for promoting productivity of public planning agencies as defended by efficiency and effectiveness.

## 2. Purpose of the Research

Efficient and effective planning is examined as a function of city, county, and regional agency structure and purpose. For this research, efficiency is measured by productivity. Effectiveness, as measured by the extent of matching organization's goals, is not examined in any detail.

For the comparative study, the organizational productivity of city and county planning agencies is assessed as a case under different administrative settings, and significant factors are sought that could improve urban management. The reason why planning agency is used as a case is that its administrative functions and work characteristics are the most similar and specialized across the governments of different administrative settings.

Two major questions are investigated: 1) what factors relate to the productivity of

planning agencies, including their administrative settings and management characteristics? 2) Are there any productivity differences between planning at the two different levels of government?

## II. Concepts and Variables

In order to develop a logical research design, a number of considerations were examined. For example, productivity as measured by the private sector could not be adapted to studying the public sector. Usually, private sector productivity is related to the production of products for sale in manufacturing or performing office work tasks in the least amount of time. However, public sector productivity is more complex. The achievement of a desired objective is viewed as effectiveness, sometimes described as a quality dimension of output. With products for sale (objects), quality can be linked to a product withstanding hard use, tight seams, etc. But with services, there is a perception that a focus on efficiency will result in deterioration of effectiveness (Balk; Hatry; Rosen, 1981).

Public sector productivity may be viewed as a measure of efficiency and effectiveness according to one definition. In this case, the products of government yield consequences those are usually not a byproduct of the private sector (Morley 1986, 8). The concept of productivity in this study is related to outputs only, with consequences not considered. Outputs are considered measures of efficiency. Using a common model, the production process of planning agencies can be summarized as: inputs, throughputs, and outputs. Inputs are the number of planning staff members; annual budget for the agency; number of planning related facilities (computers, scanners, etc.). Throughputs are organizational environments, the degree of citizens' and planners' participation, and executive management styles. Outputs are planning directors' estimates of the number of work products produced over the past fiscal year. A work product is defined as one report, book, or memorandum, one map, one public meeting or hearing; or one other planning output that has been produced by a planning agency. Thus, an agency's individual productivity (*IP*), or efficiency, is estimated by: total number of work products in an agency, plus the average time required per item of the work products, and the number of staff members:

$IP = \text{Sum of one year's work products (number for each category times the average time required per item) divided by the number of staff members.}$

**Productivity** (efficiency) is measured through 31 items on a self-report questionnaire that had been mailed to 539 planning directors holding the AICP designation. Six of the 31 items measured administrative duties and planning implementation. For qualitative analysis, 26 items measure planning agency differences.

The **dependent variable** is the aforementioned *IP*, or productivity measure of this research. Planning directors scored the 31 items (categories of work products produced over the past fiscal year). Two sub-categories are administrative duties and plan implementation. To measure the productivity, the administrative duties of a planning agency were developed, and those categories and the average time needed for each item to be completed were requested in the survey instrument.

Productivity is measured by  $IP = \text{Sum of one year's work products (number for each category times the average time required per item)} \div \text{the number of staff members}$ .

**Independent variables** represent 4 key aspects of a planning agency's setting: 1) form of city government; 2) organizational environment (size, formalization, and centralization); 3) size of city (population); and 4) executive management style.

**Form of city government** There are 4 forms of city government (similarly 4 forms of county government): 1) mayor-council; 2) council-manager; 3) city commission; and 4) town meeting.<sup>1)</sup>

**Organizational environment** Three items describe differences in the organizational environment. They are the size of organization; the degree of formalization; and the amount of centralization of the organization in which planning sits. The organizational size is the number of employees (Miller 1991, 405).

Organizational **formality** is the use of rules in an organization to describe the specific authorities, responsibilities, duties, and procedures to be followed in every job, and then supervise job occupants to ensure conformity to the job definitions.

**Centralization** is the degree to which power is concentrated in an organization. The distribution of power has major consequences for the performance of an organization and the behavior of its members.

**Personal participation** (effectiveness measure) in decision-making is measured by two variables: the degree of planner's participation in the decisions on the adoption of new planning policies and acceptance of their proposal in organization-wide decisions. More frequent participation in decision-making would be regarded as more autonomous for effective municipal planning. The degree to which an organization member participates in decisions involving the tasks associated with his position (Hage and Aiken 1967, 78-9) is the scale of hierarchy of authority. By contrast, if all work decisions must be referred to a superior in the chain of command, then there is less autonomy of authority. (See items 36 to 46 in Appendix Item 1. Survey Instrument).

**Size of city** has three categories: 1) small (under 25,000 population); 2) medium (25,001 to 200,000); and 3) large (over 200,001).

**Size of county** has three categories: 1) small (under 100,000 population); 2) medium (100,001 to 300,000); and 3) large (over 300,001).

1) Information about each is available from, Municipal Year Book of 1996. (Washington DC: ICMA, 1996).

### III. Research Design

Primary and secondary data sources are used in this research. Major information, or the primary data source, was obtained by mailed questionnaire. Secondary data sources are the 1992 Census, Municipal Year Book (ICMA, 1996), and the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) 1996/97 Roster.

In the Roster, there are 1,718 AICP members working for governments, of which 481 are planning directors and 58 are assistant planning directors. Responses from those holding the AICP designation, nationally qualified planner designation, are assumed to be adequate indicators of the opinions of all experienced planners (holding a somewhat common base of knowledge and beliefs). Also, AICP members are assumed to have high interest in receiving the results of the research; therefore, they might be more cooperative and accurate, and likely to take the time to complete the questionnaire.

During development of the survey instrument, a target group of respondents were identified and three successive pretests administered (Converse and Presser 1987, 65). After the final pretest, the revised instrument was sent to national AICP for their information and review and comment.

The survey instrument consists of 63 questions addressing productivity that include: 31 items of planning-related work, administrative duties, and plan implementation items; 26 items about organizational environments, executive management styles, and the relationships between administrative settings and the planning function of government; 6 items about the planning agency that include the number staff members, its annual budget, other departments doing planning, an education indicator, and equipment. Reliability of the instrument was confirmed with factor analysis, and internal validity tested with repeating questions and positive and negative alternating items to uncover any contradictions.

### IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

Using the universe of AICP government planners working in city and county agencies, 539 questionnaires were mailed with a return rate of 61 percent (326 total responses). City planning agencies had a total response of 285 from 44 states, with 41 county responses from 21 states. To test the reliability of the survey instrument, 5 factors were specified (orthogonal varimax rotation):

〈Table 1〉 Factor Analysis of Items 32-63

Factor 1. Leadership and Organizational Centralization (Importance of Planning). (=0.54. Factors: Q40, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
Factor 2. Planning Commission Participation (Commission Relationship to Planning Agency). (=0.43. Factors: Q36, 38, 43, 44, 45
Factor 3. Citizens Participation (Citizen Input to Planning). (=0.63. Factors: Q40, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
Factor 4. Organizational Formality (Autonomy of Planning Agency). (=0.57. Factors: Q40, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
Factor 5. Role and Responsibility (Policy, Administration, and Functioning). (=0.54. Factors: Q40, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55

In the factor analysis, Alpha coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) shows that each factor has the reliability and their values are within an acceptable range.

#### **Findings for Table 1: Factor Analysis of Items 32-63**

As an exploratory method, both 4 and 5 factors were specified for statistical analysis of the administrative setting items. Separate factor analyses (both 4 and 5 factors) were run for cities and counties. Since the factor analysis findings were similar for the counties, Table 1 provides satisfactory information about the grouping of the items. Planning agency participation in city-wide matters, degree of independence in selecting and deciding about policies and programs, and other items about independence of the agency were grouped in Factor 1. Factor 2. Planning Commission Participation (Commission Relationship to Planning Agency) contains items about the agencies relations and communications with its commission(s). Factor 3. Citizens Participation (Citizen Input to Planning) contains 3 items about citizens helping define and decide on policies and develop plans. Factor 4. Organizational Formality (Autonomy of Planning Agency) contains two items about an agencies ability to make its own decisions. Facctor 5. Role and Responsibility (Policy, Administration, and Functioning) contains 3 items about planning's role in the it's organizational setting. Three of the previously identified items describing the differences in the organizational environment are present within the factors: centralization, formality, and participation.

Based on the factor analysis, the items representing those three concepts are analyzed in the following tables (ANOVA and T-test) for both cities and counties. The 6-point Likert scale has been summarized as "disagree" and "agree." The productivity means are provided along with the standard deviations and the F-Probabilities (T-tests). As a final table, Tables 7 and 8 provide ANOVA and T-tests for planning productivity under the different forms of government, organizational size, and population size (secondary source data).

The analysis attempts to uncover those components that create the greatest differences

between the mean score for measuring productivity (*IP*) and the form of government, size of organization, and population size. Also, the mean differences between productivity are measured against organizational formality, centrality, executive leadership styles, commission's participation, citizen participation, and the role of the planner. This section of the research uses ANOVA and t-tests; and is divided into two sections - city and county analyses.

### 1. City Analysis

#### Research Findings

Mean score is indicated for *IP*. Standard deviation and t-statistic are indicated also. Factor 1, Leadership and Organizational Centralization (Importance of Planning) is split into two concepts: leadership and centralization as follows:

(Table 2) ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 1.

#### *LEADERSHIP:*

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q40: Importance of Planning agency	Low Degree	125	533.16	794.32	0.1135
	High Degree	145	702.93	934.93	
Q51: Participates in setting work	Low Degree	45	610.49	791.40	0.9186
	High Degree	226	625.11	890.91	
Q52: Comments are accepted	Low Degree	12	455.54	313.86	0.5037
	High Degree	259	628.59	891.40	
Q55: Little Information flow	Low Degree	238	605.40	839.15	0.3828
	High Degree	33	747.36	1099.44	

#### *ORGANIZATIONAL CENTRALIZATION:*

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q47: Participation of policy	Low Degree	244	646.26	914.12	0.1547
	High Degree	28	398.18	260.65	
Q53: Selects and decides	Low Degree	23	823.67	1138.98	0.2445
	High Degree	249	601.98	844.48	
Q54: Too loosely supervised	Low Degree	251	605.53	845.60	0.3220
	High Degree	21	802.26	1160.25	

For leadership in Factor 1, there are only slight differences in productivity based on whether there is support of a planning agency by a city manager or mayor. Most planners may work hard regardless of support. When staff comments and recommendations are considered and accepted, there is higher productivity. For organizational centralization in Factor 1, there is higher productivity when: the agency participates in the implementation and selecting and deciding about policies and programs. When the agency is too loosely



supervised, productivity is higher. 2)

For planning commission participation in Factor 2, productivity scores are higher when there is frequent communication with the planning and zoning commission. And, productivity of the planning agency does not seem to vary whether or not there is citizens' participation.

For organizational formality, Factor 4, there is a higher productivity score when a superior must approve a decision (42). This finding contradicts the finding for Factor 1, which reports a higher productivity score when loosely supervised.

The productivity score is higher for those planning agencies stating that they are involved in a technical and value-neutral activity (32).

〈Table 3〉 ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 2: Planning Commission Participation

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q36: Role of plan commission	Low Degree	62	673.05	927.85	0.6266
	High Degree	207	611.16	862.32	
Q38: role in final policies	Low Degree	201	606.84	818.21	0.5309
	High Degree	68	684.03	1032.60	
Q44:Plan agency and Plan commission	Low Degree	20	345.50	276.61	0.1380
	High Degree	249	647.90	904.14	
Q45: Participation of plan	Low Degree	83	585.44	845.17	0.6420
	High Degree	188	639.12	887.86	

〈Table 4〉 ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 3: Citizens Participation

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q41: Role of citizens	Low Degree	194	617.30	846.71	0.9191
	High Degree	78	629.22	940.17	
Q46: Citizen activity In plan-making	Low Degree	86	618.59	926.50	0.9696
	High Degree	185	622.94	851.52	
Q56: Citizens not active in participation	Low Degree	172	652.08	982.68	0.4381
	High Degree	100	566.78	642.34	

〈Table 5〉 ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 4: Organizational Formality

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q35: Dependency of staff	Low Degree	242	624.29	885.52	0.8488
	High Degree	30	591.98	775.21	
Q42: Supervisor's decision required	Low Degree	207	591.43	837.11	0.3085
	High Degree	64	719.01	985.86	

2) Theory Y in management may well be supported by this finding.

**<Table 6> ANOVA & T-test for Factor 5: Role and Responsibility**

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q32: Planners' value - neutrality	Low Degree	219	564.97	681.61	0.0320
	High Degree	53	851.09	1398.21	
Q33: Clear responsibilities of council and mayor	Low Degree	94	612.96	899.70	0.9154
	High Degree	178	624.82	860.78	
Q34: Either Value-laden or value-free	Low Degree	241	611.82	874.69	0.6398
	High Degree	31	689.95	868.81	

Smaller size planning agencies are more productive, as reported. Smaller size cities are more productive, also.

**<Table 7> Form of Local Government, Population, & Planning Agency Size***FORM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT:*

City Manager	187
Mayor Council	75
Other Kinds	10

*POPULATION:*

Small (<25,000)	94
Medium (25,001-200,000)	89
Large (200,001+)	89

*SIZE OF PLANNING ORGANIZATION:*

Small (1-4)	94
Medium (5-8)	89
Large (9+)	89

**<Table 8> Planning Agency Size & Population Size**

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Gov. Form	CM	187	645.55	975.90	0.6900
	MC	75	548.60	614.12	
	OG	10	697.21	301.14	
SIZE OF ORG. Q 58	SMALL	94	922.21	1279.43	0.0001
	MEDIUM	89	553.21	499.06	
	LARGE	89	369.20	448.08	
POPULATION	SMALL	122	762.79	1135.20	0.0444
	MEDIUM	124	521.59	598.18	
	LARGE	25	414.78	269.28	

## 2. County Analysis

**Research Findings**

Using results from the cities' factor analyses, the same tables are developed for the counties. The dependent variable; i.e., *IP* = sum of work products divided by the number of staff members, is productivity. Mean score is indicated for *IP*. Standard deviation and t-statistic are indicated, also. In the following ANOVA and t-test, Factor 1. Leadership and Organizational Centralization is split into two concepts: leadership and centralization.

Factor 1. Leadership, is examined in these findings: higher productivity when the mayor or manager believes that another department is more important than the planning agency; and when the agency participates in setting work programs. Factor 1. organizational centralization, shows increased productivity when an agency participates in selecting and deciding about policies and programs; and is more tightly supervised by the mayor, manager, or council. And, productivity is higher when the planning commission actively participates with the agency.

〈Table 9〉 County ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 1.

*LEADERSHIP*

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q40: Importance of Planning agency	Low Degree	19	352.85	325.84	0.1523
	High Degree	25	571.80	588.59	
Q51: Participates in setting work	Low Degree	7	305.61	244.97	0.3549
	High Degree	36	492.91	514.56	
Q52: Comments are accepted	Low Degree	4	388.56	252.52	0.7427
	High Degree	41	475.50	516.17	
Q55: Little Information flow	Low Degree	33	470.93	507.31	0.9527
	High Degree	12	481.00	479.85	

*ORGANIZATIONAL CENTRALIZATION:*

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q47: Participation of policy	Low Degree	36	433.99	485.43	0.4043
	High Degree	10	582.49	522.90	
Q53: Selets and decides	Low Degree	7	292.97	271.30	0.3166
	High Degree	39	497.38	517.87	
Q54: Too loosely supervised	Low Degree	40	488.15	522.56	0.5831
	High Degree	5	357.34	104.48	

**(Table 10) ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 2: County Planning Commission Participation**

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q36: Role of plan commission	Low Degree	13	494.38	425.99	0.8109
	High Degree	33	455.21	521.09	
Q38: Role in final policies	Low Degree	33	494.49	500.64	0.5412
	High Degree	13	394.65	480.23	
Q44: Plan agency and Plan commission	Low Degree	5	452.43	521.09	0.9205
	High Degree	40	476.26	498.22	
Q45: Participation of plan	Low Degree	16	371.12	350.29	0.2632
	High Degree	28	546.94	559.08	

**(Table 11) ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 3: County Citizens Participation**

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q41: Role of citizens	Low Degree	33	468.73	490.53	0.9578
	High Degree	13	460.05	514.80	
Q46: Citizen activity in plan-making	Low Degree	12	439.38	477.50	0.8284
	High Degree	34	475.77	503.35	
Q56: Citizens not active in participation	Low Degree	30	432.94	413.27	0.5349
	High Degree	16	528.79	623.53	

Similar to the findings for cities, counties do not have an appreciable increase in productivity when citizens participate.

**(Table 12) ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 4: County Organizational Formality**

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q35: Dependency of staff	Low Degree	37	445.84	472.49	0.8020
	High Degree	8	400.38	404.78	
Q42: Supervisor's decision required	Low Degree	30	432.94	413.27	0.5349
	High Degree	16	528.79	623.54	

Productivity in planning increases when a superior is needed to approve a decision.

〈Table 13〉 ANOVA & T-Test for Factor 5. County Role and Responsibility

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Q32: Planners' value - Neutrality	Low Degree	33	491.99	496.25	0.5778
	High Degree	13	400.99	493.55	
Q33: Clear responsibilities of council and mayor	Low Degree	20	461.77	558.20	0.9433
	High Degree	25	472.55	454.37	
Q34: Either Value-laden or value-free	Low Degree	41	495.42	507.71	0.2542
	High Degree	5	227.32	249.90	

The mean productivity score is higher in those agencies where planning directors believe that planners are not usually expected to choose among alternates using both value judgments and technical expertise.

Medium size county planning agencies have higher productivity, as do small size counties.

〈Tabel 14〉 County Population, & Planning Agency Size Population:

Small	(<100,000)	21
Medium	(100,001-300,000)	13
Large	(300,001+)	7

SIZE OF COUNTY PLANNING ORGANIZATION:

Small	(1-4)	9
Medium	(5-8)	10
Large	(9+)	27

〈Table 15〉 County Planning Agency Size & Population

Q NUMBER	GROUPS	COUNT	MEAN	Std. D.	F Prob.
Gov. Form	REGIONS	3	761.52	865.73	0.3037
	COUNTIES	42	464.85	467.22	
SIZE OF ORG. Q 58	SMALL	9	508.27	338.01	0.0324
	MEDIUM	10	796.08	733.01	
	LARGE	27	330.13	368.32	
POPULATION	SMALL	21	543.26	589.71	0.3233
	MEDIUM	13	321.19	333.01	
	LARGE	7	334.24	251.40	

## V. Conclusions

### 1. Results and Further Research

This study supports some common beliefs and produces unexpected findings. It should be noted that many of the findings must be viewed in the context of this study only. For example, *the more support of planning by city and county executive leadership (authoritative leadership), the more planning work products*; although, productivity is not significantly related to the executive manager's authoritative leadership. In the instance of centrality of organization, there is no significant degree of centrality at .05 Alpha level for the both of city and county planning agencies. Therefore, *the centrality of the planning agency does not significantly relate to increased number of work products (productivity, or efficiency)*.

For formalization of organization, this research finds that *the formality of an organization does not significantly influence a city or county planning agency's productivity*. Interestingly, however, the mean of productivity under formal organization is larger than under the informal organization. That is, the formality of a planning organization positively affects planning work productivity. Thus, this study concludes that a supervisor's active involvement promotes the planning work productivity at local government.

For citizen participation, *the results indicate that there are no significant relationships between citizen participation and productivity*. It may well mean that meeting the values of a participatory democracy will not retard the quantity of work products produced by a planning agency.

In relation to the degree of agency participation in the policy-making processes of local government, *there are no differences in productivity between situations where the planning agency has either an active or passive voice in policy-making*.

One interesting finding is the size of the organization. In the city analysis, *the smaller the organization, the higher the planning productivity*. However, in the county analysis, the medium size of planning agency has higher productivity. Both cases have statistical significance at .05 Alpha level in the ANOVA analysis.

*The forms of government do not make for differences in productivity for either the city or county planning agencies*. According to the literature of classical organization theory, it was expected that there would be significant mean differences in productivity among the governmental forms. More hierarchical city government, such as the strong mayor-council form is a setting that makes planning less productive compared to the council-manager or town meeting. But the results show that there are no significant relationships between planning productivity and the forms of government. As possible reasons, first, a modification of the mayor-council form of government has emerged and has been adopted in many cities. Contemporary governmental forms have somewhat mixed systems of their original forms (Greg, 1985). Second, the choice of each governmental form would be more explained by political value rather than administrative aspect. Under these circumstances and considerations, the forms

of government do not significantly relate to productivity in planning works.

In relation to population size, *the city size does make a significant difference (statistically) in planning work productivity.* However, the results of the ANOVA show that planning is more productive in small cities. It may well be that smaller size agencies have more to do with fewer people; therefore, they tend to operate more efficiently.

Consequently, the higher the degree of organizational formality, centrality, executive leadership styles, commission's participation, citizen participation, and the role of the planner show higher productivity in both city and county planning agencies. The mean difference of productivity in the forms of government, size of organization, and population size indicates that small size agencies and population have higher productivity. However, the forms of government do not show much difference.

In summary, these findings suggest that organizational settings, such as population, executive management styles, and the degree of citizens, commission, and agency participation can significantly affect the quantity of planning work in local governments. For instance, smaller agency sizes having more informal organizations provide a greater number of planning work products; and small size cities with more agency supportive leadership from the executive manager produce a greater number of work products compared to medium and large cities. However, governmental forms, the centralization of the organization, and the mayor or manager's authority do not significantly affect planning work.

## 2. Further Research Needed

As an attempt to measure productivity (or efficiency and effectiveness) in public agencies, this research uncovered many issues and needs for further investigation. First, there appears to be little agreement in the literature about the precise variables that define the factors, "efficiency" and "effectiveness." Another issue is the lack of agreement in the literature about the population size of "small, medium, and large cities and counties." Attached v. detached cities (metropolitan area city vs. independent city) may affect an analysis such as this one. Although the city and county size was logically divided, the division was not based on accepted criteria or theories. The lack of theory may well make the conclusions of this study invalid. Yet another issued connected to size, is rich v. poor city. For example, a city or county may be limited in resources and depend on different equipment, technologies, or shared personnel to produce their planning work products.

No baseline was used to compare with the outputs of work products. Baselines are needed to measure efficiency. In effectiveness measures, quality and goals must be measured. But the questionnaires as constructed do not attempt to measure quality. For these reasons, efficiency and effectiveness in the true sense are not measured nor studied.

Respondents only estimated the average number of hours needed for a representative work task under each category. The total time estimated, was used in calculating *IP*. The

average of an estimate is not a real number - only a "best estimate by a professional planner" of time expended.

After all of these issues are considered, this research can be best considered as both declarative and exploratory. Further work is needed, and the line of inquiry appears very worthwhile. The major findings that there are no significant productivity differences between agency settings of centrality; that formality of organization does not significantly influence planning productivity; that citizens participation may not influence planning productivity; that agency participation in policy making is not significantly related to planning productivity; and that organization size does have significance - suggest that further work is needed, important, and necessary.

### Reference

- Becker, Robert W. (1996). Core Values and Principles of Effective Planning. In - McClendon et. al. *Planners on Planning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Catanese, Anthony J. (1974). *Planners and Local Politics: Impossible Dreams*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Converse Jean M. and Presser Stanley. (1987). Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. CA. Sage.
- Dalton, Linda C. (1985). Politics and Planning Agency Performance: Lessons from Seattle. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 51(2): 189-199.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1989). Emerging Knowledge about Planning Practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9(1): 29-44.
- Edwards, J. T., and Galloway, T. D. (1981). Freedom and Equality: Dimensions of Political Ideology Among City Planners and City Managers. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 17(2): 173-193.
- Etzioni, A. (1960). Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and a Suggestion. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5: 257-278.
- Forester, John. (1980). Critical Theory and Planning Practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46, July: 275-286.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1980). Questioning and Organizing Attention: Toward a Critical Theory of Planning and Administrative Practice. *Administration and Society* 13(2): 161-205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1984). Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through. *Public Administration Review* 44(1): 23-31.
- Galloway, T. D., and Edwards, J. T. (1982). Critically Examining the Assumptions of Espoused Theory: The Case of City Planning and Management. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 48(2): 184-195.
- Howe, Elizabeth. (1980). Role Choices of Urban Planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46(4): 398-409.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Kaufman, J. L. (1979). The Ethics of Contemporary American Planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45(3): 243-255.



- \_\_\_\_\_, and Kaufman, J. L. (1981). The Values of Contemporary American Planners. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 47, July: 266-278.
- International City/County Management Association. (1993). *Municipal Year Book*. Washington, D.C.: ICMA.
- McClendon, Bruce W. and Anthony James Catanese. (1996). *Planners on Planning: Learning Planners Offer Real-life Lessons on What Workers, What doesn't, and Why*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Morley, Elaine. (1986). *A Practitioner's Guide to Public Sector Productivity Improvement*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Ravitz, M. (1988). Perils of Planning as an Executive Function. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54(2): 164-165.
- Sabatier Paul and Mazamina Daniel. (1980). *Successful Policy Implementation*. Chicago, IL. Univ. Illinois/Policy Studies.
- Shirvani, Hamid. (1985). Insider's Views on Planning Practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 51(4): 486-495.
- Starling, J. D. (1986). Ambitious Dreamers: The Oakland City Planning Department. In *Municipal Coping Strategies: "As Soon as the Dust Settles."* Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Thomas, J. M. (1988). Racial Crisis and the Fall of the Detroit City Plan Commission. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54(2): 365-374.
- Vasu, M. L. (1979). *Politics and Planning: A National Survey of American Planners*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wright, D. S. (1970). Governmental Forms and Planning Functions: The Relation of Organizational Structures to Planning Practice. In *Planning and Politics: Uneasy Partnership*, eds. T. L. Beyle and G. T. Lathrop. New York: Odyssey.

---

元聖洙 : 1997년 12월 University of Texas at Arlington에서 도시행정학박사를 취득하였으며, 논문제목은 "A Comparative Study on City Administration and Planning: Factors That Improve Productivity for Local Government Management"임.

현재 공주대학교 행정학과 조교수로서 연구의 주요 관심분야는 지방정부와 관련된 정책분석 및 평가이며, 본 학회 이외에 한국행정학회, 한국지방자치학회, 한국정책학회 등의 정회원임.

전화번호: 016-243-5455 / E-mail: sswon@kongju.ac.kr

安赫根 : 2001년 5월 University of Texas at Arlington에서 도시행정학박사를 취득하였으며, 논문 제목은 "Comparative City Land Use Allocations and Revenue Decisions"임. 현재 선문대학교와 경희대학교 등에서 강사를 하고 있으며, 주요 연구의 관심분야는 정책평가, 도시계획, 도시토지이용정책, GIS 등이며, 서울행정학회, 대한 국토·도시계획학회 등의 정회원임.

전화번호: 011-769-6394 / E-mail: supahn@freechal.com

**<Appendix> Summary of Questionnaire**Administrative Duties (Number of ~):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 01. Responding to citizen inquiries         | 02. Responding to city council requests |
| 03. Responding to mayor or manager requests | 04. City council meetings               |
| 05. Mayor or manager's office meetings      | 06. Neighborhood meetings or hearings   |

Planning Implementation (Cases of ~):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 07. Preparing and Drawing maps                        | 08. Written reports - 30 pages or less  |
| 09. Written reports - over 31 pages                   | 10. Computer programming (i.e., GIS)    |
| 11. Approved zoning cases                             | 12. Rezoning cases                      |
| 13. Subdivision and platting cases                    | 14. New ordinances                      |
| 15. Ordinance revisions                               | 16. Site plan / concept plan reviews    |
| 17. Downtown improvement plans                        | 18. Urban design plans                  |
| 19. Historic preservation plans                       | 20. Area and neighborhood plans         |
| 21. Special district plans                            | 22. Transportation plans                |
| 23. Comprehensive plans                               | 24. Environmental plans                 |
| 25. Social plans                                      | 26. Capital improvement budgeting plans |
| 27. Commercial and industrial development plans       |   |
| 28. Financial aid plans for new and existing business |   |
| 29. Relocation of business firms                      |   |
| 30. Other economic development projects or plans      |   |
| 31. Other Plans                                       |   |

Please circle the ONE number that best matches your opinion:

32. Planners are responsible for effective administration not for creating policies. Thus, we are involved in a technical and value-neutral activity.
33. The responsibilities of the council and mayor or manager is clearly distinguished. In other words, our council is responsible for policy, the mayor or manager is responsible for city administration.
34. Planners are not usually expected to choose among alternatives using both value judgements and technical expertise.
35. Whenever we have a problem, we are supposed to go to a superior for an answer.
36. Our planning commission actively participates in helping our agency develop city policies.
37. We freely communicate and cooperate with the other city departments that are under the mayor or managers control.
38. Our planning commission does not actively participate in helping our agency select and decide about final policies and programs.
39. Our agency is too closely supervised by the planning and zoning commission.
40. The mayor or manager may believe that another department is more important than our planning agency.

41. Citizens do not actively participate in helping our agency select and decide about final policies and programs.

*Please circle the ONE number that best matches your opinion:*

42. In order to take action, we have to wait until our superior approves a decision.
43. Our planning and zoning commission is not structured to provide guidance and advice to our planning agency; thus, the commission is not very supportive of our work.
44. Our planning agency frequently communicates with our planning and zoning commission in order to be effective.
45. Our planning commission actively participates in helping our agency develop plans and perform our other planning work.
46. Citizens actively participate in helping our agency develop plans and perform our other planning work.
47. Our planning agency rarely participates in implementing important city government policies.
48. Planners, here, feel as though we are constantly being watched to see that we obey all the rules.
49. We do not need to follow strict operating procedures at all times
50. Our planning agency is properly structured so that we can be truly productive.
51. Our planning agency participates in setting the city-wide work programs for planning.
52. Our staff comments and recommendations are seriously considered and often accepted by the mayor or manager and council members.

*Please circle the ONE number that best matches your opinion:*

53. Our planning agency participates in selecting and deciding about policies and programs.
54. Our staff members feel as though our agency is being too loosely supervised by mayor, manager, or council.
55. There is little, if any, flow of information between the bottom and top levels of our city government; for this reason, we hardly know what is going on...
56. Usually, citizens do not actively participate in helping our agency develop city policies.
57. Our agency's goals and objectives have been met well last year

*Finally, help us with information about your planning agency:*

58. The total number of staff (including part-time) in our planning agency is:  
\_\_\_\_\_ (persons).
59. The total number of our staff who possess (at least) a Master's degree is:  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Persons).
59. Your planning agency's total operating budget for the last fiscal year was: \$
60. In the last fiscal year, our agency paid \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for consultants.
62. Besides our planning agency, there are \_\_\_\_\_ departments in the city that perform planning work.