

**Training Agencies for Citizen Involvement:
The Many Meanings of Decentralization and their Effects on Democratic Reform**

Eva M. Witesman (primary contact)
Romney Institute of Public Management
Brigham Young University
771 TNRB
Provo, Utah 84602
Phone: (801) 422-6536
Fax: (801) 422-0311
eva_witesman@byu.edu

Charles R. Wise
John Glenn School of Public Affairs
The Ohio State University
1810 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: (614) 292-8696
Fax: (614) 292-2548
wise.983@osu.edu

Eva M. Witesman is an assistant professor of public management at the Romney Institute of Public Management at Brigham Young University where she teaches courses in statistics, public program evaluation, and nonprofit management. Her research interests include public service values, democratization, and civic engagement.

Charles R. Wise is director of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs at The Ohio State University. He is a three-time recipient of the William E. Mosher and Frederick C. Mosher Award for the best academic article published in PAR.

**Training Agencies for Citizen Involvement:
The Many Meanings of Decentralization and their Effects on Democratic Reform**

Abstract

Previous research suggests that centralized government structure may be more conducive to promulgation of training in anticorruption and policy skills training than decentralized government structure. We extend this research by examining the effect of government structure on availability of training in three different skills necessary for democratic reform: solicitation and use of citizen input, client relations, and development and use of performance indicators. We further extend the link between centralization and democratic skills training by examining the perceived role of these skills in democratic reform and extending the “centralization hypothesis” to include a discussion of the impact of state mandated training on its availability to civil service units. We find that availability of training in client relations and performance indicators is positively influenced by centralized government structure. Legal requirements have a more nuanced effect on training availability within organizations. Citizen involvement training appears to fill different needs than training in client relations and performance indicators: the former is more available when perceived as needed for expansion of civil servant responsibilities whereas the latter are more available when perceived as necessary for completing current employee functions. All three types of training are significantly more prevalent in organizations that perceive them as necessary to reform department processes or programs.

**Training Agencies for Citizen Involvement:
The Many Meanings of Decentralization and their Effects on Democratic Reform**

Introduction

The new public management (NPM) criticized public management systems in the US and abroad for being unresponsive to citizen demands, aloof to market forces that would enhance efficiency, and even undemocratic (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). This criticism led to a flurry of reform efforts in various nations and at various levels of government, giving rise to an era of government reform that was focused on privatization, enhanced citizen input, a view of citizens as clients, and heightened use of performance indicators.

The message of citizen involvement and responsiveness to the demands of both general and client publics has resonated in democratic nations and massive reform efforts have characterized the past several decades of public administration in the United States and Western Europe. These nations are among the leaders in efforts to assist democratic reform elsewhere in the world, including nations in the midst of transition from highly centralized, authoritative systems to more democratic ones.

Concurrent with the rise of new public management, Eastern Europe was in the process of rebuilding after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. Rice (1992) identified five principles likely to guide Eastern Europe in rebuilding governments in the post-Soviet context. These included, among others, retreat from the discredited central government and improved communication between citizens and government. He suggested that changing the role of government in Eastern European society would include transforming the view of government from superior to servant of the citizens, decentralizing to subnational government structures, and reforming the civil service.

The prescriptions for post-Soviet reform and principles of reform based on new public management resonated on several key points: the call for decentralization, citizen/customer orientation, community empowerment and the introduction of market forces were common themes for reform in both contexts. Domestic and international government reforms therefore operated in parallel though from very different starting points, influenced by the contemporary thought of the day.

One focus of government reform is the process of decentralizing government systems. This norm of decentralization comes in many forms, including devolution of power from higher levels of government to lower ones (Oxhorn et al., 2005), empowerment of individual units and actors in government agencies (Lipsky, 1983), and incorporation of democratic institutions through citizen involvement ranging from voting to notice and comment procedures and other forms of civic engagement (Koontz, 1999; O'Toole, 1997; Bryer, 2007). Each form of decentralization has been a major topic addressed by public administration theory about government reform in the United States and abroad (Skelcher, 2007).

Agrawal and Ribot (1999) point out that mere deconcentration of central authority or power to local units does not constitute the type of political decentralization—including accountability to citizens—intended by most democratic reform efforts, “representation and accountability are critical if devolved powers are to serve local needs...presumed benefits of decentralization become available to local populations only when empowered local actors are downwardly accountable” (474).

A primary tenet of democratic and NPM-based reform, decentralization has been associated with some caveats that may be affected by the context to which reform is applied. The successful decentralization of government structures relies heavily on background support, the culture and

institutions within extant government structures and technical design and sequencing of the decentralization process (Guess, 2005). Training of civil servants designed to aid in a cultural shift from autonomous systems to those with democratic traits is a key cultural and institutional component of this decentralization process, and should be considered in the sequencing of government decentralization (Witesman and Wise, 2009).

Among the key elements of democratic culture and institutions are extant citizen input mechanisms and an understanding of the appropriate role of citizen input in policy and administration (Agrawal and Ribot, 1999), citizen/client relations generally (Lipsky, 1983; Vigoda, 2002), and accountability mechanisms including development, use and dissemination of performance measurement indicators.

Yang and Callahan (2007) find that the “most important factor in citizen involvement decisions is the attitude public managers hold toward the value of participation” (249). This finding, along with the claim that decisions about solicitation and use of citizen input are ultimately left to public managers, makes training in this particular set of skills and values a highly relevant component of the background and training of civil servants. This is particularly true of new democracies in which no institutional history of citizen input (other than patronage) exists.

Heikkila and Isett (2007) identify performance management and citizen participation as linked and important initiatives in achieving government accountability and responsiveness, and observe that in the United States, some local governments are simultaneously incorporating both trends in an effort to reform government.

Domestic research on citizen input reforms abounds. Some scholars have examined the role of citizen input in specific areas of in policy and administration including budgeting (Ebdon and

Franklin, 2006), or have worked to refine particular mechanisms of input such as public hearings (Baker et al, 2005). Others have linked reform efforts, including e-government and other citizen input mechanisms to trust in government (Tolbert and Mossberger, 2006; Ho, 2002).

Citizen input and participation has been an area of focus particularly for local government structures, where it appears to have a positive effect on governance (Kathi and Cooper, 2005). As developing nations work toward models of local self-governance, the promise of improved governance though citizen participation holds a particularly democratic appeal (Watson, 2000).

Some research suggests that effective solicitation and use of citizen input requires a shift in the roles and relationships between citizens and administrators (King et al., 1998), indicating that cultural and institutional factors may indeed be key components of success in democratic and responsive governance. Improved trust in government has also been a major motivation for performance measurement initiatives and is hypothesized to contribute positively to the relationship between citizens and government, providing input and feedback mechanisms for both parties (Yang and Holzer, 2006). Likewise, public administrators' trust in citizens and citizen input appears to have an impact on the prevalence such input (Yang, 2005).

Critics of the new public management suggest that while citizen input and accountability are vital, the NPM focus on market-based solutions is inappropriate in a democratic context and incongruous with the unique nature of the public sector (Box et al., 2001; Hood and Peters, 2004). Several such critics suggest collaborative models in which citizens, policymakers, and public administrators work together to guide the future of government policy and administration (Vigoda, 2002; Box et al., 2001).

Clearly, solicitation and application of citizen input—whether applied in a market-influenced or collaborative model—is by no means a simple or straightforward skill. While democratic

values in nations like the United States make citizen input a vital component of the public policy and administration process, an autocratic/bureaucratic process is sometimes seen as more efficient in terms of achieving effective policy (Irvin and Stansbury, 2004; Kathi and Cooper, 2005; Vigoda, 2002). Government structures that do not have a culture or history of incorporating citizen input may see it as overly costly and inefficient, choosing to value simplicity or efficiency over democratic values. Access to training in democratic skills including use of citizen input may therefore be an important component in democratizing the culture and institutions of post-autocratic nations.

Witesman and Wise (2009) discuss an apparent paradox in administrative reform associated with democratization, suggesting that centralized government structure may be more conducive to promulgation of training in democratic skills necessary for ultimately achieving successful democratization. We extend this research by examining the effect of government structure on availability of training in three different skills necessary for democratic reform: solicitation and use of citizen input, client relations, and development and use of performance indicators.

We further extend the link between centralization and democratic skills training by examining the perceived role of these skills in democratic reform and extending the “centralization hypothesis” to include a discussion of the impact of state mandated training on its availability to civil service units.

Our research questions are as follows: (1) What effect does government structure (i.e. centralized vs. decentralized) have on availability of training in citizen input, client relations, and performance indicators? (2) What effect do centralized efforts—such as state mandates for civil service training—have on the availability of training in these democratic skills? (3) How do

perceptions about the role of citizen input, client relations and performance indicators affect availability of training to civil servants?

In order to answer these questions, we analyze reported training efforts in three specific skill sets: citizen involvement in agency decisionmaking, citizen/client relations and service, and development and use of performance indicators.

We utilize data from the Public Administration Education and Training Needs Assessment Survey administered to government officials in Ukraine as part of a larger assessment conducted by Indiana University for the Eurasia Foundation. This survey evaluates current Ukrainian civil service training practices and identifies areas of training needs to implement administrative reform.

Of the 247 respondents to the survey,¹ more than one third (40 percent) indicated that they make training in citizen involvement available to their employees. Nearly three quarters of respondents (72 percent) indicate that they provide training in client relations/service, and roughly half indicate training in development and use of performance indicators (45 percent).

This analysis contributes to the discussion of approaches to democratic reform by considering how the process of promulgating a reform effort may affect whether or not the reform effort takes place. Though the end result of democratic reform is evaluated on tenets of decentralization (Skelcher, 2007), a decentralized process of engaging in reform may not be the most effective approach.

Initial analysis suggests that in addition to a belief by public administrators in the necessity of citizen involvement training, several variables dealing with various types and levels of centralization/ decentralization have an effect on whether or not departments make citizen input

¹ The survey had 300 total respondents; 260 observations remained after standard data cleaning procedures. Of the original 300 respondents, 213 indicated training in client relations, 115 indicated training in citizen involvement, and 133 indicated training in development and use of performance indicators.

training available to employees. These include whether the agency is part of a central or decentralized government structure, centralized (national) legal requirements, and intra-agency centralization of training decisions. Control variables include size and composition of department, sources of training and funding, among other variables. Implications for the design of democratic reform efforts are discussed.

Context

Reform efforts in post-Soviet nations has been of particular interest to scholars since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Newland 1996; Rice 1992; Hale 2005; to name a few). The transition from highly centralized governmental forms to more democratic forms has been less smooth for some nations than might have been expected (Coston 1998; Newland 1996; Keraudren and van Mierlo 1998). Some nations, after experimenting with decentralized forms of government, have begun to recentralize in hopes of creating more stable government (Fish 2001; Roeder 1994). Some researchers suggest that this recentralization may be due to a failure to equip governments and civil servants with the skills and tools necessary to sustain appropriate levels of service and responsiveness under a democratic regime (Witesman and Wise, 2009).

One of the primary aims of civil service reform in the post-Soviet context is a change from previously existing institutions to arrangements more responsive to citizens. Democratization envisions that public servants will not merely serve as passive implementers of their superiors' orders, but will serve to involve citizens in policymaking and provide expert policy analysis to citizens and policymakers alike (Kotchegura 1998).

Ukraine is a democratizing former-Soviet nation in the midst of transition from a centralized structure to a decentralized structure. Ukraine, like other post-soviet nations, inherited a bureaucratic structure that is highly centralized and characterized by a top-down management

system. Concomitantly, the public management imperative for public servants was unquestioning execution of their superiors' task orders no matter how corrupt, ill-conceived, or unresponsive to citizens such orders were. Further, no analysis of policy options were prepared or presented to political superiors or to citizens. Technocratic execution was the sole mandate. Since independence, remnants of the former soviet regime's top-down bureaucratic style has largely dominated at the central government level in Ukraine and in a sizable proportion of regional and local governments, especially in the eastern and southern portions of the country. However, with the coming of the "orange revolution" (Aslund and McFaul 2006; Christensen, Rakhimkulov, and Wise 2005), and the installation of the Yushchenko presidency, a new central presence in the Presidential Administration has pressed for democratic reform of the bureaucracy.

The Ukrainian constitution passed in 1996 promised devolution of power and a future of local self-government, with an eye to the standards of the European Union. Though the Ukrainian central government retains primary control over the flow of most government resources, the 1997 Law on Local Self-Government established such autonomy to local cities, towns and villages that local governments are now the primary providers of public goods and services, and "serve as the primary interface between the state and the citizenry" (Wise et al. 2007, 29). The central government of Ukraine, however, still maintains public employees at the local level in addition to regional and national civil servants. Though locally stationed and "de-concentrated" administrative units (Verheijen 1998), these employees of the Ukrainian national government maintain ties to the central government in an explicitly hierarchical arrangement.

The presence of new, decentralized units functioning in parallel with deconcentrated, locally operating units of the central government provides a rare opportunity to observe the effects of

each government structure on civil service reform training efforts within a single cultural context (Tönnisson and Paabus 2004).

While outcomes of the Ukrainian training efforts are not yet observable, their effort is affecting two locally operating government models—one deconcentrated (centralized) and one decentralized. We are particularly interested in the points of access to the Ukrainian civil service, and whether (and to what extent) training in democratic values and institutions is available to civil servants in each government model, how legal requirements affect availability of democratic skills training, and how the perceived needs for training affect its prevalence.

Data and Methods

From July to December of 2006, Indiana University conducted an intensive assessment of public administration education and training (PA ET) in Ukraine for the Eurasia Foundation (Wise, et al. 2007). Data used in this paper is derived primarily from the Public Administration Education and Training Needs Assessment Survey administered to government officials in Ukraine as part of the PA ET effort. This survey evaluates current Ukrainian civil service training practices and identifies areas of training need. The survey was conducted in two waves, one surveying key administrative institutions in all 24 Ukrainian oblasts as well as the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, and the second surveying local self-government governments in all the oblast center cities throughout the country. The response rate for the oblast survey was 80 percent, while the response rate the local self-government survey was 56 percent.²

² More information about the survey can be found in the appendices of the report by Wise, et al. (2007), which provides detail on survey administration, including follow-up steps with initial non-respondents and a copy of the survey questionnaire.

Logistic analysis of each binary dependent variable is completed using logit models based on the default settings in the Stata 9 statistical package. Analysis was aided by use of the supplemental Stata Spost command package (Long and Freese 2005).

Research Design

The current structure of the Ukrainian government provides a unique opportunity to observe the civil service of a decentralized government structure and the civil service of a centralized government structure within the same cultural context.

The observational units in this study are offices, agencies or departments of the Ukrainian civil service as represented by department, agency or office heads in response to a survey about Ukrainian training practices. Of the 247 survey respondents in our sample,³ 98 are officials of local self-government and 149 are central government officials operating in local offices throughout Ukraine.

Locally stationed employees of the central government and employees of local self-governments share a surprising array of common characteristics that make comparisons between them particularly vivid. The most important of these characteristics, for the purpose of our analysis, is the similar access to and expectation of training by the Public administration Education and Training (PA ET) system for Ukrainian public employees. Wise, et al. describe the similarity: “In many respects the PA ET system operates in essentially the same fashion for local self-government employees as it does for central government employees. ... There is also little difference between central government units and local self-government bodies in the degree

³ The initial pool of respondents contained 300 respondents, but removal of observations that lacked key data resulted in a final sample size of 247.

to which they identify training needs of various categories of employees...Local self-government employees share similar training needs with central government employees” (2007, 32-34).

Statistically, the two public employee structures appear to be strikingly comparable. They function in the same geographic units, access the same training structures, share the same job classification structure, utilize central resources, and identify the same training needs. Though regional and national members of the Ukrainian civil service access the PA ET training system much more prevalently, the civil servants in our sample—local employees of the central government and self-government employees—have relatively similar access rates, at 15.4 percent and 18.2 percent, respectively (Wise et al. 2007, 20-21).

We are interested in the effect of various forms of decentralization on access to training in skills associated with democratic reform; namely, (a) use of citizen input in policy decisions, (b) client relations/customer service, and (c) development and use of performance indicators.

While previous work on decentralization in democratic skills training has focused only on whether the government units providing training were themselves situated in central government units or local, self-governing units (Witesman and Wise, 2009), we expand the concept of decentralization to include decentralization of training decisions, training mandates, funding sources, and other cultural and structural factors that may affect training in democratic skills. We argue that democratization, as a cultural shift in values, may be affected by a culture of decentralization in addition to structural decentralization. While this view is consistent with previous work, it contributes a broader understanding of the meaning(s) of decentralization in democratic reform.

Variables and hypotheses

Our analysis explores the impact of decentralization on the likelihood that civil servants will receive access to training in incorporation of citizen involvement. A second dependent variable, availability of technical skills training, will allow us to determine the extent to which our conclusions are general to all civil service training, and to what extent they are limited specifically to training in democratic skills and values (Witesman and Wise, 2009)

Citizen input training is a dependent variable of interest because it represents an effort to provide civil servants with the tools necessary for incorporation of citizen viewpoints in a system that was previously highly authoritative, and bottom-up reform was unknown. Provision of citizen input training to local units provides some evidence of effort to prepare civil servants for democratic reform. Our training availability variables each measure a dichotomous response to the prompt, “please indicate whether your department makes training available for employees in each of these skill areas” in which a list of skill areas was provided and respondents were invited to mark “yes” or “no.” The three skills analyzed in this paper were listed as “Involving citizens in agency decision making,” “Client relations/service,” and “Developing and using performance indicators.”

Note that while we understand that the factors and mechanisms affecting availability of each type of training may differ, our primary purpose is to compare and contrast the effect of a specific set of independent variables, representing different types of centralization, on the availability of training in democratic skills and values. We therefore utilize the same independent variables in each model for the sake of control and comparison.

An inherent assumption in our analysis is that training of civil servants provides an effective means of promoting and bringing about cultural and organizational change prerequisite to effective democratic reform, though we recognize that the relationship between reform-based

training and reform outcomes is nuanced (McCourt and Sola 1999; Healy 2001). Our dependent variables are neither outputs nor outcomes—indeed, neither outputs nor outcomes are presently observable in the Ukraine’s relatively recent efforts at democratization. Rather, these dependent variables represent important inputs to the process of transforming the civil service. We therefore present the following analysis as a means of determining the pathways we believe to be most likely to provide civil servants with access to the concepts and procedures that will facilitate overall reform.

Following Witesman and Wise (2009), we control for organization characteristics (size, service composition, gender composition, age, education, and location), cultural variables (considerations made in making training decisions), goals of training, funding sources, and training sources.

To the centralization questions we add data on the perceived “need for skills,” in which respondents indicated whether employees in the organization need each specific type of skill in order to (1) “carry out current functions and tasks,” (2) “expand their responsibilities within their current position or move into new positions with expanded responsibilities,” and/or to (3) “reform and change department processes and programs.” Table 2 describes the proportion of respondents indicating agreement with the need for each skill to meet organizational needs. Note that while there is strong agreement (88 percent of respondents agree) that client relations/service is necessary to complete current employee functions and tasks, most other indicators are fairly evenly split between agreement and nonagreement regarding the utility of these skills either for current functions, expansion of functions, or reforming organizational processes or programs. The question regarding the correlation of the perceived need and the availability of training is therefore valid.

This need for skills variable is an important question, a useful statistical control, and is specific to the dependent variable in each model.⁴ In other words, in the models predicting availability of citizen input training, we have included variables that indicate whether the organization perceives citizen input training as necessary for current functions, expanding responsibilities, or reforming processes and programs. Likewise for the client relations and performance indicator models. We do not have specific expectations regarding the availability of training being impacted by perceived need of various skills (i.e. whether the skills are perceived as needed for completion or expansion of employee tasks for each type of skill). We would expect, however, any relationship between perceived need and availability of training to be positive. Negative correlation between these need variables and the availability of training would indicate a significant mismatch between training available and training desired.

H1: Perception that skills in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and/or (c) performance indicators are necessary for (1) completion of current civil servant functions or (2) expansion of civil servant responsibilities will have a positive impact on the availability of training in those respective skills.

We also hypothesize that a perception that these specific democratic skills are necessary for reform will have a positive impact on the availability of training in such. *H2: Perception that skills in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and (c) performance indicators are necessary for reform of civil service process and programs will have a positive impact on the availability of training in those respective skills.*

In order to answer the question of impacts of various kinds of decentralization on the availability of training in citizen involvement, client relations and performance indicators, we

⁴ Due to the structure and content of the survey, these variables are unavailable for the policy skills, anticorruption and technical skills training variables used utilized by Witesman and Wise (2009).

will analyze and interpret key indicators of centralization or decentralization, including government structure and the impact of legal requirements on availability of training in specific skills.

The first indicator is structural decentralization, and indicates whether the organization represented in the survey response is a regionally operating unit of the central government (central admin=1), or whether it is an agency of the decentralized local self-government structure (central admin=0). The Ukrainian post-Soviet context—in which parallel centralized and decentralized governments operate side-by-side as regional/local offices as the government transitions to democratic systems—is a rare opportunity to observe such parallel government structures in a single cultural context. Following the conclusions of Witesman and Wise (2009) regarding policy skills training and anticorruption training, we might expect a centralized government structure to have a positive impact on training in the democratic skills examined here.

H3: Structural centralization will have a positive impact on the availability of training in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and (c) performance indicators.

Two cultural factors included in the models indicate cultural centralization or decentralization. First, whether employees are primarily responsible for their own training decisions is an indicator of internal, operational decentralization within the organizational structure. This culture of decentralization may actually indicate a value shift, making the governance of such an agency more democratic. Greater affinity for democratization and open decisionmaking processes and thus make training in citizen input and client relations more likely. This assumes that some threshold of decentralization/democratization may be reached that neutralizes the benefit of having a centralized training approach. Because the current theory

suggests a benefit to centralized structural characteristics, we hypothesize that this theory holds; however, we suggest that cultural factors that suggest an affinity for democratization may have a mitigating effect on the centralization hypothesis in this case.

H4: Centralization of training decisions within an agency will have a positive impact on the availability of training in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and (c) performance indicators.

The second cultural factor that may affect availability of training in democratic skills is whether or not an agency uses legal requirements mandated in new or amended legislation as a criterion for making decisions about which employees should receive training. Agencies that report legal requirements as a key criterion for making employee training decisions are appealing to a highly centralized authority for training decisions. Where specific types of skill training are mandated in the law, we would expect this kind of cultural centralization to have a positive impact on availability of training. Where a specific type of skills training is not mandated, however, we would expect this type of centralization to have a negative impact on the availability of that type of training.

H5: Using legal requirements as a criterion for employee training decisions within an agency will have a positive impact on the availability of training in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and (c) performance indicators.

Respondents to the survey were asked, in addition to which criteria they used in making employee training decisions, what the goals of state mandated training were. Among the options listed was the goal to “conform to existing or new legal and/or procedural requirements,” while other options included various other individual and organizational benefits (respondents were asked to select all that apply). As with the cultural importance of legal authority in making

individual employment decisions, we expect the goal of legal conformity to have a generally positive effect on the availability of state-mandated democratic skills training.

H6: Having legal and/or procedural conformity as a goal for state mandated training within an agency will have a positive impact on the availability of training in (a) citizen input, (b) client relations, and (c) performance indicators.

Findings

The hypotheses described in this analysis relate various forms of decentralization to their impacts on the availability of training in three areas key to citizen engagement and democratization; namely, training in citizen input, training in customer or client relations, and training in development and use of performance indicators. Each of these types of training relates to a key element of public management reform and incorporation of democratic skills and values. It has been hypothesized that centralization in its various forms (as measured by the variables in this study) will have positive impacts on the availability of training for civil servants in Ukraine.

While some findings from this analysis are consistent with previous research on the relationship between centralization and the availability of democratic skills training, the results suggest that different forms of centralization have different impacts on the availability of training.

The variables measuring need for skills were specific to each dependent variable and are instructive in understanding the specific purposes envisioned for each of the three types of training from the perspective of survey respondents.

Indicating that citizen involvement training is necessary for reforming process or programs increases the odds of citizen involvement training being available to employees by a factor of 11.7, holding all other variables constant ($\beta=2.459$, $z=4.84$). This finding is significant at the

$\alpha=0.001$ level. Indicating that citizen involvement training is necessary for expanding employee responsibilities increases the odds of citizen involvement training being available to employees by a factor of 6.1, holding all other variables constant ($\beta=1.804$, $z=3.50$). This finding is significant at the $\alpha=0.001$ level. Needing training for current employee functions does not appear to be related to availability of citizen involvement training.

Training in client relations also appears to be highly correlated with reform. Indicating that client relations training is necessary for reform of processes and programs increases the odds of that type of training being available to employees by a factor of 4.1, holding all other variables constant ($\beta=1.408$, $z=2.78$). This finding is significant at the $\alpha=0.01$ level. Unlike training in citizen involvement, however, training in client relations is uncorrelated with expansion of employee responsibilities but is correlated with performing current functions. Indicating that client relations training is necessary to perform current functions increases the odds of client relations training availability by a factor of 4.1 ($\beta=1.417$, $z=2.31$). This finding is significant at the $\alpha=0.05$ level.

Need for skills variables were only slightly correlated with availability of training in development and use of performance indicators. Indication of use for this training in performing current functions ($\beta=0.665$, $z=1.70$) and in reforming process and programs ($\beta=0.727$, $z=1.91$) each increase the odds of this training being available by a factor of roughly 2. These findings are significant at the $\alpha=0.1$ level but not at $\alpha=0.05$.

Being a locally operating agency under the centralized government system did not significantly correlate with training in citizen involvement, but was weakly ($\alpha=0.1$) correlated with availability of training in client relations, increasing the odds of this kind of training by a factor of 2.5 ($\beta=0.934$, $z=1.95$). Being part of the centralized government system also positively

correlated with availability of performance indicator training ($\beta=1.169$, $z=2.67$, $\alpha=0.01$), and increased the odds of availability of this training by a factor of 3.2. The positive correlation between association with central government—as opposed to local self-governing agency units—is consistent with previous research findings on availability of democratic skills training.

Two variables in this analysis relate to the role of legal and/or procedural conformity in availability of democratic skills training, and each appears to have a very different impact on the availability of training. The first of these, the cultural variable indicating whether or not legal requirements are considered in making training decisions, is negatively correlated ($\alpha=0.1$) with availability of training in citizen involvement ($\beta=-0.976$, $z=-1.95$), client relations ($\beta=-0.900$, $z=-1.94$), and performance indicators ($\beta=-0.718$, $z=-1.88$), decreasing the odds of availability of each type of training by roughly half.

The second variable, asking respondents to indicate whether legal or procedural conformity is a goal of training, is positively correlated ($\alpha=0.01$) with availability of citizen involvement training, but is uncorrelated ($\alpha=0.1$)—though with a positive coefficient—with each of the other types of training. The general finding that consideration of legal requirements decreases availability of training but conformity with legal and procedural requirements as a goal of training increasing availability of training appears to be robust to various model specifications⁵.

Controls for funding and training sources do not appear to have systematic significant effects on the availability of training, with availability of funding and training sources appearing to be more related to which organizations offer funding or training in which areas rather than any kind

⁵ Alternate specifications included including only one of the variables at a time, adding an interaction term, decomposing the legal/procedural conformity variable into its component parts, and removing various potentially interactive control variables. In all of these specifications, the coefficient direction remained consistently negative for the variable for consideration of legal requirements and positive for the variable indicating legal/procedural conformity as a goal of training. In the interaction model, the interaction term was significant ($\alpha=0.1$) and positive for the citizen involvement model and the legal cultural variable remained significant, though the legal/procedural conformity goal variable was no longer significant in models predicting any of the three dependent variables.

of systematic effect. Similarly, controls for organizational characteristics do not appear to have any systematic effects on the availability of democratic skills training. We maintain, however, that these are meaningful controls and should therefore remain in the statistical models.

Discussion

As might be expected, training availability is highly correlated with perceived need for training, and these perceived needs are nuanced based on the democratic skill being considered. All three types of training considered here appear to be consistent with the purpose of process or program reform, though only citizen input training is seen as necessary for expansion of civil service responsibilities. Client relations and performance indicator training appear instead to be perceived as necessary for public servants to complete their current functions.

This analysis also lends some support to the hypothesis that centralized culture may be more conducive to availability of training in democratic skills. The models presented here provide some additional support for previous claims that affiliation with central government may positively impact availability of training in client relations and performance indicators, though the same conclusion is not supported in the model predicting availability of training in citizen input.

The role of legal requirements—an indicator of centralization of training objectives through government mandate—appears to have a rather nuanced effect on availability of training at the operational level. The negative correlation of consideration of legal requirements on availability of training suggests that where legal considerations are made, training in the skills examined here is not made available, and where it is not considered, training in these skills is made available. This suggests, perhaps, that legal requirements as they currently exist do not clearly indicate a state mandate for training in citizen input, client relations, or development and use of

performance indicators. Thus, if legal considerations are of primary concern to an organization, training in these skills is ignored because it is not required by law. Conversely, if legal requirements are of little concern, non-mandated training is more likely to occur.

In the case of citizen involvement training, having legal or procedural conformity be a particular goal of training had a significant and positive impact on availability of training. Because legal requirements as a training consideration is negatively correlated with this dependent variable, it may be that some non-legally binding procedural requirements are among the motivating forces encouraging training in this democratic skill. While no law exists mandating citizen involvement, various issued orders and directives originating primarily from the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers in 2003- 2004 sought to bureaucratize the process of citizen involvement in decision making. A 2003 resolution by the Cabinet of Ministers to increase citizen involvement in the decision making process encouraged such mechanisms as public hearings and public councils consisting of NGO and university representatives. A subsequent directive instructed each ministry to create these public councils, thereby involving citizens (primarily NGO representatives) in their decision making processes. Yet another directive assigned the task of increasing public involvement in the decision making process to deputy heads of executive agencies at all levels. The empirical analysis suggests that these directives were successful in making training in citizen input more available to organization employees.

The Ukrainian context suggests that mandates for democratic skills training need not be legal requirements; other pressures for procedural conformity may also have a positive impact on availability of training. Whether this must be a primarily centralized force for conformity or whether decentralized, mimetic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) would have a similar effect is unclear.

Because of the pressures on reforming governments to decentralize, it is important to recognize other means for maintaining effective pressures for cultural democratic reform, including the training of civil servants in democratic skills. The findings of this paper suggest that while centralized government structure appears to be a strong tool in promulgating such training, other centralized methods, including pressures for legal and procedural conformity, may yet remain effective tools in enhancing the availability of democratic skills training for civil servants at all levels of government.

The findings of this paper also suggest that organizational reform efforts are most effective when supported from within; organizations that perceive a need for democratic skills are significantly more likely to seek training in these areas, even when controlling for a variety of other factors and influences.

Of the three perceived organizational needs examined here (current functions, expansion of employee responsibilities, and reform), it is heartening to note that in all three models, the need most powerful in predicting availability of democratic skills training was not urgency or immediate need, but rather a desire to reform processes and programs.

This combination of reform from within and a support for skills training from without may be a key formula for ensuring needed cultural, not just structural, reforms in democratizing nations.

References

- Aslund, Anders and McFaul, David. Eds. 2006. *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine's Democratic Breakthrough*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Baker, William, Lon Addams, and Brian Davis. 2005. Critical factors for enhancing municipal public hearings. *Public Administration Review* 65(4):490-499.

- Box, Richard, Gary Marshall, B.J. Reed, and Christine Reed. 2001. New public management and substantive democracy. *Public Administration Review* 61(5):608-619.
- Brinkerhoff, Derick and Jennifer Coston. 1999. International Development Management in a Globalized World. *Public Administration Review* 59(4):346-361.
- Bryer, T. A. (2007). Toward a relevant agenda for a responsive public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17:3 pp. 479-500.
- Christensen, Robert K. Edward Rakhimkulov, and Charles R. Wise. 2005. The Ukrainian Orange Revolution Brought More than a New President: What Kind of Democracy will the Institutional Changes Bring? *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*. 38:207-230.
- Cogburn, Jerrell D. 2005. The Benefits Of Human Resource Centralization: Insights From A Survey Of Human Resource Directors In A Decentralized State. *Public Administration Review* 65(4):424-435.
- Connaughton, Bernadette and Tony Verheijen, eds. 1999. Higher Education Programmes In Public Administration: Ready For The Challenge Of Europeanisation? Limerick: Centre for European Studies.
- Corkery, Joan 1998. Management Of Public Service Reform: A Comparative Review Of Experiences In The Management Of Programmes Of Reform Of The Administrative Arm Of Central Government. Fairfax, VA: IOS Press.
- Coston, Jennifer. 1998. Administrative Avenues to Democratic Governance: The Balance of Supply and Demand. *Public Administration and Development* 185:479-493.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*, 48:147-160.

- Ebdon, Carol and Aimee Franklin. 2006. Citizen participation in budgeting theory. *Public Administration Review* 66(3):437-448.
- Fish, M. Steven. 2001. The Dynamics of Democratic Erosion. In *Postcommunism and the Theory of Democracy* by Anderson et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frederickson, H. George and Kevin B. Smith. 2003. *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. Jackson, TN: Westview press.
- Goetz, Klaus H. 2001. Making Sense of Post-Communist Central Administration: Modernization, Europeanization or Latinization? *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(6):1032-1051.
- Guess, George. 2005. Comparative decentralization lessons from Pakistan, Indonesia, and the Philippines. *Public Administration Review* 65(2):217-230.
- Hale, Henry E. 2005. Regime cycles: Democracy, Autocracy, and Revolution in Post-Soviet Eurasia. *World Politics* 58:133-165.
- Healy, Pdraig. 2001. Training and Public Sector Reform: An Integrated Approach. *Public Administration and Development* 21:309-319.
- Heikkila, Tanya and Kimberly Isett. 2007. Citizen involvement and performance management in special-purpose governments. *Public Administration Review* 67(2):238-248.
- Hicks, James F. and Bartlorniej Kaminski. 1995. Local Government Reform and Transition from Communism: The Case of Poland. *Journal of Developing Societies* 9(1):1-20.
- Ho, Alfred. 2002. Reinventing local governments and the e-government initiative. *Public Administration Review* 62(4):434-444.
- Hogson, Geoffrey. 2006. What Are Institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues* 40(1).

- Hood, Christopher and Guy Peters. 2004. The Middle Aging of New Public Management: Into the Age of Paradox? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14:267-282.
- Irvin, Renee and John Stansbury. 2004. Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort? *Public Administration Review* 64(1):55-65.
- Kathi, Pradeep and Terry Cooper. 2005. Democratizing the administrative state: connecting neighborhood councils and city agencies. *Public Administration Review* 65(5):559-568.
- King, Cheryl, Kathryn Feltey and Bridget Susel. 1998. The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public Administration Review* 58(4):317-326.
- Klingner, Donald E. 1996. Public Personnel Management and Democratization: A View from Three Central American Republics. *Public Administration Review* 56(4): 390-399.
- Kolisnichenko, Natalya. 2005. National Organizational Arrangements for Delivering Public Administration Education and Training. Unpublished paper commissioned by UN/IASIA joint taskforce on improving public administration education and training.
- Koontz, T. M. (1999). Administrators and citizens: Measuring agency officials' efforts to foster and use public input in forest policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9:2 pp 251-280.
- Kotchegura, Alexander. 1998. The Russian Civil Service: Legitimacy and Performance. In *Civil Service Systems in Central and Eastern Europe* edited by Tony Verheijen, 15-46. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Long, Edward and Aimee L. Franklin. 2004. The Paradox of Implementing The Government Performance And Results Act: Top-Down Direction For Bottom-Up Implementation. *Public Administration Review*. 64(3):309-319.
- Long, J. Scott and Jeremy Freese. 2005. *Regression Models for Categorical Outcomes Using Stata*. Second Edition. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Lucking, Richard. 2003. *Lessons on Best Practice in the Approach to Effective Civil Service Training: A Comparative Study of Selected Countries from Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union 1989 to 2003*. New York: UNDP.
<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UNTC/UNPAN012894.pdf>
- McCourt, W. and N. Sola. 1999. Using Training to Promote Civil Service Reform: A Tanzanian Local Government Case Study. *Public Administration and Development* 19:63-75.
- McGill, Ronald 1997. Civil Service Reform in Developing Countries: A Strategic Perspective From An Institutional Development Base. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 10(4):254-267.
- Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* 83:340-363.
- Mintzberg, Henry. 1989. *Mintzberg on Management*. New York: Free Press.
- Newland, Chester A. 1996. Transformational Challenges in Central and Eastern Europe and Schools of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(4):382-389.
- Nunberg, Barbara. 2000. *Ready for Europe: Public Administration Reform and European Union Accession in Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- O'Toole, Lawrence J. (1997). The implications for democracy in a networked bureaucratic world. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 7:3 pp.443-459.

- OECD 1996. *Ethics in the Public Service: Current Issues and Practices*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD 1997. Public Service Training Systems in OECD Countries. SIGMA Papers no. 16, August, 1997 Paris: OECD.
- Oxhorn, Philip, Joseph S. Tulchin, and Andrew D. Selee (eds.) (2005). *Decentralization, Democratic Governance, and Civil Society in Comparative Perspective: Africa, Asia, and Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Philippe Keraudren and Hans van Mierlo 1998. Reform of Public Management In Hungary: Main Directions In Public Management In Central And Eastern Europe. In *Innovations in Public Management: Perspectives from East and West* edited by Tony Verheijen and David Coombes, 143-158. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Polidano, Charles. 2001. Why Civil Service Reforms Fail. IDPM Public Policy and Management Working paper no. 16. http://www.man.ac.uk/idpm/idpm_dp.htm
- Rainey, Hal G. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. 1997. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rausch, James E. and Peter B. Evans. 2000. Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic Performance In Less Developed Countries. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75:49-71.
- Rice, Eric M. 1992. Public Administration in Post-Socialist Eastern Europe. *Public Administration Review* 52(2):116-124.
- Rice, Eric. 1992. Public administration in post-Socialist Eastern Europe. *Public Administration Review* 52(2):116-125.
- Roeder, Philip G. 1994. Varieties of Post-Soviet Regimes. *Post-Soviet Affairs* 10:61-101.
- Ryan, Jeffrey J. 2004. Decentralization and Democratic Instability: The Case of Costa Rica. *Public Administration Review* 64(1):81-91.

- Simon, Herbert A. 1946. The Proverbs of Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 6(1):53-67.
- Skelcher, Chris (2007). Does Democracy Matter? A Transatlantic Research Design on Democratic Performance and Special Purpose Governments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17:1 pp. 61-76.
- Thompson, James. 1967. *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tolbert, Caroline and karent Mossberger. 2006. The effects of e-government on trust and confidence in government. *Public Administration Review* 66(3):354-370.
- Tõnnisson, Kristiina and Kaido Paabus (2004). Securing common knowledge and values in decentralized public training system. The case of Estonia. United Nations Online Network in Public Administration and Finance, <http://unpan.org>
- Tõnnisson, Kristiina and Kaido Paabus. 2004. Securing Common Knowledge and Values In Decentralized Public Training System. The Case of Estonia. UNPAN paper accessed on October 15, 2007 from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/NISPAcee/UNPAN018458.pdf>.
- Verheijen, Tony. 1998. "Public Management in Central And Eastern Europe: The Nature Of The Problem. In *Innovations in Public Management: Perspectives from East and West* edited by Tony Verheijen and David Coombes, 207-219. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Vigoda, Eran. 2002. From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens and the next generation of public administration. *Public Administration Review*. 62(5):527-540.
- Watson, Douglas. 2000. The international resource cities program: Building capacity in Bulgarian local governments. *Public Administration Review* 60(5):457-463.

- Wise, Charles R., et al. 2007. Strategic Assessment Of The Present State Of Public Administration Education And Training In Ukraine And Prospects For Launching A Capacity Building Institution For Public Officials. Unpublished paper commissioned by the Eurasia foundation.
- Witesman, Eva M. and Charles R. Wise (2009). The Centralization/Decentralization Paradox. *Public Administration Review* 69:1, pp116-127.
- Yang, Kaifeng and Marc Holzer. 2006. The performance-trust link: Implications for performance measurement. *Public Administration Review* 66(1):114-126.
- Yang, Kaifeng and Mathe Callahan. 2007. Citizen involvement efforts and bureaucratic responsiveness: Participatory values, stakeholder pressures, and administrative practicality. *Public Administration Review* 67(2): 249-264.
- Yang, Kaifeng. 2005. Public administrators' trust in citizens: A missing link in citizen involvement efforts. *Public Administration Review* 65(3):273-285.
- Yoder, Jennifer A. 2003. Decentralisation and Regionalisation After Communism: Administrative and Territorial Reform In Poland and the Czech Republic. *Europe-Asia Studies* 55(2):263-286.
- Agrawal, Arun and Jesse Ribot. 1999. Accountability in decentralization: A framework with South Asian and West African Cases. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 33(4):473-502.

Table 1: Logistic regression standard and factor change coefficients for citizen involvement training, client relations training, and performance indicator availability of training dependent variables (n=247)

	Citizen Involvement				Client Relations				Performance Indicators			
	β	e^{β}	z		β	e^{β}	z		β	e^{β}	z	
Need for skills												
Current functions	-0.251	0.8	-0.53		1.417	4.1	2.31	**	0.665	1.9	1.70	*
Expand employee responsibilities	1.804	6.1	3.50	****	-0.216	0.8	-0.45		0.070	1.1	0.17	
Reform process/programs	2.459	11.7	4.84	****	1.408	4.1	2.78	***	0.727	2.1	1.91	*
Centralization												
Central admin.	0.078	1.1	0.16		0.934	2.5	1.95	*	1.169	3.2	2.67	***
Org characteristics												
Agency size	-0.002	1.0	-0.85		0.003	1.0	0.97		0.001	1.0	0.79	
Pct. service	0.040	1.0	2.19	**	0.014	1.0	0.76		0.012	1.0	0.70	
Pct. female	0.024	1.0	1.80	*	0.005	1.0	0.45		0.006	1.0	0.59	
Pct. postsecondary	-0.019	1.0	-0.63		0.017	1.0	0.60		0.004	1.0	0.19	
Pct. 46 or older	0.021	1.0	1.81	*	0.023	1.0	2.15	**	0.012	1.0	1.33	
Proximity to train ctr.	0.004	1.0	1.15		-0.002	1.0	-0.66		0.002	1.0	0.76	
Cultural variables												
Employee decision	1.051	2.9	1.05		1.039	2.8	1.00		0.756	2.1	0.87	
Seniority considered	-0.786	0.5	-1.21		-0.776	0.5	-1.40		-0.846	0.4	-1.67	*
Rank considered	-0.418	0.7	-0.46		-0.627	0.5	-0.78		0.119	1.1	0.17	
Job need considered	-0.565	0.6	-0.70		-1.161	0.3	-1.62		0.045	1.0	0.07	
Promotion considered	-1.213	0.3	-2.42	**	-0.266	0.8	-0.59		-0.541	0.6	-1.45	
Legal requirements	-0.976	0.4	-1.95	*	-0.900	0.4	-1.94	*	-0.718	0.5	-1.88	*
Impacts promotion	0.613	1.8	1.06		0.765	2.1	1.50		0.510	1.7	1.11	
Impacts pay	-0.585	0.6	-0.49		2.251	9.5	1.30		0.392	1.5	0.40	
Required for retention	0.614	1.8	0.75		1.623	5.1	1.70	*	-0.134	0.9	-0.22	
Candidates lack skill	0.677	2.0	1.55		0.367	1.4	0.89		0.075	1.1	0.21	
Goals of training												
Legal/procedural conformity	1.086	3.0	2.69	***	0.192	1.2	0.60		0.312	1.4	1.08	
Current task perform.	-0.405	0.7	-1.01		0.538	1.7	1.49		-0.311	0.7	-0.93	
New tasks in dept.	-0.245	0.8	-0.60		0.410	1.5	1.23		0.316	1.4	1.03	
Prep. for leadership	0.206	1.2	0.62		0.345	1.4	1.08		0.132	1.1	0.50	
New tasks out of dept	0.890	2.4	1.88	*	0.485	1.6	0.87		0.634	1.9	1.67	*
Improve org perform.	0.884	2.4	2.08	**	-0.093	0.9	-0.28		0.544	1.7	1.70	*
Employee satisfaction	0.187	1.2	0.61		-0.351	0.7	-1.21		0.145	1.2	0.63	
Source of funding												
State budget	0.620	1.9	1.15		0.448	1.6	0.90		-0.213	0.8	-0.48	
Ministerial/dept.	1.582	4.9	2.65	***	0.404	1.5	0.71		0.142	1.2	0.31	
Mgmt. dev. institutes	0.682	2.0	1.48		0.251	1.3	0.53		0.788	2.2	2.01	**
Employees	0.649	1.9	1.16		1.244	3.5	1.99	**	-0.270	0.8	-0.57	
External grants	1.773	5.9	2.67	***	0.676	2.0	1.06		0.434	1.5	0.79	
Source of training												
University PA schools	0.047	1.0	0.09		0.010	1.0	0.02		0.063	1.1	0.15	
Institutes of PA	-0.638	0.5	-1.11		0.005	1.0	0.01		-0.254	0.8	-0.60	
Mgmt. dev. institutes	-0.066	0.9	-0.13		0.760	2.1	1.61		1.092	3.0	2.67	***
Ukrainian Acad. PA	0.682	2.0	1.35		-0.170	0.8	-0.38		-0.289	0.7	-0.72	
Foreign organizations	1.284	3.6	1.94	*	0.069	1.1	0.09		-0.766	0.5	-1.30	
Ukrainian NGOs	-0.426	0.7	-0.52		0.916	2.5	0.76		-0.762	0.5	-0.97	
Ministerial academy	-1.560	0.2	-2.28	**	-0.020	1.0	-0.03		0.125	1.1	0.24	
Regional training ctr.	-0.062	0.9	-0.11		-0.324	0.7	-0.63		-0.792	0.5	-1.79	*
Other source	0.694	2.0	1.11		0.077	1.1	0.12		-0.975	0.4	-1.77	*
Constant	-6.971	--	-1.86		-5.065		-1.57		-4.247		-1.60	
Pseudo R²	.4682				.3404				.2976			

Note: * $P \leq .1$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq .01$; **** $P \leq .001$

Table 2: Proportion of respondents agreeing with need for skill areas to meet organization needs (binary responses; n=247)		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Proportion of respondents (Agree)</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>
Involving citizens in agency decision making		
Necessary to carry out current functions and tasks	0.46	0.032
Necessary to expand employee responsibilities within current position or in a new position	0.40	0.031
Necessary to reform and change department processes and programs	0.48	0.032
Client relations/service		
Necessary to carry out current functions and tasks	0.88	0.021
Necessary to expand employee responsibilities within current position or in a new position	0.49	0.032
Necessary to reform and change department processes and programs	0.46	0.032
Developing and using performance indicators		
Necessary to carry out current functions and tasks	0.64	0.031
Necessary to expand employee responsibilities within current position or in a new position	0.49	0.032
Necessary to reform and change department processes and programs	0.52	0.032