A VISION FOR THE NEXT CENTURY-
GOVERNMENT WITHOUT CORRUPTION

Dixon E. Southworth
NYS Department of Civil Service

David M. Van Slyke, Ph.D.
Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University

Please do not cite without authors' permission.

A Vision for the Next Century- Government Without Corruption

 This paper applies a new framework for administering public programs developed by Southworth and Van Slyke to acts of corruption. The authors review several recent articles on topics pertaining to ethics in government and propose that corruption, rather than being a violation of a specific law or moral code, is visible by its corrupting influence on others that erodes the "social contract" agreement made by responsible citizens.

This paper briefly discusses the new framework and then presents background information on the topic of corruption. Then, three types of corruption are linked to the underlying purposes of public programs. Using data collected from a statewide telephone survey of 800 Georgians, called the *Georgia Poll*, citizen perceptions are examined in the area of service delivery, public corruption, and the beliefs that government is good and effective.

Finally, this paper describes a new social justice warrior, who attacks existing social norms and programs to achieve greater social justice and advance social goals not readily accepted by the general public. In advocating for unwelcome changes, these warriors are often accused of violating the social contract and being "Un-American." Subjected to close scrutiny and often acts of violence because of their high profile, these new warriors are also very often accused of corruption, sometimes legitimately and sometimes not. This paper will explore the rhetoric in such cases.

It is the ambitious hope of the authors that, by shedding light on different acts of corruption, this paper will facilitate movement towards a vision for the next century of government without corruption. Our optimism is not predicated on the smallness of the task, because it is substantial, but rather on how far we have already come since the birth of our nation just a little over two centuries ago.

THE NEW FRAMEWORK

The new framework for public programs developed by Southworth and Van Slyke[1] begins with one unifying ethical tenet: *Neither provide nor charge for unnecessary services.* From this tenet are derived two fundamental public program purposes: 1) Public programs must provide *important services* that should not and cannot be provided by private businesses, and 2) Government is responsible for advancing *social justice*.

The authors propose that there are three public program <u>service</u> components: 1) Solve or prevent societal problems, 2) Provide care and compassion, and 3) Through the distribution of information and other resources, enable people to solve their own problems. The authors propose there are four public program <u>social justice</u> components: 1) Equitable laws and procedures that make a level playing field on which people who are motivated to do their best can enjoy substantial individual rewards, 2) Generous distribution of our nation's wealth to all our citizens, especially the downtrodden and most needy, 3) Due process procedures that provide a mechanism for citizen dissent, and 4) The social contract that holds people accountable for being responsible citizens and for helping themselves to the fullest extent possible when aided by public programs.

The intended <u>impact</u> of these public programs is to advance the *belief*s among our citizens that 1) These programs provide important value; 2) These programs are fiscally responsible; 3) These programs properly balance individual rights and benefits against rights and benefits for all; and 4) Because of these programs, our government is good. Finally, the desired <u>sustainable result</u> of this system is *social harmony*.

From this structure, the authors identify eight fallacies about measuring program performance that block clearer understanding of public program successes and failures and better accountability. One of these <u>fallacies</u> is that *corruption is always going to exist, and cannot and should not be measured or confronted.* The reason the authors list this fallacy is the deleterious effect corruption has on the perceptions of public programs,

potentially undermining the best efforts of those public administrators committed to improving program performance.

ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

The Winter 1999 edition of *Public Personnel Management* was a special issue on the topic of ethics in contemporary human resource management. The issue begins by making a very clear point that ethics laws are not sufficient to establish boundaries of ethical behaviors. To portray any action that is not illegal as being okay is seen as the "low road" to ethics (Menzel, p. 519).

One recurring theme in several of these articles is ethical behavior requires adherence to a higher moral purpose, one that transcends individual acts. Chandler begins his article by citing the Athenian Oath, "'We will never bring disgrace to this our city by any act of dishonesty or cowardice, nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks...We will strive unceasingly to quicken the public sense of public duty; that thus, in all these ways we will transmit this city not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us'" (p. 506). Then Chandler, drawing from the words of Aristotle and Hegel, goes on to say that public servants acting as representative citizens "do good acts because they have been prescribed by the requirements of virtue, good manners, the revealed word of God, traditions, the elders, the common law, the Constitution, or some other source of transcendental authority...To be moral is to live in accordance with the moral tradition of one's community" (pp. 507-8).

Menzel notes that in the late 1960s at a retreat called "Minnowbrook," a group of young academics "put forth a call for a New Public Administration...for promoting social justice and equity" (p. 517). Pfiffner builds on this theme by saying that public service ethics are more than just ethical behaviors. They also require "a dedication to the public interest and a commitment to mission accomplishment" (p.541). Burke presents a new set of "Es," replacing efficiency, effectiveness and economy with empathy, evaluation and

ethics (pp. 533-4).

Many of these authors seem to regard work outside public service by contracting out of services as less honorable and doomed to be corrupt. "Hollowing out bureaucracy and eliminating regulations will make a seedbed for corruption and scandal...contracts have always made a tempting environment for kickbacks and fraud" (Pfiffner, p. 550). These writers also seem to reject a utilitarian basis of government ethics in which the public interest is merely the sum of its individual parts, and '"the public interest, so defined is, essentially, no public interest, only competing interests"'(Menzel, p. 520).

In a separate article, Victor and Cullen present a different image of ethics in government, by presenting three ethical criteria for behaving in an organization: egoism or self-interest, benevolence and principle. Then they create a matrix of ethical behaviors by looking at these three types of ethical actions at the individual level, the organizational level and the cosmopolitan (societal) level (p.104). In this context, it is clear that an individual has many very different vantage points when considering an ethical approach to an action or activity. For example, at the individual level, an act of benevolence can be viewed as helping a friend. At the organizational level an act of principle can be viewed as following a company rule or procedure. At the cosmopolitan level an act of principle can be viewed as following a law or professional code. Problems occur when, for example, a benevolent act of helping a friend violates an organizational or societal principle. Thus, many ethical decisions can be most complex and in many ways contradictory. And when referencing a higher "transcendental authority," we must ask, "Upon who's transcendental authority should we rely?"

As mentioned earlier, the new framework for public programs presents four components to social justice- equity (procedural justice), equality (distributive justice), due process, and the social contract. Note that these components, like the three ethical criteria of self-interest, benevolence and principle, are often contradictory and so require judgment and group consent in their applications. For example, equity (procedural

4

justice) implies a system in which all citizens are subjected to the same procedures, thus giving no one an unfair advantage. Equality (distributive justice) implies that, regardless of the procedures in place, everyone is entitled to a minimum level of our country's resources (e.g. public education).[2] Moreover, procedures may be applied equally, but have very different impacts on population subgroups. For example, a government incentive to use public transportation applies only to those people where public transportation is available- one standard, but not universally applicable.[3] The social contract provision to be a good citizen implies following established laws and societal agreements, but dissent requires one to publicly object to established laws and societal agreements when procedural errors or unfair or disparate results are discovered. This paper, using the social justice component of public programs in the context of explaining ethical behaviors, advocates a utilitarian view of ethical behaviors wherein structured disruption is needed for sustainable social harmony.

As mentioned earlier, one of the desired long-term impacts of this new framework is to foster the belief that public programs provide important "value." Kamakura and Novak performed regression analyses on several value systems and identified four underlying value domains: achievement, hedonism (pleasure), empathy (human relations) and security (p. 125). Public programs, therefore, to be perceived as having value must address several or all of these value domains (or other value domains that might be added to these four). Moreover, any "transcendental authority" must also address our value domains if it is to provide meaning to its followers. Some such authorities may focus on security and human relations while others may focus on achievement and pleasure. But any "transcendental authority" that does not serve our value systems is, by definition, purposeless and doomed for extinction. Thus, a government ethic, predicated on social justice, must be utilitarian and flexible because people are different and always changing; and we place different emphases in our daily lives on these ethical criteria and value domains.

CORRUPTION

The term "corruption" as it relates to public programs is also presented in this paper from a utilitarian vantage point. <u>A corrupt act is a public act or action by one who serves the public that undermines or "corrupts" citizen beliefs of the underlying value, fiscal responsibility, fairness and/or goodness of public programs.</u> Over time, these corrupt acts may diminish adherence to the social contract of being a good citizen, and ultimately diminish social harmony.

Three types of corrupt activities are the **quid pro quo**, **abuse of power**, and **excessive self-interest**. An example of the quid pro quo is a constituent's payment to a government official for the specific purpose of gaining an unfair advantage or favor over other interested parties. This activity directly violates the equality (distributive justice) component of the social justice aspect of public programs. It very likely violates the equity (procedural justice) component, as well. The quid pro quo is a more complex matter than it first appears, however. For example, if someone gives financial support to a candidate running for office because he/she ran on the platform of reducing taxes for small businesses, the subsequent lowering of taxes could be perceived as providing representative government. In fact, cutting taxes and less government versus higher taxes and more social programs are common lines of demarcation between political candidates. Moreover, research presented later in this paper shows that a substantial portion of the population believe that when the winners do as they campaigned, their supporters should rightly benefit. Still, support to reform campaign financing is growing because more and more people are becoming dissatisfied with this less than arms-length quid pro quo device.

Abuse of power has long been viewed as an act of corruption, particularly when strong punitive regimes carry dissenters away in the night who are never seen alive again. While this level of abuse of power is generally not perceived as a problem in this country,

lynchings in the South were carried out against Blacks well into the twentieth century, and complaints of police brutality against minorities continue to surface, sometimes with video-taped evidence. These reports can undermine confidence in procedural justice, distributive justice and the social conscience of law enforcement officers. Meanwhile, the widespread drug trafficking and related gang shootings along with high death rates have made law enforcement an extremely dangerous profession over the last several decades. Still, if there is one social concern the Simpson trial has brought to the public's attention, it is the disparate treatment of non-whites by our legal system.

Excessive self-interest occurs when officials put their own interests above those of the people they represent. While self-interest is a legitimate ethical criterion, it takes on a corrupting influence when people perceive public officials as being above-the-law or not adhering to the same principles they are advocating for the average citizen. In the end, people may begin to ask themselves "Why should I obey the laws of the land when those who wrote them or are responsible for enforcing them don't?" Unfortunately, there are so many good, recent examples of acts of excessive self-interest and their harmful effects that it is unnecessary to list them.

Corruption occurs from acts of commission and acts of omission- the failure to act as authorized. As regulators, government officials are obliged to carry out the laws of the land, including taking action against those entities that otherwise may be doing good for a local populace or a local economy. For example, regulators may be reluctant to take a firm stance on a legal violation by an employer who, when penalized, may decide to leave the area causing a serious undesirable consequence of fewer jobs. However, if the regulator fails to act and the event becomes public, private citizens may believe that some private businesses are allowed to operate outside the law, again corrupting their beliefs about the goodness and fairness of government programs.

THE RESEARCH

The data for this research was gathered from a telephone survey of 846 Georgians, 18 and older, randomly selected and interviewed on a variety of public policy issues. The survey was conducted by the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University. The Center reports that ninety-five percent of the time, error due to the random selection process will be no more than 3.4 percentage points plus or minus the reported percentage for 846 respondents. Error for smaller subgroups is likely to be larger.

Respondents were asked four questions pertaining to acts that might be perceived as corrupt. The first two questions relate to an act of commission that might be perceived as corrupt based on a quid pro quo. The third question addresses an act of commission possibly perceived as corrupt based on abuse of power, and the last question addresses an act of omission possibly perceived as corrupt based on excessive self interest. Respondents were asked to state to what extent they agreed or disagreed with four statements using ratings ranging from 1- "completely disagree" to 7- "completely agree," with 4 meaning "neither agree nor disagree," 8 meaning "no opinion" and 9 meaning "no response."

The questions were presented as follows:

To what extend do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

1) Politicians take care of those people or organizations who make large contributions to their campaigns.

2) Large campaign contributors affect your belief that the work government does is good.

3) Reports of police brutality affect your belief that police are good.

4) Increased air pollution affects your trust in government regulators.

Generally, some form of statistical manipulation is needed to produce insight into the underlying meaning of the data generated from such studies. However, in this case the

frequency distributions provided the most meaningful results. Chart 1 shows the response frequency distributions for Statement 1 concerning peoples' beliefs that politicians take care of large contributors to their campaigns. Generally, statistical results appear as a normal or bell curve with extreme values appearing less frequently. In this case, an inordinately large number of people chose Response No.7, indicating that they completely agreed with Statement 1 (348 respondents out of 846 total or 41.1% of all responses). Note that if it were not for Responses No. 7 and No.1 ("Completely disagree") that the results would appear generally as a bell or normal curve. Thus, these two responses suggest a bias or propensity to respond in absolute terms by respondents completely agreeing or disagreeing with the statement. Moreover, respondents were far more likely to agree to some extent with Statement 1(583 responses) than disagree (136 responses), showing a clear majority of people do believe a quid pro quo exists between large donors and politicians. Another 127 respondents indicated they neither agreed nor disagreed, voiced no opinion or did not respond to the question.

Error! Not a valid link.

The second question asks respondents to indicate to what extent large campaign contributors affect their underlying belief about the goodness of the work that government does. Surprisingly, the results are mixed. The largest group of respondents (175) indicated that large campaign contributors had <u>no</u> affect on their perceptions about the goodness of government, but the second largest group (144) completely agreed that large contributors <u>did</u> affect these beliefs. The total votes are almost perfectly split with 323 respondents disagreeing to some extent with the statement, 319 agreeing to some extent with the statement and the remaining 204 neither agreeing nor disagreeing, voicing no opinion or not responding to the question. Thus, while there is broad agreement that a quid pro quo exists, there is profound disagreement as to whether the quid pro quo is harmful to our perceptions of government. As discussed earlier, some people may

approve and view rewarding campaign supporters positively as providing representative government, while others may disapprove and see this as a spoils system wherein the spoils go to the victor and his/her supporters.

Chart 3 presents the frequency distributions for Statement 3 in which respondents were asked to what extent reports of police brutality affected their beliefs that police are good. Once again, there is a propensity to respond as "completely agree" (151 responses or 17.8%) or "completely disagree" (186 responses or 22%). These figures suggest that a large segment of respondents are not influenced at all by reports of police abusing their power, while another large segment of respondents seem to accept these reports as being completely true and absolute evidence of a corrupt act. Overall, 304 respondents indicated they agreed to some extent with the statement; 348 respondents indicated they disagreed to some extent with the statement; while 194 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, voiced no opinion or did not respond.

Because Blacks have been reported as the subjects of police brutality far more frequently than Whites, one would expect this subgroup to be more likely to agree with Statement 3. Table 1 reveals that while this is true, both groups have high response rates

TABLE 1

	Whites		Blacks	
Value	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1	119	22.2	40	18.3
2	59	11.0	20	9.2
3	48	9.0	21	9.6
4	85	15.9	25	11.5
5	67	12.5	31	14.2
6	35	6.5	8	3.7
7	86	16.0	49	22.5
8	26	4.9	19	8.7
9	11	2.1	5	2.3
Tot	536	100	218	100

for both "completely agree" (Whites- 86 or 16.0%, Blacks- 49 or 22.5%) and "completely disagree" (Whites- 119 or 22.2%, Blacks- 40 or 18.3%), and both groups have similar distribution patterns.

Finally, respondents were asked to what extent they agreed with Statement 4 that increased air pollution affects their trust in government regulators. The statement implies that air pollution is the result of a corrupt act of self interest by polluters and a corrupt act of omission by regulators when they fail to regulate the polluters. As Chart 4 shows, the frequency distribution for Statement 4 forms a pattern similar to one for the previous question. Once again, the high proportion of "completely agree" and "completely disagree" responses distorts what otherwise would be a typical distribution curve. Overall, 354 respondents indicated they agreed to some extent with the statement; 297 respondents indicated they disagreed to some extent with the statement; while 195 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, voiced no opinion or did not respond.

Error! Not a valid link.

FINDINGS

The most important finding in this study is that large segments of the population appear to be ready to completely agree or disagree with the statements presented on public programs without giving due consideration to the evidence. These findings suggest that many people are predisposed in their views of government and government agents, either positively or negatively. Another large segment of the population seems to have no opinion on the topics one way or the other.

As we become better able to improve government performance, the intended result is to increase confidence in government. However, these results suggest that some dissatisfied people may never be swayed by improved performance, while other people may be completely satisfied with the status quo before any improvements are made. If

these findings hold true, then it would appear that higher performance may affect the beliefs of only that segment of the population who actually evaluate the evidence on its merits. There is also a concern that the large segment of the population that registered no opinion and those who responded with "completely agree" and "completely disagree" may be displaying signs of laziness or indifference. Rather than careful thinking about these issues and being socially aware and responsible, these respondents may have simply adopted predetermined beliefs or no firm opinions at all.

However, there may be another dynamic influencing people's responses. Many people may believe, as did the Athenians, that loyalty to country and adherence to the social contract comes above all else; therefore, to complain or speak ill of one's country may go against this belief. Others, however, may believe that the truly dutiful citizen is one who speaks out against injustices, and they assume the role of the responsible citizen by having a predisposition to dissent.

THE NEW SOCIAL JUSTICE WARRIOR

In ancient times, the military warrior went out to conquer new lands and seek out new battlegrounds. More recently the role of the warrior was to rise up for the cause of freedom in one's homeland. At the end of the twentieth century the perseverance of these warriors has brought about numerous democracies all around the world, establishing this form of governance as the clear preference. While America still must continue to be ready to fight if necessary, with the end of the cold war we are beginning to question the role of our military warriors. Because our country is still viewed as the leader of the world, free or otherwise, we need our armed forces to be ready, when necessary, to fight the remaining evil leaders of the world and to help those people in other countries seeking freedom and protection. However, the world has experienced a dramatic change, and the role of the military warrior is changing as well.

Ironically, there is a new warrior for our times; it is the social justice warrior. These warriors fight with words instead of weapons, and wage war within our society instead of

on other shores. Taking a stand against the strong forces of the status quo, the new

warriors step forth into a high risk environment to speak out against social injustices.

These new social justice warriors separate themselves from the crowd by publicly

exercising the right to free speech in order to right the social wrongs. With people like

Mahatma Ghandi and Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. as examples, they speak out on

behalf of poor and needy people, the afflicted, and those unfairly discriminated against

because of their race, sexual orientation, or disability. At first, they fought for equity- to

have the same procedures applied in the same way for all people. But now they speak in

terms of equality, questioning the disparate effects of these long-established procedures

like the ones for funding school districts.

Often claiming a moral authority as they speak, these warriors question the motives

and moral integrity of those they oppose. Many of their opponents are the established

governmental leaders of local communities, states or even the country; other opponents

are the industrial and business leaders accused of polluting the air and land and getting

special favors for their large campaign contributions. These warriors make accusations

about the quid pro quos, the abuses of power and the excessive self-interests that cause

social injustice.

But the road to social justice is a complex one. Sometimes political candidates claim

to be social justice warriors, and their opponents make the same claim. From the

beginning, the debates center on whether the opposing candidates are responsible for

social injustices or otherwise supporting unfair practices and programs. Lauding their

own moral authority, these candidates become debaters of dissent, reverting into debates

over who has the least integrity.

The media, smelling fresh blood, seems more than happy to enter this fray. What had

once been private is now made public in pursuit of challenging the moral authority of

these high-profile warriors. The charges by these social justice warriors about their

opponents' excessive self-interests, abuses of power and quid pro quos come back to

haunt them. Soon the "spin doctors" enter the scene to deflect the backlash, but the public is left with strong evidence that corruption is universal. The social justice warriors earn their title as they realize they've just entered a battle "to the death"- the death of their privacy; the death of their family relations; and the death of a normal life.

DISCUSSION

This paper postulates that corruption works as a corrupting influence on the four elements of our social justice system- equity, equality, due process and the social contract. The forms of corruption- abuse of power, the quid pro quo and excessive self interest- invariably surface as violations of one or more of these elements, thereby corrupting citizens' beliefs that we live in a just society and that we are, ourselves, all responsible for social justice.

Average people participate in the social justice process by being responsible citizens and also by stepping forward to voice objections to injustices. While adhering to the social contract may seem clear and straight-forward, due process is a messy business. But both are our responsibility.

Because of different emphases on the ethical criteria of self interest, benevolence and principle, and on the different value domains of security, empathy, pleasure and achievement, each of us may have a preference of how we serve our society in terms of being the good citizen. We may choose to compassionately help each other, dutifully obey the laws, or noisily step forward to champion a cause.

While it is our right and responsibility to promote and obey the social contract, this does not imply timidity and inaction on our part. It implies action and civility. While it is our right and responsibility to dissent, this does not imply we should make pointless noise for the purpose of self-aggrandizement. Assertiveness was promoted as a highly valued attribute not so long ago. But assertiveness has its price in terms of long-term relationships, especially when demands are made for trivial purposes.[4] Moreover, dissenters who speak out for self-serving purposes and false causes undermine the

important role that due process procedures play in our society.

As our society continues to reveal more information about all of our activities, both public and private, one wonders how long any of us will be willing to step forward into roles of public leadership. Still, we must believe that there are people who serve the public and do adhere to the social contract, as well as to organizational, legal and professional standards. We must also believe that there is a way to differentiate information that is harmful to the individual but not relevant to that person's public leadership role, and pursue methods to shield that information in such cases.

At this point we must ask one final question: Is corruption a necessary component of power and governance? We must hypothesize and explore the possibilities that to maintain power, leaders must abuse their power to fend off enemies; to build power, leaders must use opportunities for quid pro quos at their disposal; and because leading requires such great strength and commitment, leaders must serve their own interests first as their reward and protection. There is certainly evidence to support these hypotheses, but the question is whether the evidence is causal or circumstantial, and if it is universal. If we find out it is causal, perhaps we should reexamine our definition of corruption, for an act cannot be corrupt if it is a necessary part of a necessary role.

Perhaps the greatest change we are experiencing today is our capacity, with the aid of computers, to measure many things, no matter how great or small. As mentioned earlier, the first and basic premise of the authors' new framework for public programs is the ethical tenet to neither provide nor charge for unnecessary services. Because we have better ways to measure program and individual performance, we have the ability as we have never had before to build a program structure that will enable us to measure how well public programs meet their intended goals. Moreover, this advanced ability to measure performance has brought about the mandate for strategic planning. When stark evidence is presented on public programs without goals, objectives and measurement information, we must necessarily now question their legitimacy and seek to bring in new

managers. As program measurement and accountability evolve, unnecessary activities and unaccounted funds will surely surface, exposing not just inept management but also corrupt acts that we can then seek to eradicate.

CONCLUSION

Measuring program performance is not a Machiavellian exercise of getting the last dollar out of every taxpayer and the last ounce of work out of every worker. Rather, it provides us the opportunity to make great dreams and watch them come true. Our goals need not be small and rigid, but rather grand and expansive. Reverse global warming. Manage the growth of our planet's population. Generate enough energy so no one ever has to go to sleep at night in a cold room.

Corruption is not what it used to be, and will continue to diminish in importance. Already, so many injustices have been identified, and so many people have worked to eradicate them. The democratic way of life is catching on throughout the world, and as our planet continues to become more accessible, social justice will spread as well. For many years, Julian Simon challenged those who predicted gloom and doom for our planet by noting the many great documented advances over the last 200 years, and optimistically predicting an even brighter future.[5] The nature of man is such that we purposefully evolve towards a better way of life.

Wiener and Doescher, in discussing how to overcome barriers to cooperation for public purposes, explain that one must emphasize certain points in the message including, 1) reaching the goal is important, 2) each person's contribution will make a difference, 3) the size of the dilemma is small, and 4) the goal will assuredly be reached (p. 43). This paper has set forth the challenge of achieving the important and lofty goal of government without corruption. The authors have emphasized the importance of the social contract and citizen dissent, which require us all to be responsible citizens in this endeavor. And by demystifying corruption, the authors have attempted to reduce the size of the dilemma and provide assurance that this lofty goal will undoubtedly be reached. But this is still

just a first step.

NOTES

[1] From an unpublished paper by Southworth and Van Slyke entitled, "Beyond POSDCORB- A New Framework for Public Programs" presented in part by Professor Van Slyke at the Southeastern Conference for Public Administration, October, 2000.

[2] This distinction of equity identified as procedural fairness and equality identified as distributive fairness is based on an article by Kenneth A. Rasinski entitled "What's Fair Is Fair- Or Is It? Value Differences Underlying Public Views About Social Justice."

[3] Different treatment of different subgroups is discussed more fully in H. George Frederickson's book entitled, The Spirit of Public Administration, pp. 116-8.

[4] An interesting study on assertive people and the legitimacy of their requests is presented by Emil Chiauzzi and Richard G. Heimberg in an article entitled, "Legitimacy of Request and Social Problem Solving, A Study of Assertive and Nonassertive Subjects."

[5] Julian Simon was interviewed for a 1997 article in *Wired* magazine in which he discussed a number of mythical, gloomy projections made about the future of the world, including a prediction that the world would run short of food in the 1970s.

REFERENCES

Burke, F., (1999). *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 529-41.

Chandler, R. C., (1999). Deontological dimensions of administrative ethics, revisited. *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 505-15.

Frederickson, H. G., (1997). The spirit of public administration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kamakura, W. A., and Novak, T. P., (1992). Value-system segmentation: Exploring the meaning of LOV. Journal of Consumer Research, 19, 119-32.

Menzel, D. C., (1999). The morally mute manager: Fact or fiction? *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 515-29.

Pfiffner, J. P., (1999). The new public service ethic in the new public personnel system. *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 541-57.

Rasinski, K. A., (1987). What's fair is fair- Or is it? Value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 201-11.

Regis, E. (1997). The doomslayer. *Wired*, 5.02 136-40, 193-8.

Southworth, D. E., and Van Slyke, D. M. (2000). "An Absence of Performance Measurement and its Impact on Managing Third-Party Relationships in Social Services." Paper presented at the Southeastern Conference for Public Administration (SECOPA), October, Greensboro, NC.

Southworth, D. E., and Van Slyke, D. M. (2001) Beyond POSDCORB- A new framework for public programs. (Unpublished).

Victor, B., and Cullen, J. B., (1988) The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 101-25.

Wiener, J. L., and Doescher, T. A., (1991) A framework for promoting cooperation. Journal of Marketing, 55, 38-47.