City Managers, Mayors, and Councilmembers: Local Government Stability in Tennessee

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Mark Steven Watson
May 2019

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Jenna, for all the patience and caring she has given me through this academic journey. I will always be indebted to her for sharing me with the academic world during this time. This feat would not be possible without her encouragement, love and an occasional shove to reach this lofty goal!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The academic journey of seeking this Doctor of Philosophy degree has been a lifelong desire of mine. As a practicing City Manager for over 42 years across the United States, I have finally pursued this goal, but it would not have been possible without so many teachers, classmates and personal friends cheering me on. Without them, this personal quest would not have been accomplished.

I would recognize the consistent presence of Dr. David Houston during my academic journey and most importantly as my academic advisor. Along with my advisory committee, Dr. Patricia K. Freeland, Dr. Michael Fitzgerald and Dr. Catherine Hammon, they have consistently urged me through the process of research and moving forward with this academic study. Thanks to each of them for their advice, counsel, discussions and commentaries on public administration and the perspectives that have taken me to new frontiers. A special thanks must also go to Cary Springer of the UT Office of Information Technology, without whom I would not have been able to analyze this survey so thoroughly.

I have had wonderful guidance in the University of Tennessee Political Science Department. I extend my thanks to Dr. Richard Pacelle, Dr. Brandon Prins, Dr. Krista Wiegand, Dr. David Folz, Joe Jarrett, Bruce Tonn, Dr. Ian Downs and Dr. John Scheb. They have grounded me in solid skills, thinking and learning. A special thanks goes to Dr. Nurgul Alitieva for helping me to re-learn statistics and new computer skills. And, of course, the students in our classes from 2012 to 2019 were an inspiration including some whom I have hired to be the next generation in Tennessee local government.

In the encouragement of this project, a special thanks must go to Dr. James Svara in North Carolina, a leader in local government research. I also wish to thank Dr. Rosemary O'Leary of the University of Kansas for her advice on the background of this project.

I want to give a special thanks to my colleague, Steve Thompson, Assistant Vice President of the Institute for Public Service and friend for many years. Thank you for being my partner in all the classes over the years and pushing me to be the best.

Finally, it would not have been possible to do this without the support of the Oak Ridge City Council as they have supported advanced education for me and have always seen the value in it. City Managers and members of the Tennessee City Management Association across the State of Tennessee have also been supportive of my efforts for many years. I celebrate this project with them and salute to continued good government in Tennessee for the next 50 years!

ABSTRACT

City government in Tennessee at the highest levels consists of numerous Mayors, Councilmembers, Aldermen and Commissioners who are elected by the citizenry as the governing body of their communities. These elected officials, in almost every instance, have an administrator that is charged with conducting the affairs of the local government, providing oversight and efficient execution of these elected official's goals. Since the formation of Tennessee communities, the elected body has planned and accomplished community building tasks. In the Progressive era of the 1910s, the development of professional local government managers began their arrival in Tennessee cities. Since that time, roles and responsibilities have been established by city charters, state laws and experience.

Today's modern communities are challenged by an ever changing environment which raises questions of whether elected officials and appointed city administrators and city managers are changing too. Limited academic study has occurred on small cities across the United States as impacted by their officials. The interaction between elected officials and their administrative managers play an integral part for the success and viability of their communities.

Utilizing a detailed survey of Tennessee city managers and elected officials, this study identifies key findings of stability and change among the positions. The study identifies a strong reliance upon city manager, councilmembers and mayoral roles, skills and characteristics for creating success in Tennessee cities. The survey explores various statistically significant aspects of these official groups and organizes their work relationships with respect to the four dimensions of government of *Mission, Policy, Administration and Management.* The findings confirm that roles of these elected and appointed officials of smaller Tennessee cities do not vary from their responsibilities in most instances, neither do they encroach on the established roles of city managers, mayors and councilmembers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION 1
Public Administration Insight on Theory 5
Conclusion 18
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH 20
The Survey Sample 20
Survey Construction 24
Analysis Tools Used 29
CHAPTER THREE: RESPONSIBILITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS 31
Responsibilities of Officials 31
Official Changes in Governmental Duties 39
Levels of Participation by Officials 40
Level of Involvement in Official Responsibilities 45
Budget and Financing 45
Services with No Significant Findings 51
Utility Systems and Infrastructure 56
Community Planning 60
City Administrator/Manager Leadership 62
Roles of Elected Officials 66
Relations Between Elected Officials and Administrators 70
CHAPTER FOUR: ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT 75
Information Sources for City Council 82
Policy Action Statements 85
City Council Oversight Functions 88
Rating of Municipal Tasks 90
Involvement in Public Activities 93
Leadership Activities 100
Official Involvement in Economic Development 106
Official Involvement in Finance and Budgeting 109
Political Leadership 118
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH 120
Observations on the Responsibilities of Officials 123
Observation on the Duties of Officials 125
Observations on Official Activities 126
Observed Characteristics of Administrators and Elected Officials 128
Overview of Official and Preferred Tasks 133

Leadership....134
Conclusion....136
Future Research Considerations....137
BIBLIOGRAPHY....140
APPENDIX....146
VITA....148

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Tennessee Elected and Appointed Official Respondents 23
Table 2-2: Activities Used to Measure Involvement in Four Dimensions of the Governmental Process... 28
Table 3-1: Level of Responsibilities 32
Table 3-2: I am Responsible for the Daily Business/Activities of the City Government 34
Table 3-3: I Am Responsible for Developing Policies which will determine the Daily Outcomes 35
Table 3-4: I am Responsible for Insuring that City Services are Provided by the City Government 36
Table 3-5: I am Responsible for Employees of the City Government 37
Table 3-6: I am Responsible for Supporting Policies Adopted by the City Government 38
Table 3-7: Participation in Governmental Roles 42
Table 3-8: The Managerial Assignment of Resources and Priorities of the City Government 43
Table 3-9: The Administrative Rules and Regulations of the City Government 43
Table 3-10: Levels of Involvement and Participation 46
Table 3-11: Budget Preparation 46
Table 3-12: Budget Adoption 48
Table 3-13: Long-Term Bond Financing and Financial Planning 48
Table 3-14: Grant and Grant Applications 48
Table 3-15: Public Safety Participation Aspects 52
Table 3-16: Parks, Quality of Life and Housing 55
Table 3-17: Utilities and Planning 57
Table 3-18: Utility Systems and Infrastructure Maintenance Level of Involvement 58
Table 3-19: Community Development and Planning 60
Table 3-20: Role Characterization of City Managers 63
Table 3-21: Roles of Elected Officials 68
Table 3-22: Relations Between Elected Officials and Administrators by Positions 71
Table 3-23: Relationships Between Mayors, Councilmembers, and City Managers. 71
Table 4-1: Relationship Between Elected Officials and Managers 77
Table 4-2: The Governing Body Takes a Short-Term View of Decision Making 79
Table 4-3: The Governing Body is Quick in Decision Making 80
Table 4-4: The Mayor and Council Rely on Financial Data to Guide Decision 80
Table 4-5: The Governing Body Regularly Reviews Community Properties 81
Table 4-6: Sources of Governing Body Information 83
Table 4-7: Changing Local Policy 86
Table 4-8: Governing Body Relies on Professional Staff to Propose Policy Change 88
Table 4-9: Governing Body Waits for Priority Issues Before Instigating Policy Change 88
Table 4-10: Managerial Oversight 91

Table 4-11: Review of Tasks for Elected Officials and Administrators 92
Table 4-12: Active Involvement by Elected Officials and Administrators 94
Table 4-13: Lobbying and Obtaining Legislation at State Level 96
Table 4-14: Encouraging Morale in City Operations 96
Table 4-15: Developing New Organizational Structures and Efficiencies 97
Table 4-16: Creating a Budget on an Annual Basis 99
Table 4-17: Raising and Identifying New Revenue Sources 99
Table 4-18: Activities of Public Leaders 101
Table 4-19: Attending Community Events 103
Table 4-20: Mentoring Staff and Directing Staff 104
Table 4-21: Meeting with State and Federal Officials 104
Table 4-22: Working with Other Governing Body Members 105
Table 4-23: Media Relations and Information Sharing 105
Table 4-24: Official Participation in Economic Development, as Characterized by New Business 108
Table 4-25: Economic Recruitment and Economic Development 111
Table 4-26: The City Council or Mayor Participates in the Financial and Budgeting Systems 111
Table 4-27: Summary of Budget/Finance Responses 112
Table 4-28: Political Leadership Descriptions 117

CHAPTER ONE
OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

The organizational structures of today's municipal governments are vastly similar to those of the post-World War II era. Election of mayors and councilmembers continue, having remained the same or modified by its citizens over various charter reviews or initiative and referendum processes. Along with these elected officials, the city managers or city administrators have provided the executive leadership to implement the changes and strategic directions of the communities they serve. In some cases, the terms of their offices are cut short through political change or a community having the need for a different set of skills to take it through financial downturns, economic revitalizations or major growth. Over time, limited study has occurred in the small cities and towns of America, when it is usually seen that the large metropolitan cities of America are studied in more detail.

This study started with the idea that the roles of key elected officials in local government were evolving and their responsibilities were changing. The established roles of city manager and city administrators were also assumed to be changing with the impacts of the political environment, ever increasing managerial demands upon local government, charter and regulatory changes and the perspectives created by social media and the press. Although the institutional reliability of local government has appeared to change over time with round the clock media coverage of government activities, observations of its capacity to respond to community demands is consistently challenged. For the past 30 years, initial identification of roles through research created some understanding of the key actors in local government, however, limited direct research has occurred to follow these positions and how they may have changed over time, either real or perceived. This project has represented an effort in organizing for greater research on the behalf of local government elected and appointed official roles and their direct link to active engagement with its citizens through the work of those key elected and appointed officials. This study is an effort to acquaint a larger audience about the intricacies of elected officials and professional city administrators in the smaller cities of Tennessee.

As seen in the past, the role of the expert or professional administrator in municipal government has not been well defined, nor has the role of his counterpart, the elected politician (Herson, 1957). In an article entitled the “Lost World of Municipal Government,” political scientist Lawrence J. T. Herson suggested a strong need for a new focus of academic textbook studies on political and administrative leadership in municipal governments. Local government focus was sorely lacking in detail and theory then. Today, in 2019, with changing social dynamics, political perspectives, new state and federal laws and a mature integration of private and public provision of service, it is possible that the role of the city manager and the role of the elected official has changed. As government has evolved from the political changes of the Progressive Era to the current world of new public administration theory, complementarity and collaborative government, it is appropriate to assess the role of today’s administrators and elected officials.

As frequently confirmed by experiences of practitioners in the field of local government, the roles and activities of local government officials are continually evolving and changing. These changes bring about known and unknown expectations for the roles of local government administrators and their political officials. In the hierarchical structures of federal, state and local governments, it is the local government that is found to have the most direct impact on citizens and their lifestyles. As such, more attention is needed on those arenas that touch more citizens.

Over 60 years ago, the article by Lawrence J. T. Herson, noted that local government focus was sorely lacking in detail and theory. In that study, Herson believed the study of municipal governments had become a stagnated area of political science. The roles of city managers and elected officials were confined to specific roles based on predisposed maxims focusing primarily on efficiency and financial concerns, while ignoring community values and utility of municipal services. (Herson, 1957) Logically, he concluded the city council/manager form of government was the most responsive type for a community. However, new theories of public administration have subsequently led to new perspectives varying from the original political-administration dichotomy thoughts of

Woodrow Wilson in the 1870s to changes brought about through new public administration in the 1990s (Osborne & Gaebler, 1997) and on to today's initiatives in inclusionary and collaborative government (O'Leary, 2012).

This dissertation seeks to improve our current knowledge associated with the known specific roles of today's city managers and elected officials in smaller Tennessee communities and how they may have changed from a true political-administration separation to a shared duties in their charter mandates, specific or actual responsibilities. The dissertation has sought to capture changes in roles and responsibilities as identified by elected officials themselves and their associated city and town administrators. Travelling back to previous survey research conducted in the 1980s, this study has sought to identify evolved changes in practice and responsibility in today's public arena.

In the "Search for Meaning in Political-Administrative Relations in Local Government" article, (Svara, 2006) the general placement of a line delineating the Dichotomy-Duality model was located, where two spheres of influence were established showing the approximate "work commitments" into each of the four arenas. The spheres included segments that were the domain of the elected officials and that sphere that belonged to the city administrator. This model indicated several explanations and assumptions were logically developed by the author to create the model. This survey of Tennessee officials were tested against this model with these work arenas in mind. Assuming this division of duties was correct, the validation and update to the current time, duties and place is appropriate.

Practically speaking, mayors or city managers in smaller cities do not have the staff resources to have the specialized personnel structures of larger communities. Basic services must be provided first, leaving limited staff resources for administrative support except for that appointed administrator or city manager working with a mayor or councilmember with strategic, managerial and operational roles. The lack of depth in a smaller city is not one of organizational planning, but one of economic necessity. The demand on the leaders of these communities may cause the role of the elected official or

the administrator to be more diversified than those of their larger counterparts. As was studied in 1987, 1988, and with a large city survey in 1989, policy initiation roles were compared in Council-Manager cities and Mayoral-Council cities, only to find that the role of the city manager as a strategic policy initiator was viewed as greater than that of their councilmembers. This continues the challenge to the original dichotomy-duality model of the past and moves our executives and elected officials toward new models of local government (Svara 2006).

In the 1996 City Manager Plan Task Force Survey, as conducted by the International City/County Management Association, (ICMA) it was noted that elected officials were observed as shifting their role from the general and strategic to the specific managerial oversight and sometimes specific operational responsibilities. (Svara, 2006). Recognition through another survey of 22 large U.S. cities was significant, but did not pursue capturing the same trend for the majority of smaller cities (Svara, 1999). However noted, small cities make up most of the cities in the United States, particularly those that operate under the Council/Manager form of government (www.ICMA.org). This gap can represent a significant lack of information available from public administration research if not examined in greater detail and has usually been identified as a "future research need". As defined by a survey of today's Tennessee elected officials and administrators, this study shall explore the results of responses by Tennessee officials serving in an elected capacity and an administrative capacity. A clearer picture of actual duties of city managers, mayors and councilmember may occur by sharing the results of the groups and identify changes that may occur in short term and long-term responsibilities to local government.

Roles and responsibilities will be focused on to determine levels of responsibilities, participation and effective aspects of the job as a Mayor, City Manager, City Administrator or Councilmember. Each position has official responsibilities, political engagement activities and effectiveness responsibilities for local services. The survey to be considered will identify the relationships between groups, determining where such relationships overlap or establish independent activity. The work relationship between

elected officials may also clarify the role of the mayor or city council, while understanding whether the city administrator's role is expanding or shrinking, officially or by practice. The activist in an elected position may focus on the elimination of local conflict by solving the policy or managerial issues, while exhibiting elected leadership oversight in a positive light. These individuals accomplish matters or tasks which can be quantified or measured specifically and strive to solve big problems or issues that involve subjective or intuitive results. Meanwhile, the intangible issues of today's municipal governments may involve long term strategic issues that may not be solved in a single term of office, necessitating the long-term stability of the city administrator/manager. The professional executives must also be able to recognize the matters ahead of the community and making decisions based on the long-term goals of a community.

In particular, the study shall provide answers to essential questions: (1) Do the roles and participation in small to medium populated cities have elected officials and city managers/administrators developing differing roles or similar roles with each other? From the assumed tangible managerial roles required in the modern municipality are professional city manager or elected official functions still similar to the Four Dimensions of Government model? (2) Could the influences of political position, economic, environmental and personal factors in smaller cities substantially influence the actual roles of administrators and elected officials and transform them into newly defined roles previously delineated by city charters, community practices or state law?

Public Administration Insight on Theory

City managers and the elected bodies that govern their work are instrumental in the success of local government in the United States. The roots of governmental stability have been secured for over 100 years as the council-manager form of government has grown. Today it is the most used choice of government for cities over 2,500 population. Developed in 1912 in Staunton, Virginia, this form of government sought to return control of municipal government to local citizens (www.ICMA.org). The professionalism of an appointed city manager as a partner in local government has proven its adaptability through the years as an important model used by successful communities. However,

through the years, modern influences to the responsibilities of local government have caused evolution of both the responsible elected official and the non-partisan city administrator or city manager professional. The leadership of the community has relied on these officials, and simultaneously, shown optimism as to their oversight of municipal government activities.

In 1985, the roles of administrators were confirmed and described within two spheres of influence for elected officials and administrators. They were compared through the filters of *Mission, Policy, Administration and Management* (Svara, 1985). Testing of the model occurred in the realm of policy initiative with a test of Michigan city managers, indicating that the utility of the Svara model was possible. Findings included a strong policy commitment on the city councils for major decisions, but strong initiative on the part of managers for the majority of organizational decision making (Browne, 1985). Over time, as city managers and elected officials attained initial strategic goals and objectives, the allocation of time spent by elected and appointed counterparts in specific roles were observed to change in levels of involvement, resulting in more time spent by administrators on mission and policy matters which is previously the territory of elected officials. Meanwhile, elected officials spent more time in roles of the administrative and managerial challenges of the organization. There was still time spent in traditional roles, but the diversity of community needs began to change the involvement and engagement of professional administrators and expectations of elected official including both mayors and councilmembers.

In 1989, policy initiation roles were compared in Council-Manager cities and Mayoral-Council cities only to find that the role of the Manager as a strategic policy initiator was viewed as greater than that of the elected councilmembers, continuing the challenge to the original dichotomy-duality model of the past and moving toward complementarity and collaborative models of the future (Svara, 2006). City managers were found to complement the policy making process through 1) policy leadership 2) policy formulation 3) goal setting and 4) resource allocation (Demir and Reddick, 2009). Part of this finding

affirmed the idea of greater participation in mission and policy roles and spheres of influence as highlighted by Demir and Reddick.

A visual chart of the Dichotomy-Duality model was developed by Svara that identified spheres of influence and their approximate allocation of involvement towards the areas of *Mission, Policy Administration and Management*. (Svara, 1985).

As this report examines the smaller cities in Tennessee, the concepts outlined by Svara may be found to have modified spheres of influence conjectured by him. If the roles of city managers and administrators have changed through assumed new roles such as economic development, the responsibilities of the city managers and administrators have impacted those roles in some way. Tasks and roles can become greater as duties, projects and sizes of communities change, too. Larger cities and growing cities may have an ability to add additional personnel, but smaller cities facing similar but no less daunting challenges, must absorb those duties within pre-existing staffs and limited knowledge and competence levels. Leadership must be attained through the elected officials or the



Figure 1. The Dichotomy-Duality Model. (Source: Adapted and reprinted with permission from Public Administration Review, 1985, *45* [1]: 228.)

professional city managers or administrators themselves which will cause the sharing or delegation of defined duties, just to achieve the goals and missions of the city.

However, changes were noted by public administrators and academicians of changes in the public sector. Evolution in the political environment was first noted at the 1988 Minnowbrook conference when the “electoral activist” appeared in city councils as opposed to a trustee, who was detached from the managerial or administrative day to day world of local government. The activist was described as a person that served as a community spokesperson or representative in an augmented role for elected officials (Prewitt, 1970, Svara, 1999). His or her role was to make the community aware of short term and immediate issues within the community. Current roles of the electoral activist influenced movement to solutions that addressed community or constituent needs and less of citywide solutions. These “personality changes” of the elected official impacted the local responsibilities expected of the councilmembers or mayor. Needless to say, the role of the city administrator or city manager was affected.

Policy changes that reacted with city missions moved the elected official into the realm of administration and management. Elected officials were unconstrained in taking on the role of facilitating government operations for constituents instead of adhering to chosen concentration on strategic and mission driven community directives. Meanwhile, the administrator was expected to keep ongoing managerial roles in guiding the administrative organization, while simultaneously providing enhanced perspectives and participation in the global strategic missions and public policy enhancements that was occurring with the elected officials but not to the degree as in the past.

The “electoral activist” developed due to changing times and changing perceptions by those elected to mayoral or council positions. Elected officials began to serve as ombudsmen in order to solve localized problems (Heilig and Mundt, 1984). When the staff at City Hall was observed to be intransigent, the elected official has also chosen to deal with the more tangible issues of getting water lines fixed, parks developed, budgeting for projects, and getting streets repaired. Meanwhile, the administrators dealt with intangible issues such as long term economic development of a community and improved

prospects for successful public safety. A reduction in civics and basic knowledge of local government also may have led to limits in using the appropriate department official to address daily tangible problems. A modification of the earlier Minnowbrook findings by this dissertation proposes to identify a world of "tangible and intangible activists." (O'Leary, Van Slyke and Kim, 2010) which shall impact the political and administrative roles even further into the future.

Today's elected official and administrator roles are broad and varied. The aspects of the "tangible activist" actually crossing over the official roles established for Councilmembers, Mayor and Administrators/Managers is a possibility. The tangible activist focuses on the elimination of local conflict by solving the policy or managerial issue, while exhibiting elected leadership or management in a positive light. Individuals accomplish matters or tasks which can be quantified or measured specifically. The influences upon the organization that faces such changes can create an organization that retreats within itself to avoid the confrontations which might occur. If one seeks to serve in an elected capacity and finds it challenging to work in the realm of policy and mission, elected officials and managers alike will gravitate toward the influences that have identifiable impacts on solving community problems as affected by municipal services, particularly in a small community.

Conversely, the position of "intangible activist" strives to solve big problems or issues that involve subjective or intuitive results for long term benefit. The intangible issues involve long term strategic issues that may not be solved in a single term of office for an elected official. It may involve the same term for an appointed city manager or administrator. Given the politics of a given organization or community, the period may even be a short one for the city manager. However, the strong desire for positive action for looking ahead and making policy decisions based on the solid long term goals for the community allows both types of leaders to grow in the municipal government arena.

The most utilized form of government in small to medium sized United States communities is the Council-Manager form of government (National Civic League, 2017).

As established by the National Civic League's 8th model city charter, the council/manager form of government establishes that ultimate responsibilities of the elected officials are for policy decisions and oversight of the executive. All executive functions and appointed officials are centered with the city manager functions. With minor variations, individual charters of each city in the United States outline roles and responsibilities of the studied groups. The description of the Mayor's duties as a baseline from the 8th Model City Charter states: "The mayor shall be a voting member of the city council and shall attend and preside at meetings of the council, represent the city in intergovernmental relationships, appoint with the advice and consent of the council the members of citizen advisory boards and commissions, present an annual state of the city message, appoint the members and officers of council committees, assign subject to the consent of council agenda items to committees, and perform other duties specified by the council. The mayor shall be recognized as head of the city government for all ceremonial purposes and by the governor for purposes of military law but shall have no administrative duties" (National Civic League, 2003).

On executive functions, the 8th Model City Charter describes: "The city manager shall be the chief executive officer of the city, responsible to the council for the management of all city affairs placed in the manager's charge by or under this charter". A further commentary more fully delineates the expected role of this position: "The listing of the manager's powers and duties assumes that the manager will not only perform managerial duties in the city's operations but will also have a significant role in the development of policy. There are important policy implications in the manager's duties to prepare and submit the budget; to report on the city's finances, administrative activities, departmental operations and future needs; and to make recommendations on city affairs." (National Civic League, 2003)

Research has been conducted since 1945 trying to identify and define these specific traits about the role differences between elected officials and administrators (Svara, 1976, 1985, 2006). Past commentaries led to vast discussions regarding distinct separation of duties, until the thought of complementarity was broached by Svara outlining the explanatory process of a modified dichotomy/duality model to explain actual local

government practice. In 1985, two spheres of influence were studied: Elected Officials and Administrators. They were compared and recognized through the filters of *Mission, Policy, Administration and Management*. Given the strictness of assigned charter roles, elected officials were technically anticipated to spend most of their time in the realms of *Mission* and *Policy* matters, while allowing the administrators to manage and conduct the operations of the city. The testing for such research was limited to large U.S. cities and ultimately larger surveys of managers in particular states by the International City/County Management Association. (Svara, 1985) The limited research on small government leadership roles has had a lesser concentration and focus on how these roles function in smaller and less populated cities.

As previously mentioned, in 1988, a focused study on leadership in the Council-Manager city occurred in Ohio. The unique relationships of city managers have placed them with differing relationships with governing boards, fellow administrators, community groups and their employees. The city management profession through the International City/County Management Association, ICMA, established recognition criteria that included flexibility with the City Council's interaction with the city manager, blurring the lines between strict policy-administrative roles for each. The duality of each other's roles were further established (Svara, 1985).

The focus of this study will be the State of Tennessee. With an identified 19,492 municipalities nationwide, Tennessee contains 347 incorporated cities, with only six government units larger than 75,000 in population. This places Tennessee in 17th place for population and a total statewide resident factor of 6,495,978 (www.tn.gov). The assessment of city managers and administrator roles as compared to the roles of mayors and elected officials is expected to provide a broad overview of smaller municipal governments and how the elected and administrative roles actually exist, operate and affect progress in Tennessee communities.

Falling back on research, it was the concluded that the "dichotomy-duality model prescribed a particular division of functions" for the public administration world. (Svara,

2003) It could be identified that behavior varied more than the former model allowed and that as roles of elected officials and their administrators complemented each other, changes would occur from the original dichotomy-duality models to a shared role identified as complementarity. Using the 1996 study of the International City/County Management Association in cities of over 200,000 population, new groundwork was laid for changes in expected roles. But the question lay that “the attitudes of city managers regarding the roles of elected officials must be examined further” (Svara, 2006).

Complementarity was just one aspect of the modern administrative role. Complementarity affected the roles of administrators and elected officials by not limiting identified models of political-administrative relations: separate roles, overlapping roles, responsive administrators and autonomous administrators. (Svara, 2006) Complementarity included all four traditional models of these administrative roles. Research also identified that the role of the administrator may be found in two roles: community building and modernizing the organization, in addition to standard administrative roles and policy guidance. After examination, the city manager/administrator found himself in the role of facilitator, bringing disparate community groups together, while coordinating governmental team structures (Nalbandian, 1989, 1991). Additional roles of city managers include situational analysis, interpersonal relations, assessing the community and negotiating. (Hinton and Kerrigan,) The administrator has also become the “translator” between the administrative world and the political world as defined by the city manager, but sought new roles in community engagement. (Nalbandian 2006)

Further public administration studies noted that administrators needed not only technical skills but the skills to affect change, having human interaction skills and executive leadership skills (Denhardt, 2001). As Denhardt identified, debate has centered on public administration as an art. Knowing that future administrators required skills that could effectuate change, the knowledge to work between administration and elected officials became an essential part of the ability to interact between sectors. Psychological, interactive and cognitive development were learning processes that provide the future

base skills for the modern day administrator (Habermas, 1979; Kohlberg, 1971). Risk reduction by preventing lawsuits became another challenge for administrators. (Batt, 1997) Listening to the stories and perspectives of citizens would be helpful in defining administrative roles and response (Herzog and Claunch, 1997). Skill sets of administrators also became a psychological contract in leading communities forward and progressing toward their visions (Nalbandian, 1989, 1991).

Prior to 1960, literature, for many years, concentrated on keeping strict separation of the distinct policy roles between administrators and policy makers. In its finding, administration was distinct from the realm of policy creation (Goodnow, 1940; Herson, 1957). Many of these were set by specific city charters or by limiting state laws. The first fifty years of modern public administration as we knew it kept the work role arenas separate through the valuable focus on efficiency and effectiveness of services, leaving policy definition to the realm of elected officials. (Dahl, 1947; Herson, 1957). Studies and surveys attempted to continuously define and refine the needed skills of the city manager, while identifying the changing environments of cities. This was observed in a detailed review of three successful city manager case study profiles and their seven observations for the administrator role such as concern for values, generalist skills, continuing education and concern for traditional values (Nalbandian, 2006). Success of the city manager/administrator was identified through fiscal management and little of differing value. Policy development and utility was integrated into the administrator's responsibility. Administrators became "neutral administrative experts" which had to be policy neutral in their approach to management, thus further accentuating the differences between roles of administrators and elected officials. While administrators were limited in their activity and leadership, elected officials were free to take a more visible role in dealing with business and constituencies.

From an opposite perspective, elected officials have been charged with developing policy as a primary responsibility to guide the community to its ultimate goals. However, perspectives from the elected point of view were seen to differ (Svara, 2006). In a state legislator's perspective, it was viewed that administrators were unequal partners in the

role of government. The legislature, as an institution, did not view the realm of administrators as partners when it came to addressing policies, laws or strategic planning (Lee, 2001). At the City Council or Mayor level, we saw these legislative leaders taking on traditional managerial roles in developing paths for implementing decisions, handling complaints and providing oversight functions of the City Manager as required by charter. Some of this came about through citizen engagement and advisory committees to the elected officials. These observations, as outlined in the Model City Charter and localized techniques to address oversight tended to demonstrate a reversal of responsibilities and were identified as an important area to be studied further. To accomplish this, the Svara model was identified as providing a significant framework (Herzog and Claunch, 1997).

The role of the elected official and the administrator has seen the evolution of the city management profession with the advent of new public administration models where traditional government services are now outsourced to the private sector for the accomplishment of efficiency and cost. The New Public Management theories of using third parties to sustain municipal services throughout the 1990's radically changed the approach to government service provision, establishing new contractual approaches within which to meet city missions. Public/private partnerships such as the provision of trash services, landfill operations or even fire suppression services allowed for city governments to meet growing demands for services. New methods of outsourcing, managed competition and competitive pooling led to new managerial roles to be learned by the city manager, with the oversight role of elected officials and mayors increasing to monitor progress and insure best value for the community (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). Elected official roles changed from pure policy to one of comparing costs, identifying customer service expectations and calculating "return on investment." The elected official was found to find new oversight challenges to themselves and their organizations, while still relying on the professional and technical expertise developed within municipal organizations by their administrators (Svara, 2006).

Further developments in research and literature have currently identified realistic concepts of collaborative governance and shared roles by administrators and elected

officials. Collaborative governance, which is defined to engage communities and constituents of interest within the structures and processes of governments, continues the blurring of the responsibilities of administrators and elected officials (O'Leary and Vij, 2012). A case study of homelessness in Vancouver, Canada, revealed an advantage to finding solutions to institutional problems in policy terms by *time, task and target*. The study found that the use of the many distinct interested parties increased the role of elected officials and leadership, while the bureaucratic agencies were kept on task by the administrators. Both working simultaneously, created a "collaborative advantage" for the networked project along with the third party non-profit sector (Doberstein, 2016).

Collaboration is highly dependent upon the abilities of the administrators and their elected counterparts, each bringing to the table the skills necessary to meet the collaborative goal (Frederickson, 2007). Abilities are found to be personal in nature and were examined in a survey of the Federal Executive service to include individual skills and traits, interpersonal skills that encouraged collaboration and group processing skills. In detail, these skills might include such abilities as mediation and facilitation (O'Leary and Vij, 2012). All of these skills would become part of those to be used by local government elected officials as advised and supported by the city managers and city administrators.

Collaborative governance, as an outcome and frequently identified desire of civic engagement continues to get research attention. As the roles of the administrator continuously evolve from its origins, public leadership and involvement becomes essential elements to being successful, creating vibrant resilient cities within which to operate. As administrators explore the timed use of their skills, groups engaged with cities need skills of sponsorship, facilitations and advocacy. Collaborative governance involving various groups may thus call for many different leadership roles such those requiring mediations skills technologist or simply representation at the policy table. (Emerson/Gerlak, 2014; Agranoff 2006; Bryson et al. 2006; Carlson 2007). When each of these new leadership areas are compared to the elected official and administrators in 2019, we will observe modification to traditional roles. With new perspectives, the elected officials and

administrator's collaborative capacities to adapt will be expected to adjust to the roles in both the political and administrative worlds (Emerson/Gerlak, 2014).

As collaborative leadership develops in theory and practice, the roles of the administrator and his elected official will see rapidly changing roles. While the basic political dichotomy-duality of the past is recognized in city charters and state laws, the complexity of problems that are greater than one organization will continue to grow. The elected official and administrator as public leaders will face many issues that impact collaboration, mustering the traditional yet differing skills for the task.

Today's administrators now find themselves in a highly visible administrative world changing from tangible, identifiable technical roles to a role of meeting intangible community needs and economic goals, traversing more and more into the recognized and sometimes expected sphere of the elected officials. Because of the complexity of the administrator's environment, interacting with governments, non-profits, and private sector we find an increasingly complex role in policy development. As the professional advisor to elected officials, we find the administrator addressing significant challenges at a community strategic level. Meanwhile, elected officials have moved into the "electoral activist" role helping constituents and solving tangible problems (Prewit, 1970).

Several researchers found that city managers or administrators had become active in policy making, political processes and brokering varying interests of the Council and community (Ammons and Newell, 1988; Berman 1997; Nalbandian, 1989, 1991; Svara, 1991, 1998).

As outlined by the earlier table, figuratively showing the levels of engagement in *Mission, Policy, Administration and Management,* the "lines" began to shift and modify based on the levels of commitment and changing responsibilities to the four role areas (Svara, 2006). Elected officials found that their defined spheres of influence simultaneously began to shift to more engagement with the administrator. In an oversight role over administration, elected officials would find their responsibilities defined by organizational

responsiveness, while obtaining satisfaction by constituent groups as their principals. The city manager, as the principal agent would absorb more than just his role as an agent but as a facilitator of process (Selden, Brewer and Brudney, 1999).

Elected officials meanwhile, could have retreated from their governance role through reduced attention to mission, reduced attention to policy tasks and increased intrusion into the tangible arenas of administration and management, particularly the handling of complaints. The fulfillment of City Council goal oversight became part of management orientation versus the global oversight of progress. With tools like city council approved contracts and deliverables, the roles of the elected officials began to look more like those of the city administrators, concentrating on effectiveness, administration, efficiency and management innovation.

Today, city administrators may find that intangible matters of long term vision and strategic planning are becoming a more absorbing responsibility when dealing with complex community issues. Given the turnaround time for local elections, city administrators often become the "holder of the vision" and staying the course. Previously, with major policies and mission adjustments, changes were made during elected officials' term of office. However, changes in strategic direction became a matter of convincing elected officials of proposed changes and then developing long range planning directions. Economic development initiatives are proposed and processed by administrators, while elected officials face approval and potential voter backlash to the proposal offered.

It is professed in this dissertation goals of a community can best be defined through the actions of elected officials and administrators in matters that may be considered "tangible or intangible." This study is identified to help classify the concise comparisons of elected officials as Mayor and Councilmembers. The survey will clarify professed to actual duties of this critical leaders in the public circuit. The study will also take into account the roles and responsibilities of city managers and city administrators in their relationships, tasks and leadership roles to frame today's responsibilities in smaller cities in Tennessee.

It may be easier for an elected official to point to tangible objects or topics that are accomplished such as a street being paved or a community center being built. Successful positive, tangible initiatives enable the elected official to get re-elected just like a state official passing legislation. Due to term length and aspirations for higher office, elected officials may choose the tangible expeditious accomplishments as electoral activists versus the long term intangible strategic mission development by leaving that to the administrator (Svara, 1999). Examining the Dichotomy-Duality Model it is surmised with the concept of applying tangible actions versus intangible actions, abstract versus concrete, or immediate versus long term, that such changes may directly impact the relationships of the administrator and elected officials. Recognizing research of complementarity (Svara, 1996, 1999, 2006), this may be even more significant in smaller populated cities.

Recent research has studied various theories of leadership, but public sector roles have not been studied in depth for their tangible influencing factors, particularly in smaller towns. Roles of administrators and political officials can easily be marginalized by theory when said public factors are not considered (Spicker, 2012). Factors such as decision making, accountability, external factors and ethics all have differing impacts on the leadership characteristics in the public sector. Research stresses that public leadership is affected by numerous variables, often by emphasizing public aspects over leadership. This was graphically described by Vogel and Masal (2015) as significantly influencing the public factors affecting leadership. In assessing the elected official's role and the administrator's role, the evaluation of leadership will always be an influencing factor.

Conclusion

This dissertation proposes to investigate the current roles of city managers, administrators, mayors and elected officials. With the assumption of uniformity in the Svara model, it is very conceivable that the accepted roles of the above groups have changed since his research initiative in 1988. Each group will meet their assigned or official roles, but informally, may act completely different. Administrators may be the leader in the development of "intangible" long term policies, while the elected official may

take the “tangible” role of some managerial oversight duties of the city manager. Simultaneously, other elected officials on a city council may assume the other roles of managerial oversight of the city manager through committees and subject areas. With changing politics, elected officials now face the need for activism and tangible results for their re-election. Instability at the national and state levels have trickled down to the local level and may be safely assumed to be evolving in new directions.

However, the long term character of strategic planning and mission driven activities are now left to the skills of the administrator or manager. They must become the intangible activist that retains a long term strategic vision for the community and the mission it serves. Each individual and the role they play affect the changing demands on the services of government over time. This project will demonstrate that roles of the administrator and manager continue to evolve and just perhaps, the role of the elected official and the administrators have reversed!

CHAPTER TWO
METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The research approach to this project involved a survey to elected officials and appointed administrators in Tennessee. As brought up in the literature review, a general research finding is a tendency to examine national, state or large city governments. Research is limited on smaller communities in the United States, creating less understanding on how these communities operate. Many small local governments are found in states with more sparse populations or more rural environments. Limited recent study and research on the elements of small cities have yielded a void in the knowledge available about city managers, mayors, city councilmembers and appointed administrators and what they are currently doing in 2019. The purpose of the survey was to advance our knowledge and understanding of these important local positions, how they work together in serving smaller communities, and what roles define the significant duties of these official senior positions when not in larger communities.

The Survey Sample

The state of Tennessee is a large state representing varied interests and histories in three distinct regions stretching from the mountains of Appalachia to the delta region along the Mississippi. The state consists of four large cities: Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga and Memphis. These four communities have their own issues of different scales including consolidated metro government environment such as Nashville and impacts of a major university in a city like Knoxville. Murfreesboro is also a city in excess of 100,000 population that was not included in the study. Beyond these, Tennessee consists of numerous small towns and medium sized cities.

When examining nationwide demographic data, the United States consists of many small cities. Many of these cities are operated through the Council-manager form of government, an outcome of the Progressive era in the 1910's. This form of government consists of an elected City Council that hires a trained professional city manager to conduct the operations of the city. This form represents nearly 55% of the cities across

the United States. The traditional form of government in the United States is the Mayor – Council form of government, where a mayor is elected to serve as chief executive of the city. These two forms of government were the only forms tested through this survey.

A population range was defined for the project with cities having a lowest population of just below 5,000 and a highest population of 75,000. Most medium sized communities are found throughout the state, with those over 10,000 being Council-manager form of government cities. Mayor-Council cities are found in all the population ranges, but is required by Tennessee law in cities below 10,000. In the survey, this is potentially where many of the administrators and other positions participated outside of city managers.

Two hundred and twenty (220) individuals from 75 communities were selected to participate from across Tennessee. Elected officials were selected from the cities with one Mayor and one Councilmember being chosen. The Mayor from each city was selected regardless of being directly elected or elected from within the governmental body.

Since each city has more councilmembers than mayors, a City Councilmember was selected from each City at random. If the City Council was more than a six member council, then a second City Councilmember was selected and invited to participate. Uniquely, every third Councilmember was selected from an alphabetical city council listing. In the larger city council, the sixth Councilmember was also selected from the alphabetical listing. Since there are always more Councilmembers than Mayors, and, the research is looking for patterns from these positions, it was important to not skew results by having an excessive number of Councilmembers.

When selected for participation, each of the 220 individuals were provided with individual identifications for response. No generic response boxes were used. The individual identifications allowed for questions to be asked if necessary and contacts to be made if the survey were only partially complete. Requests to not participate were honored and

the individual identifications would be deleted. No identification of the survey participants occurred once submittal was made.

City Managers were easily identified by position and listings on websites. However, the appointed administrators or administrative officials which were appointed by the Mayor, were chosen based on support to the elected officials. Other positions that responded were City Clerks, Chief Administrative Officer, City Recorders, Town Administrator or Town Manager. Table 2.1 identifies the positions by title and their inclusion within the response.

For six months prior to the issuance of the survey, announcements were made to members of the Tennessee City Management Association (TCMA) in regional and statewide meetings. City and town managers are today's members of the Tennessee City Management Association (TCMA) which is now a professional association supporting 125 administrators and their principal assistants across the Tennessee. Serving 85 local governments, the association has long standing in Tennessee and was founded in 1964. At the 2018 TCMA spring and fall conferences, city manager and administrator members were notified of the status and intent of the upcoming survey. Assistance and cooperation was requested from the membership to be alert to emails when this survey went out and encourage their selected Mayor and Councilmember to strongly consider participation. Elected officials receive many on-line requests and public inquiries for their assistance, many of which are not responded to. In this instance, the peer administrator or city manager was instrumental in encouraging and achieving the response rate for the survey.

The pre-announcements to TCMA were instrumental in legitimizing the survey and establishing a degree of confidence which was achieved when dealing with the elected officials. This association's recognition as the professional association of Tennessee city managers and administrators created the credibility needed to obtain participation. For general information, the TCMA association provides training and ethical guidance on the activities of professionally trained city managers, encouraging best practices in local government.

Table 2-1: Tennessee Elected and Appointed Official Respondents

Position	Frequency		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Alderman	5		7.6	7.6
Chief Administrative Officer	1		1.5	9.1
City Administrator	10		15.2	24.2
City Clerk	1		1.5	25.8
City Manager	19		28.8	54.5
City Recorder	1		1.5	56.1
Commissioner	2		3.0	59.1
Councilmember	5	7.6	7.6	66.7
Councilor	1	1.5	1.5	68.2
Mayor	15	22.7	22.7	90.9
Recorder	1	1.5	1.5	92.4
Town Administrator	4	6.1	6.1	98.5
Town Manager	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
	66	100.0	100.0	

Each selected city official received an invitation to participate by receipt of the survey. Three invitations were generally sent individually to the Mayor, a selected City Councilmember and the administrator/city manager. Participation and survey response signified consent to allow use of the information garnered in this survey by the survey administrator.

Prior to the distribution of the survey, it had received review and approval by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee to insure that content and questions would allow for protection of the participant. Since most information in the Tennessee governmental sector is open to the public, the domain allowed flexibility for the survey information to be collected without overriding concerns of confidentiality or privacy. Efforts were taken to ensure that none of the participants were aware of any other person's responses to the survey by eliminating any identification of respondents upon completion of the survey timeframe

Survey Construction

In 1987 and 1988, two surveys were conducted in conjunction with the International City/County Management Association on the roles of city managers. The survey paralleled an earlier survey of 12 cities (six council manager cities and six mayor council cities). This survey identified that city managers participated in the important roles of Mission, Policy, Administration and Management. The narrow scope of this survey indicated a need for further study which was conducted above.

Two surveys utilizing the same approach were conducted with city managers in the states of North Carolina and Michigan. The results discovered the roles of city managers which were based in solidly defined roles did not correspond definitively with the dichotomy-duality model and theory. This theory adhered to a strong separation between the political sphere of responsibilities and the administrative sphere of responsibilities. Greater levels of participation by city manager in all aspects of the four spheres of involvement was noted to occur. Oversight in specific areas of involvement may be shared, encroached upon and shunned to truly define the involvement patterns of the city manager versus elected positions.

The results of this work in the 1980s guided a portion of this survey to further define the work of city manager/administrators, mayors and councilmembers. The survey attempts to directly ask of participation levels within the realm of governmental work. Using modern statistical, multivariate analysis, the results help to indicate the separation or joint sharing of the government duties based in Tennessee's small cities of 5,000 to 75,0000 in population.

Concentrating on Tennessee allows a unique focus on one of the smaller states in the U.S. Recognizing the limits of data for small cities in less populated states, the survey allows for the development of a methodology that can be applied to other states outside of those above and particularly those of rural nature and fewer major cities. The focus on small Tennessee cities has allowed an insight into several questions:

- Are appointed administrators and city managers encroaching on defined roles of municipal elected officials?
- Do municipal elected officials have lesser involvement than authorized officially, due to assumption of roles by appointed administrator/city managers?
- Do mayors and city councilmembers have differing levels of participation in the activities of the city?
- Do the actual roles compare more closely or less closely to the perceived roles of elected and appointed officials in local government?

Using these surveys as a model, and insuring that further focus on the roles of elected officials and their administrative counterparts were identified, the survey was developed to define the similarities and differences that were found between the today's officials and those that were surveyed in 1987 and 1988.

Several consultations occurred before developing the instrument. Since the surveys were developed with Dr. James Svara, formerly of North Carolina State University, at the time, an interview occurred with him as to the perceived focus of the study. Initially, discussions centered on the concepts of strict separations between the political roles and the administrative. However, Dr. Svara eventually came to the realization of a new concept defining duties which was that of "complementarity." While not adhering to a strict political/administrative dichotomy, Dr. Svara advised that there were potential changes in the levels of oversight by elected officials over their city managers or administrative officials. This would have an important effect on the roles of the city managers and even changing dynamics of being an elected official.

A second conversation occurred with Dr. Rosemary O'Leary of the University of Kansas. Upon discussing the concept of changing roles and responsibilities, Dr. O'Leary, who has written frequently on the change of government to collaborative levels with other governmental and non-profit units, identified that these changing methods of governments could have an effect on roles and responsibilities of elected officials and appointed officials such as city managers.

Further discussions occurred with city managers within Tennessee regarding state laws, governmental approaches and responsibility considerations they have experienced with past city management work in Tennessee. Individuals such as Bill Hammon, former Assistant City Manager of Alcoa, and Pete Peterson, City Manager of Johnson City and Mike Walker, former City Administrator of Brentwood, all provided an information overview regarding Tennessee requirements of city management and limitations of elected official's involvement in local government. These peers in local government were also able to advise and assess the directions and questions to ask regarding the overall survey.

Based on a broad literature review, governmental experience and overall responsibilities of government, questions were developed that could help to identify what small city mayors, councilmembers and city managers and administrators do in Tennessee in 2018. Almost 30 years since the original ICMA studies involving small cities, the survey proceeded to clarify significant changes or duties that have stayed basically the same. New job categories and duties such as economic development and strategic planning are two examples of duties that were not a general responsibility in the 1980s.

Of critical importance to the development of survey questions was the attachment of questions to a roles and responsibility chart developed by Dr. Svara, when indicating the amount of time spent by the administrators and elected officials in differing roles.

The work of Dr. Svara created a visual image on the dichotomous roles of these positions. Question #3 of the survey parallels the chart and questions participants about the arenas in which elected officials and administrators operate, yielding current perspectives and whether changes have occurred. The center line identifies that each of these spheres of involvement are represented by greater and lesser amounts of involvement. As part of this survey, one purpose is to determine if these responsibilities correspond to the level of involvement theorized in 1985.

The survey was developed with a “building block” approach to levels of involvement in various aspects of local government. Each question successively added an additional layer of awareness among our groups: Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrator/managers. By building the survey in a successive fashion, the responses were able to confirm the responses of the groups and move to greater levels of refinement.

In tabulating the initial responses, it became apparent that there were not significant response differences between the city managers and the administrators. As such it was decided to merge them as one category, using a group of 38 responses as those of the administrator/managers.

In interpreting Goodnow, Svara identified that “politics and administration are conceptually distinct, but the activities associated with each are not neatly divided between different sets of officials”* (Goodnow, 1900, Svara, 2006: 1082). The rating system of the survey was developed to recognize scales of participation and involvement in various task arenas such as finances and economic development. The differences between the elected officials and the administrators was to be determined by the outcomes of the survey. The survey inquired about levels of responsibility and participation in various municipal government service sectors. The survey also inquired about levels of involvement by administrator/city managers and elected officials. Finally, the survey inquired about the working relationships between these groups.

As the survey questions were developed, a ranking system was established using 1-5 scales and 1-7 scales. If a respondent did not associate with the answer, they could reply “not applicable” or “did not know”. This permitted the use of Tukey’s Honest Significant Difference analysis, establishing responses above or below a median of “3” or “4” as outlined by the question.

In the article, “The Search for Meaning” by Svara (Figure 2.2), identification of numerous activities representing four dimensions of governmental processes (Mission,

Table 2-2: Activities Used to Measure Involvement in Four Dimensions of the Governmental Process

MISSION	ADMINISTRATION
Determining the purpose of city government and the scope of services provided.	Evaluating accomplishments of specific programs.
Developing strategies for the future development of the city.	Implementing programs and delivering services.
Setting long-term fiscal priorities for the city.	Resolving citizen complaints about services.
POLICY	**MANAGEMENT**
Developing annual program goals and objectives.	Changing management practices or reorganizing city government.
Budget process.	Hiring decisions about department heads.
Identifying current issues that require attention by city government.	Hiring decisions about employees below the department head level.

Administration, Policy and Management) were provided in the following chart. Using these listings as a guide, survey questions were developed to shed light on these essential activities in municipal government, whether they were conducted by elected officials or administrators.

In developing the ordering of the questions in the survey, focus was in several areas. The first area of study was that of duties and tasks as measured by responsibility and participation. The second area of study was that of roles and characteristics as measured by levels of involvement. The third area of study was that of work relationships as measured by effectiveness. The fourth area of study was that of duty assessment as measured in likelihood of being used.

The survey was conducted with a QUALTRICS software program as supported by the University of Tennessee. After identification of the selected participants, the survey was sent out in October/November 2018. Each participant was provided with separate respondent address and individualized electronic conveyance of the survey. Responses were returned to a common data site at the University of Tennessee. The survey was issued out to participants on October 17, 2018. The survey period closed on November 16, 2018, a survey period of 31 days. Late participation was not allowed and individuals with partially completed surveys received reminders of the deadline.

The electronic survey, entitled *Changing Roles of Elected and Appointed Officials in Tennessee***,** as sent to the participants, provided a degree of anonymity by their election to participate. Participation provided consent to utilize their data. All invitations were initially sent to public governmental emails. Assistance was only requested through city administrators or senior municipal staff for contact addresses.

In the introductory letter, the following qualification was made: "There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research project. **All records on this project will be kept confidential.** No references will be made in the oral or written reports which would link any participant by city, position or named individual". A password for distribution purposes only was created that simply allowed me to check the participants name off the at random list when the questionnaire was submitted. Participation was voluntary, and participant could choose not to participate at any time.
To define again, the study's purpose is to currently compare the roles and priorities of elected officials and compare those with their city administrators or city managers.

Analysis Tools Used

The analysis of the data required the use of the QUALTRICS survey software to assemble in a controlled off-site system under the control of the University of Tennessee. The statistics were grouped by Administrator/managers, mayors and councilmembers.

Three sets of tools were used to analyze the data. First, descriptive statistics were generated for each survey item for all respondents, and also separately for each of the three categories of respondents (i.e., mayors, councilmembers and administrators/managers).

Second, due to the large number of items in the survey, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on each numbered survey question that contains multiple questionnaire items. For instance, survey question #1 asks respondents to "indicate your level of responsibility" and lists nine items for which the respondents are to assign a value from 1 to 5. A MANOVA was performed with these nine items serving as the dependent

variables and respondent position category being the independent variable. The MANOVA routine in SPSS generates the Wilk's Lambda test statistic for determining whether a statistically significant difference in average response across the three respondent position categories exist for any of these nine items.

Third, a post hoc analysis was performed for each numbered survey question that produced a statistically significant Wilk's Lambda statistic, a Tukey's HSD (honest significant difference) test was performed on each item to determine on which items the groups of respondents differed and the nature of the difference. For all statistical hypotheses tests, a 95% confidence level (i.e. $p <= 0.05$) is used to determine statistically significant differences. For instance, if the Wilk's Lambda test statistic is determined to be statistically significant for question #1, a separate Tukey's Honest Significant Difference statistic is reported for each of the nine items under this question (Hari, Black, Babin, and Anderson, 2010).

The development of a survey to assess the activities of city managers, administrators, mayors and councilmembers is essential to understanding the current sphere of involvement for both elected and appointed officials. The survey was prepared with attention paid to the establishment of the 1985 and 1987 surveys of Michigan and North Carolina city managers. The process established then, was helpful in grounding the results being sought in this current survey.

The details of the process should reveal care and attention to the protection of the participants, while clarifying the actual activities of the three groups of officials, whether observing responsibility, participation or effectiveness. The technical details of the analysis using MANOVA, ANOVA or Tukey's Honest Significant Difference processes are a successful path forward to assess the levels of engagement by the elected or appointed officials.

CHAPTER THREE
RESPONSIBILITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS

The mechanism to explore detailed facets of the job duties and tasks of the elected and administrative officials was a twenty section survey of statements for response. In November 2018, a survey was submitted across the state of Tennessee to elected officials, including both Mayors and City Councilmembers. Additionally, city managers and administrators were also contacted for completion of the survey. The title of the survey was: “Changing Roles of Elected and Appointed Officials in Tennessee.” As described in the Methodology chapter, the survey was sent to cities within the population range of 5,000 to 75,000. Response was received from 66 respondents as members of their mayor, councilmember, and administrator personnel, representing a 30% response rate to the survey. Each of the twenty sections are to be highlighted as to the replies of the respondents and their resulting statistical implication as individual groups and through mean scores. The implications of those responses to the statements are reviewed from a job relationship standpoint and the statistical patterns are identified through the Tukey’s Honest Significant Difference methodologies.

Responsibilities of Officials

Initial identification of roles and responsibilities were gathered from the respondents to set the stage for the survey. Nine questions identifying degrees of responsibilities in elected official and appointed official roles were identified. Each of the participants were asked to rank their level of responsibility within a range, with five (5) being the highest level of responsibility, three (3) being the midpoint and one (1) being the lowest level of responsibility. Seventy-three respondents replied to these nine (9) statements. The mean scores of the respondents are outlined in Table 3-1. The table shows the mean score response by the total group of respondents. The highest and lowest scores were identified and a standard deviation score was provided.

Table 3-1: Level of Responsibilities

Description of Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am responsible for the daily business/activities of the city government.	66	1	5	3.61	1.691
I am responsible for developing policies which will determine the daily outcomes of city government services.	65	2	5	4.28	.820
I am responsible for developing policies which create outcomes to meet the goals and vision of the city.	66	1	5	4.27	.887
I am responsible for insuring that city services are provided by the city government.	66	1	5	4.20	1.180
I am responsible for funding the services to be provided by the city government.	66	1	5	4.00	1.150
I am responsible for determining which services are to be provided by the city government.	66	1	5	3.80	1.099
I am responsible to the citizens served by our city government.	66	3	5	4.73	.570
I am responsible for employees of the city government.	66	1	5	3.91	1.454
I am responsible for supporting policies adopted by the city government.	66	1	5	4.47	1.056
Valid N (list wise)	65				

The survey questions consist of responsibilities that would exist with employees at the executive levels of an organization and elected officials that would oversee the executive levels of an organization. City governments are required to provide services, both essential and non-essential. The services which are provided each day in municipal environments are done by actual governmental requirements, by developing policy and by conducting analysis of funding for those services.

As a total participant group, six of nine responses were found above a mean of 4.0 indicating a very strong sense of responsibility by public officials for the services rendered, policies developed, funding of city government, and citizen support. It may be identified that the strongest level of support within the question is observed when asked about responsibility levels to the citizens themselves. A mean of 4.73 was recognized out of a total possible of five, indicating that responsibility to the citizens is exceptionally important. Note that the lowest mean response was at 3.61, demonstrating that respondents did not rate below the midpoint and the statements were not unimportant in nature. The measure of responsibility to citizens became the strongest mean and attained the highest level of

all 9 questions in the group. Overall, the respondents have an above midpoint to strong sense of responsibility for all statements rated.

Three questions of the group were recognized with mean levels below 4.0: responsibility for daily, everyday activities of local government (3.61), responsibility for determining what services are to be provided (3.80) and responsibility for the employees of city government (3.91). These levels are below the strongest levels of responsibility, but well above the middle of the rating system at 3.00. Below the 3.00 midpoint, we could safely identify that the respondents were not responsible for these city services.

The results of the MANOVA indicate there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes toward responsibility in government by each respondent's position **[Wilk's Lambda = 0.160; F (18, 124) = 10.356; p= 0.001]**. In examination, five of nine questions were found to be significant. As a result, each statement was subjected to a post hoc test using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test. This test was used to determine where the difference occur between three groups: Mayors, Councilmembers, and City Managers/ City Administrators. The results of this post hoc analysis shows how the statistical differences occur among the groups. Upon a finding of statistical significance, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Tests (HSD) were run on the five (5) statements of responsibility found to be significant.

In Table 3-2, it was found that the mayoral group and councilmember group were similar in scoring. The scoring of 1.87 for Councilmembers and 2.00 for Mayors indicated a very close scoring similarity and established as a common subset group. These two groups had a significantly different relation to that of the city administrator/city manager group. City Administrators had the strongest scoring for daily business activities at 4.92, nearly twice that of the elected official's group.

Table 3-2: I am Responsible for the Daily Business/Activities of the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	15	1.87	
Mayors	21	2.00	
Administrators or Managers	37		4.92

The rating demonstrates a very, very strong relationship and probability that the administrator/managers definitely view the business activities of their city government as their responsibilities. The mayors and councilmembers will take a much lesser view that they are responsible for the daily activities of government. Although, it is often thought that the elected official is the person in charge of the city work force, this post hoc analysis demonstrates exactly the opposite and shows that city administrators take that responsibility and this activity level is accepted by their elected counterparts.

The second statement of responsibility demonstrating significance is that of developing policies for daily outcomes in the city government (Table 3-3). It is noted that when rating this statement that the lowest score of 1 was not utilized by the respondents. Personal responsibility for the policies that shaped daily outcomes of city services was assumed to a 2 level by all, signifying shared responsibility to at least a point below the midpoint. As a result a post hoc test was done for the review of this responsibility by the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test.

Table 3-3 below identifies the results found about this significance statement indicating strong levels of support by each group for addressing the outcomes of the city government services. Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test indicates that Councilmembers and Mayors may both have very strong commitment to develop policies as a similar group. The Councilmembers have a strong score at 3.67 as a group showing above the midpoint participation in the policy development associated with daily activities. The mayors are even more so with a very strong score of 4.24.

The post hoc test identifies that the responsibilities of the mayor group, however, may be susceptible to participating in either subset Group I or II. The Mayors will sometime gravitate to a probable relation with the City Councilmembers, but in other instances, may gravitate to the responsibilities for such seen by the city managers/city administrators. Tukey's Table 3-3 indicates a very strong flexibility for Mayors to move between the groups providing a larger difference between the administrator and the city council.

The City Administrator/managers were not significantly similar to that of the Councilmembers. The City Administrator/managers at 4.46 did have a significantly higher scoring indicating more responsibility on day to day activities with more similarity to the responsibilities of the Mayor than the Councilmembers as a governing board.

Developing policies to shape city service outcomes demonstrated potential for shared or joint outcomes. In actuality, Table 3-3 show the Mayors often have need to cross boundaries as to being responsible for policy outcomes that govern daily responsibilities. The difference between legislative functions and executive functions are visibly demonstrated by the post hoc scores.

In the third statement (Table 3-4), the responses found that responsibility to insure city services are provided was significantly different creating three separate groups. The strongest measurement in this area was the Administrator/managers group with a 4.89 score out of 5.00 possible, representing a very strong commitment for this group. It should be recognized that the managerial staff usually has a deep sense of social responsibility and obligation to insure that service is provided.

Table 3-3: I Am Responsible for Developing Policies which will determine the Daily Outcomes of City Government Services

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	15	3.67	
Mayors	21	4.24	4.24
Administrators or Managers	37		4.46

Table 3-4: I am Responsible for Insuring that City Services are Provided by the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test				
		Subset		
Position	N	1	2	3
Mayors	21	3.05		
Councilmembers	15		3.93	
Administrators or Managers	37			4.89

Councilmembers, in this instance, expressed their obligation to maintain services also. Perhaps this represents a strong push to respond to constituents. The very strong score of 3.93 identifies itself as a stand-alone group statistically. It is neither close to administrators nor mayors. Mayors were rated closer to the midpoint of the scoring perhaps showing less inclination to take responsibility for insuring city services are sustained, and instead, leaving it up to the city administrators to handle and councilmembers to front with the constituencies. Reasons for this level of commitment may be indicative of city charters, delegation to senior management, or councilmembers taking additional care for wards or districts. Interestingly, the results of this statement led to separate findings of groups where each one is different from the other groups. The City Administrator/managers may take the usual responsibilities for everything a city organization does or doesn't do, while Mayors may recognize any limitations that they may have in pushing responsibility for services, leaving that instead to the city managers. The City Councilmembers are recognized with their own separate group as they take responsibility for insuring services to the citizenry, which is different than a managerial oversight function.

The fourth statement of significance (Table 3-5) is that of being responsible for the city employees themselves. Again, the Administrator/Managers find themselves strongly committed as a group for being responsible to the actions of the city employees and taking responsibilities for their actions, right or wrong. The Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference analysis shows strong responsibility levels for this executive group with a mean score of 4.78. A very strong score will indicate close affinity to the work and actions produced by the employees.

Conversely, the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test score drops slightly below the average midpoint of 3.00 when examined (Table 3-5). Responsibility is shown less for Councilmembers at 2.93 and for Mayors at 2.71 with these median scores. The post hoc test identifies two groups with similarities. Mayors and Councilmembers indicate that they are not responsible for city employees. The employees have important purposes for providing services, but the elected officials in this case are closely aligned to defer this responsibility to the city managers. The subset group of city managers at 4.78 are almost perfectly scored to very strongly indicate their engagement with the employees and their work. We know that the city managers are responsible for the employees with their higher score, but additional factors may come into play for elected officials with such matters as restrictions by charter, opportunities to engage with employees and basic separation of elected officials and staff hires made only by Administrator/Managers.

The final statement of significance (Table 3-6) was that of supporting policies that have been adopted by the city government. Often, the elected or appointed officials have inherited policies adopted by their predecessors. They may agree or disagree with the policy. In the execution of the policy, the city administrators may be challenged to enforce the policy yet be flexible to make the community work with the policy or changes in policy.

Table 3-5: I am Responsible for Employees of the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	21	2.71	
Councilmembers	15	2.93	
Administrators or Managers	37		4.78

Table 3-6: I am Responsible for Supporting Policies Adopted by the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	1	2
Mayors	21	3.52	
Councilmembers	15		4.33
Administrators or Managers	37		4.95

This Tukey's Honest Significant Difference analysis demonstrates that the Councilmembers and the Administrator/managers as a group feel similarly strong responsibility for supporting policies (Table 3-6). Administrators have a mean measurement of 4.95 which is just short of the maximum range of measurement. Councilmembers drop slightly to a very strong mean score of 4.33 stressing further levels of responsibility for supporting policies. Mayors are above the median of the range at 3.52 a midpoint score, but significantly less than the other two groups. Statistically, since Mayors are often seen as leaders of change, this group may be more prone to scaling support of policies back to a point where there is flexibility to respond, oppose or develop solutions that enhance political life. The Administrator/managers however, are required to support policies, but may make suggestions to improve such policies. No matter how bad the policy is, the administrator/managers are still obligated to enforce or recommend change to an unforeseen policy challenge.

In summary of the first survey statement governing responsibility, the survey participants responded to nine statements, of which, five are held to be at a level of significance that encouraged further comparison between the groups with the post hoc comparison as completed through a Tukey's Honest Significant Difference analysis. In each of the five statement's case, the Administrator/Managers were found to have the highest levels of responsibility of the questions asked. They only shared that responsibility in a dual role in two instances: with the Mayors when developing policies that determine daily outcomes and with the Councilmembers when supporting policies by local government. A very strong response yielded a result that the Administrator/Managers were responsible for daily services, outcomes, selection of services to be provided, responsibility for with

employees and responsibilities for the policies to be adopted. Very little of these responsibilities were shared with the elected officials.

The post hoc analysis found that councilmembers were in the middle of the range for four of five questions of significance in the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference analysis. Their response was always strong and in a range from 1.87 to 4.33. The midpoint is 3.00. The City Council was the lowest of those groups surveyed for the category of policy development responsibility, leaving one to conclude that the policy body awaited recommendations for them to consider.

Mayors were found to have the lowest responses in three of the five significant questions in the Tukey' Honest Significant Difference analysis. Their scores were located in the middle of the groups for one question and the highest measure of a second question. Mayors were found to have the highest responsibility when determining which services are provided by the government. Mayors were in the middle category of each subset when claiming responsibility for policies.

One surprising observation was the scoring of the responsibility for city employees. It seems by the post hoc test that the obvious relations between the scoring of the Councilmembers and Mayor, that the responsibility for the employees is the full responsibility of the city managers/city administrators. Both Mayor and Councilmembers are near and below the midpoint indicating a medium level of support for this item being a responsibility for this group. Along with responsibilities come job duties themselves which will be observed next.

Official Changes in Governmental Duties

From time to time, city governments make changes in the roles and duties of their elected and appointed officials. This may come in the form of charter amendments, initiative and referendums by citizenry, changes in state law, or general evolution of the government. To confirm that the participants in the survey had not seen major change in their positional duties since January, 2016, a "yes/no" question was asked of 74 participants on this

question. Fourteen (14) of the 74 participants had seen changes in their job duties. Sixty (60) participants indicated that no change had occurred in the past two years. On a valid percentage basis, 81.1% of the survey participants had seen no change and 18.9% had seen some change within their assigned duties. At 81.1% the respondents (60) represented a sample size that had sustainable levels of duties defined for the jobs of mayors, councilmembers, city administrators and city managers.

Levels of Participation by Officials

In 1985, Dr. James Svara created a visual image of four major responsibility areas for elected officials and city managers. This image created a shared division of time commitment expended in each area by the elected officials and city managers (See Figure No. 1 in Methodology, Chapter 2). These distinct areas were identified as Mission, Policy, Administration, and Management. A visual image demonstrated that Mission and Policy were the areas of participation and a majority time commitment by elected officials while the majority of time by city managers was participation in the areas of Administration and Management. Research in this report seeks to determine if this has changed in some way over time in the past 35 years. On an inquiry basis, we seek to find if the roles of elected officials and administrators have seen their roles change in the 35 years since this study.

Statement 3 of the survey asked each participant to identify their level of participation in each work area. Inquiry was made in four statement areas:

- The managerial assignment of resources and priorities of the city government
- The administrative rules and regulations of the city government
- The policy initiatives and policy development of the city government
- The mission and strategic direction of the city government

Table 3-7 reports the summary statistics for the four statement areas relating to the participation by the survey respondents in the Mission, Policy, Administrative and Managerial areas. Generally, it was found that Mission and Policy arenas were consistently stronger for the mayors and councilmembers than the city administrators. In

the Administrative and Managerial arenas, it was found that scores were consistently stronger for the city administrators than the mayors and councilmembers.

The survey participants responded to the four dependent variables and were noted at strong group mean levels based on a 1-5 scale of participation (Table 3-7). Administrator/Managers were scored at 4.84 for managerial and administrative rules, indicating strong participation in these areas. Administrator/managers were less participative in policy development 4.16 and strategic planning 4.21, but still in very strong position above the midpoint of 3.00. The average mean scoring for managerial assignment was 3.98 and administrative rules at 4.39. The two average mean scores still demonstrate strong measurements.

Mayors and City Councilmembers had greater scores for the work of policy initiatives and strategic mission than the Administrator/Managers in these areas. The Mayors were found to have mean scores of 4.15 on policy matters while they were greatly involved with the strategic mission with a score of 4.77. Councilmembers were also strongly involved with the strategic mission 4.45 and likewise strongly engaged in policy initiatives 4.36. Both areas indicated very strong participation levels in the 1-5 rating scale. The Councilmembers also had a 4.00 score when associated with administrative rules and regulations. The higher score should demonstrate that more involvement is occurring in the policy arena by the Councilmembers (Table 3-7).

Mayors and City Councilmembers had greater scores for the work of policy initiatives and strategic mission than the Administrator/Managers in these areas. The Mayors were found to have mean scores of 4.15 on policy matters while they were greatly involved with the strategic mission with a score of 4.77. Councilmembers were also strongly involved with the strategic mission 4.45 and likewise strongly engaged in policy initiatives 4.36. Both areas indicated very strong participation levels in the 1-5 rating scale. The Councilmembers also had a 4.00 score when associated with administrative rules and regulations. The higher score should demonstrate that more involvement is occurring in the policy arena by the Councilmembers (Table 3-7).

Table 3-7: Participation in Governmental Roles

Descriptive Statistics	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The managerial assignment of resources and priorities of the city government.	Administrators or Managers	4.84	.679	38
	Mayors	2.77	1.739	13
	Councilmembers	2.45	1.293	11
	Total	3.98	1.531	62
The administrative rules and regulations of the city government.	Administrators or Managers	4.84	.370	38
	Mayors	3.38	1.446	13
	Councilmembers	4.00	1.183	11
	Total	4.39	1.046	62
The policy initiatives and policy development of the city government.	Administrators or Managers	4.16	.886	38
	Mayors	4.15	.987	13
	Councilmembers	4.36	.809	11
	Total	4.19	.884	62
The mission and strategic direction of the city government.	Administrators or Managers	4.21	.843	38
	Mayors	4.77	.439	13
	Councilmembers	4.45	.522	11
	Total	4.37	.752	62

The results of the MANOVA indicate that there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the Four Role Areas of Elected and Administrative officials by the respondents to the survey **[Wilks' Lambda test 0.343; F (8, 112) = 9.918, p= 0.001].** As a result, each statement in this section was subjected to a post hoc test using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test allowing determination as to which items had different attitudes according to the position held by the respondent. What follows is the post hoc analysis for each of the four statements.

Two areas of significance in the dependent variables of 1) the managerial assignment of resources and priorities of the city government AND 2) the administrative rules and regulations of the city government. The Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test (Table 3-8) identified the analysis of the three groups yielded two significant subsets. As confirmed the Councilmembers (2.45) and Mayors (2.77), found their level of activity to be below the midpoint and sufficiently similar to each other as a group. However, the participation rate of the administrator/manager in managerial assignment of resources/priorities were very significant at 4.84. It would be observed that the managerial activity within the municipal organization continues to be a significant domain of the city manager.

The work associated with administrative rules and regulations (Table 3-9), as a second of four statements were noted as significant in the testing. Both of these participation work areas would signify strong responsibilities being maintained by the administrator/managers, with elected officials in a lesser role.

The post hoc test regarding Administrative Rules and Regulations indicates a divide, but much stronger participation by the elected officials than was seen in the managerial statement in Table 3-8. At a 4.84 score, the Administrators or Managers match their scoring regarding the managerial statement. However the Mayors (3.38) and Councilmembers (4.00) now have higher scoring indicating a greater level of activity in this administrative arena. In the managerial arena seen in Table 3-8, Mayors (2.77) and Councilmembers (2.45) are showing a significant activity level increase into the administrative arena. The Councilmember scoring of 4.00 is a very strong indication of activity which may mean that Councilmembers through their oversight function has the tendency to encroach in a larger way than expected. In the case of the Svara model, the commitment line could move in this activity when reviewing the sphere of influence between the elected officials and administrators.

Table 3-8: The Managerial Assignment of Resources and Priorities of the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	11	2.45	
Mayors	13	2.77	
Administrators or Managers	38		4.84

Table 3-9: The Administrative Rules and Regulations of the City Government

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	13	3.38	
Councilmembers	11	4.00	
Administrators or Managers	38		4.84

As stated, Councilmembers and Mayors find similarities as a group with their levels of participation in these statement area. These two elected official groups are more alike levels below the midpoint of the test when associated with managerial activities. Administrator/Managers should be noted as having very strong participation levels in the participation of managerial and administrative assignments. This firmly establishes their dominance as a group with respect to these duties and should represent a larger commitment on the Svara chart. In either case, the Mayors and City Councilmembers begin to have higher participation rates in the Administrative area. Perhaps this is noted as an oversight function or a constituency response situation to increase this involvement. Most of all, city managers (4.84) are found to be most active as a group over the elected officials. Their participation in the administrative rules and regulation activity is needed to insure government response.

In the course of conducting the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test there were no findings of significance or relationship for the two areas of Mission/Strategic Direction and Planning initiatives. All scorings between groups was scored with $p \leq 0.05$. The non-significant p-score identified group relationships for Missions/Strategic Direction scored at 0.052 between the Mayors and Administrators. This indicated close relationship but not significant when it comes to defining the city government strategic direction.

Most importantly, Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test found that differences between the Mayors and Councilmembers was minimal with both participant groups acting more alike than different. It indicates that Mayors and Councilmembers may continue to engage in areas of interest, have political priorities or have a clearer understanding of their assigned roles by city charter.

In summary of this statement, it is important to recognize that past theories and studies by academics such as Svara, indicate that the definition of participation levels by city managers and elected officials are more significant outside of strategic and policy development arenas. In assessing these areas, we find the participation levels of the Administrator/Managers to be very strong in day to day managerial and administrative

responsibilities and ultimately, a confirmed primary responsibility. Administrators participate strongly but are less participatory than their elected counterparts as Mayors and Councilmembers, who remain firmly participating in strategic levels and policy development at extremely strong participatory levels. However, the crossover of Councilmembers into the arena of administrative responsibility is viewed by the results of our post hoc tests.

Level of Involvement in Official Responsibilities

There are many duties and functions within each municipal government. To further explore the involvement of the Mayors, Councilmembers, City Managers, and Administrators in these subject areas, 68 survey participants were asked to gauge their level of involvement in each of several activities (Table 3-10). This was tested on a one to five scale ranking system with one being the least involved and five being the most involved. Determination of the significant job duty areas would allow the study to focus on those areas of elected official priority involvement, average levels of involvement or reduced levels of involvement. The same focus would determine those areas of significant involvement by the city managers and appointed administrators.

Budget and Financing

Four areas of focus were surveyed (Table 3-11) in this element of involvement: budget preparation, budget adoption, long term financing and planning, and grant applications. Given external influences upon city financing, the involvement of elected and appointed officials is essential to insure financial solvency, financial planning, and cost analysis for city services. Sixty-eight (68) participants were organized into three groups consisting of Administrators/Managers, Mayors and Councilmembers. The responses of the groups are seen below.

Table 3-10: Levels of Involvement and Participation

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Budget preparation	Administrators or Managers	4.63	.786	38
	Mayors	3.06	1.349	18
	Councilmembers	2.58	1.443	12
	Total	3.85	1.396	68
Budget adoption	Administrators or Managers	3.68	1.254	38
	Mayors	4.83	.383	18
	Councilmembers	4.67	.651	12
	Total	4.16	1.128	68
Long-term bond financing and financial planning	Administrators or Managers	4.53	.647	38
	Mayors	4.11	1.023	18
	Councilmembers	3.25	1.485	12
	Total	4.19	1.040	68
Grants and grant applications	Administrators or Managers	4.05	1.012	38
	Mayors	2.61	1.195	18
	Councilmembers	2.17	1.193	12
	Total	3.34	1.356	68

Table 3-11: Budget Preparation

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference			
		Subset	
Position	N	1	2
Councilmembers	12	2.58	
Mayors	18	3.06	
Administrators or Managers	38		4.63

Initially, the top two job areas involve Budget and Budget Adoption. In the response, we noted significant involvement of the Administrators with the preparation of the budget, with the elected officials taking a lesser role. Administrators have a very strong mean score response at 4.63, with Mayors at 3.06 and Councilmembers at a low 2.58. However, changing the topic to Budget Adoption (Table 3-12), lessens the amount of involvement and participation by the administrators (3.68) and increases the involvement of mayors (4.83) and councilmembers 4.67). Of course, the major responsibility as elected officials is the adoption of the budget, so an increased participation rate is logical. In this case the roles reverse with the Mayor and Councilmembers taking the responsibility of active involvement for budget adoption.

Long term bond financing (Table 3-13) has very strong participation by the Administrators and the Mayors, while the participation by the Councilmembers is significantly less, relegating them to the approval processes associated with approving the issuance of long term debt.

Grants and grant applications (Table 3-14) are noted as a responsibility of the Administrator/Managers at 4.05 or very strong. Mayors (2.61) or Councilmembers (2.17) define their involvement in the grant processes as limited, perhaps identification of possibilities after attending a conference and becoming aware of the grant. Further study of that detail would need to occur.

The results of a MANOVA analysis in these job participation areas indicates that there is an overall statistically significant difference at an even higher degree of confidence with $p \leq 0.001$ **[Wilk's Lambda = 0.414**; **F (8,124) – 8.585, p<.001].** Significance was found in all four duties at 0.001 within the municipal organization. As a result, each statement or job in this section was subjected to a post hoc test using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test to determine the different perspectives by the position of the respondent. The result of this post hoc analysis shows where the statistical differences emerge between the tested groups.

Table 3-12: Budget Adoption

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Administrators or Managers	38	3.68	
Councilmembers	12		4.67
Mayors	18		4.83

Table 3-13: Long-Term Bond Financing and Financial Planning

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
Position	**N**	**Subset**	
		1	**2**
Councilmembers	12	3.25	
Mayors	18		4.11
Administrators or Managers	38		4.53

Table 3-14: Grant and Grant Applications

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	12	2.17	
Mayors	18	2.61	
Administrators or Managers	38		4.05

The post hoc analysis created two subset groups with our defined mayors, councilmembers, and administrators. As indicated above, the average mean of all three groups indicated an involvement level of 3.85. Now, in Table 3-11, a very strong level of involvement was recorded by the Administrators at 4.63 indicating their key role in annual budget development. Mayors answered with a 3.06 mean near the midpoint, while demonstrating a median level of involvement in the budget. Councilmembers responded with a 2.58 mean showing a less than midpoint level of involvement. The post hoc analysis shows that Administrator/managers are significantly more involved in budget preparation (mean of 4.63) than Councilmembers (mean of 2.58) or Mayors (mean of 3.06). Mayors and Administrators do not significantly differ in their level of involvement. We find that the Administrator/Managers are significantly more participative in budget preparation than the elected officials. Elected officials do not significantly differ from each other.

Budget adoption (Table 3-12) was rated differently with a very strong level of participation by the City Councilmembers and the Mayors. For all positions, an average mean of 4.16 (Table 3-10) indicated a strong level of involvement by all groups. Mayoral engagement was at the very strongest levels of involvement at a mean of 4.83, Councilmembers were at similar very involved levels at 4.67.

The post hoc test indicates that two groups have been recognized as significant and similar. Administrators and city managers have a lower mean score of 3.68 which will indicate a significantly higher level of participation by these individuals in budget adoption. However, as true to adoption processes as possible, both Councilmembers and Mayors, as a group, are strongly attached to this duty. The function of budget adoption which is officially recognized as an elected person function is found as significantly similar. The level of responsibility essentially does not differ between the mayors and councilmember. Since this process was subsequent to the budget preparation process, Administrator/City Manager involvement was strong but less than their budget preparation levels. It was found that the significance of involvement is extremely strong with Councilmember and Mayoral engagement within the budget adoption process. The budget adoption process

has major impacts to the community by establishing services and tax rates, which initiates the programs of the city government for the coming year.

Long term financing (Table 3-13), through the use of bonded indebtedness instruments are a normal financial function of government. Because it usually entails pledging the "full faith and credit" of the city taxpayers, there is usually a degree of involvement and analysis by senior city officials. The mean cumulative of our participants is found at a strong level of involvement at 4.19 (Table 3-10). Because this is an assumed administrative function, the administrator/city managers were ranked at a very strong mean level 4.53 by the respondents. The administrators will be actively engaged in preparing the financial recommendations for long term financing. When examining, Mayors held a mean level of 4.11 or a similar level of involvement as the administrators. This may indicate the engagement of the mayors in stressing importance of long term financing to the community and constituency as a matter of leadership. Councilmembers were found to be at a lower level of involvement at a mean level of 3.25. Since City Councils are the approving body of local government, their level of involvement may be viewed as engagement at certain points along the process of gaining the long-term financing. However, the Administrator/ Managers are significantly more involved in long term financing (4.53) matters with local government as to their elected counterparts (Mayors: 4.11 and Councilmembers: 3.25. As such, Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test identified the Mayors and Administrators as close partners for this duty.

Grants and grant applications (Table 3-10) are a level of involvement that is a continuous function of local government. The application of grant funds allows the supplementing of local funds for projects of local interest that would not ordinarily be provided by the city government. Familiarity with sources of grants can come from elected and appointed sources.

The mean average of all groups for their level of involvement was found at 3.34. This indicates a more normal level of involvement, closer to the midpoint of 3 on a 1 to 5 scale. In the post hoc analysis (Table 3-14), the strongest level of involvement became that of

the Administrator/city managers at 4.05. Scoring indications of these administrators were very strong responsibility levels. The manager function to find and seek grant opportunities were significantly stronger involvement levels than their elected counterparts. Administrators could stand as their own group. Indications of limited involvement by the Mayors as a group (2.61) and the Councilmembers as a group (2.17) shows limited engagement in this activity and leaving it to the administrators.

In summary, the functions of city government related to financial matters consists of involvement in the budgetary processes and financial planning. In examining the positions of Mayors, City Councilmembers and Administrator/Managers, the strong levels of involvement in budget preparation and budget review significantly involve the city managers as a chief executive. In typical city charters, a city manager is to provide a recommended budget for approval by City Council. This analysis demonstrates that this process is, in general, adhered to by the participants in strong levels of involvement by the Administrators and Mayors. Councilmembers involve themselves, in general, to a lesser extent in budgetary processes, excepting the approval processes of these financial categories.

Services with No Significant Findings

A significant portion of city government revenues and responsibilities are expended on public safety services consisting of police, fire and ambulance services. During the survey, levels of involvement were requested from the participant on a 1 to 5 scale from least participative to most participative. They were subsequently grouped in our categories of Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrator/managers. Four areas of questions were surveyed, and mean scores were established on a 1 to 5 scale:

- Public Safety services oversight (3.56)
- Emergency management preparation (3.09)
- Environmental quality and code enforcement (3.19)
- Constituent inquiries and complaints (4.19)

The breakdown by group of City Administrator/City Managers, Mayors and Councilmembers is defined by groups (Table 3-15).

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is not a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about public safety services

[Wilk's Lambda = 0.773; F (8, 112) = 1.924; $p \leq 0.05$].

In examining the mean scores by groups, it was found that Administrators provided a very strong level of oversight at 4.18 for Public Safety services. Mayors were secondarily scored at 3.12 near the midpoint on oversight, while the Councilmembers were below midpoint at 2.83. Mayors (2.71) and Councilmembers (2.58) were below the midpoint in emergency management preparation. This is found to be surprising for Mayors, as they are utilized in state emergency services as the primary political person responsible for recovery. Although the administrators may do the administrative work in a recovery, the official capacity of Mayor, whether strong mayor or weak mayor, is the chief respondent for the community with state and federal resources.

Table 3-15: Public Safety Participation Aspects

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Public Safety services oversight.	Administrators or Managers	4.18	1.074	33
	Mayors	3.12	1.269	17
	Councilmembers	2.83	1.586	12
	Total	3.63	1.358	62
Emergency management preparation.	Administrators or Managers	3.52	1.093	33
	Mayors	2.71	1.448	17
	Councilmembers	2.58	1.443	12
	Total	3.11	1.320	62
Environmental quality and code enforcement.	Administrators or Managers	3.55	1.201	33
	Mayors	2.82	1.286	17
	Councilmembers	2.75	1.485	12
	Total	3.19	1.316	62
Constituent inquiries and complaints.	Administrators or Managers	4.42	.614	33
	Mayors	3.88	1.317	17
	Councilmembers	3.83	1.337	12
	Total	4.16	1.027	62

Environmental quality is a desired trait in every community. However, some of the responsiveness and participation in this work area may require a certain level of professional knowledge, thus higher involvement by the city managers (3.55) and lower engagement by the Mayors (2.71) and Councilmembers (2.75).

Today's environment for Councilmembers and Mayors is one that strives to be responsive to constituents. This is particularly true for citizen complaints or inquiries. The median for Mayors (3.88) and Councilmembers (3.83) is in strong position for participation in this duty. Although, City managers/administrators have a stronger median score (4.42), this may be less due to citizen contact and more to do with Mayor or Councilmember delegation to the manager to solve the problem.

School financing for some Tennessee cities engage significantly city funded school systems. Systems are located across Tennessee, operating similar to countywide systems operated by county government but serve the city they are located in. Only 38 of the survey participants responded to this inquiry. Some school systems have a separation between the City Council and the Board of Education. In such instances, cities must maintain certain levels of financial support just like county supported systems. For instance, the state of Virginia maintains similar city educational systems. In many instances, the City must provide funding for education, but is not allowed to intrude upon the administrative operations of the school system.

An ANOVA analysis was run on this unique municipal operation that some Tennessee cities participate in. The low level of mean scores below the midpoint was indicative of a lower participation rate in this responsibility. An average mean of 1.97 indicated low levels of involvement by our three city official groups with this service. The mean scores of the Mayors (3.29), Councilmembers (2.30) and Administrator/managers (3.10) were found to be indicative of limited engagement in education. The one-way ANOVA test results were found to be insignificant with $p \leq 0.05$ indicating no significant differences among the groups [**F (2, 35) = 1.331 P-value = 0.255].** No further analysis was conducted. The uniqueness of school systems being part of local municipal governments is not found to

be a service in many places, instead yielding to independent school boards. Due to the age of Tennessee as a state, the educational component of municipal service is an influencing factor on the role of the Mayor, Councilmember, and Administrator/manager only in certain cities for purposes of this report. Further study in other states with such structures is merited to determine any detail upon the roles and responsibilities of the elected officials and administrators.

The involvement of elected officials and their administrators in the amenities of a community are important for sustainability of its residents. Their level of involvement can determine the outcomes and directions of the community. Quality of life issues can be a determining factor on the directions the Mayors, Councilmembers and Administrator/managers may want to take the community.

Several areas were questioned for the determination of this area of involvement. Total group means were established by participants based on a 1 to 5 scale. The participant's responses yielded mean group scores:

- Parks and parks amenities: 3.67
- Library services: 2.81
- Community festivals and recreational activities: 3.26
- Affordable housing development: 2.60

Table 3-16 shows the breakdown by the groups of Administrator/managers, Mayors and Councilmembers. The summary statistics is shown for all the survey items in the Park, Quality of Life and Housing section. Generally, it was found that all groups basically fall into a similar scoring group above the midpoint. Administrators at 3.95, mayors at 3.64 and councilmembers at 3.18 all indicate a strong scoring for their involvement in this area of municipal activity. Elected official scores were below the parks scores even further for Community festivals and recreational activities and Library Services. Indications are that Library services are of lesser interest and least participative by the elected officials and the city manager themselves (2.48). Mayors took a greater role (3.64) in community festivals since this is an opportunity to visibly support the community. The

Councilmembers took on a lesser role at 3.36 while the city managers were at the midpoint, essentially allowing community festivals to be more of an elected official activity. The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is not a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ among the averages for the three groups **[Wilks' Lambda = 0.722; F (8, 74) = 1.633; p= 0.130].**

These specialty areas are common but yet unique aspects of these services are an important element of community. Parks and Park amenities were found to have median scores reflective of importance to the Mayor and Administrator. Mayors and Councilmembers scored slightly above the midpoint when the subject of library services was responded to. Administrators had less participation. Mayors had the highest level of involvement for community festivals, with Councilmembers shortly behind in scoring. The city manager score hovered near the midpoint. In summary, it would be found that these municipal services have less involvement of mayors, councilmembers, and administrator/managers. Affordable housing was of highest concern to the mayors (3.18) with city managers and councilmembers below the midpoint in concern.

Table 3-16: Parks, Quality of Life and Housing

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Parks and park amenities	Administrators or Managers	3.95	.973	21
	Mayors	3.64	.924	11
	Councilmembers	3.18	1.401	11
	Total	3.67	1.107	43
Library services	Administrators or Managers	2.48	1.504	21
	Mayors	3.18	1.601	11
	Councilmembers	3.09	1.514	11
	Total	2.81	1.532	43
Community festivals and recreational activities	Administrators or Managers	3.00	1.183	21
	Mayors	3.64	.809	11
	Councilmembers	3.36	1.567	11
	Total	3.26	1.217	43
Affordable housing development	Administrators or Managers	2.38	1.161	21
	Mayors	3.18	1.537	11
	Councilmembers	2.45	1.572	11
	Total	2.60	1.383	43

The topics of park and park amenities, library services, community festivals and recreational activities and affordable housing development, are regular areas of involvement by each of our three groups. The lack of significance between each group's degrees of involvement led to no further analysis of these requirements. Mean scores by each participating group were grouped close together, further exposing the scoring to a lack of significance.

Utility Systems and Infrastructure

The utility infrastructure is a mandatory aspect of municipal government service, providing water and sewerage services to a community at large. In some cities, additional infrastructure may include electric or gas services. As modernization occurs, infrastructure for Internet, phone and cable TV services are part of the infrastructure. Most visible is that of streets and sidewalks throughout the community. The financial costs of this infrastructure is allocated through a capital improvements plan established and reviewed in each city by their City Councils, Mayors and Administrator/city managers.

Related areas were surveyed with the participants and median scores were established by group and as a whole group. The participant's mean group responses yielded the following means for level of involvement:

- Utility Systems and Infrastructure Maintenance: 3.15
- Capital projects prioritization: 4.40
- Strategic planning: 4.49
- Economic Development: 4.09

We may view a midpoint scoring for all groups on Utility Systems and Infrastructure Maintenance. The midpoint scoring a 3.15 indicates limited involvement

Table 3-17 report summary statistics by groups for all survey pertaining to the section on long term planning, utilities and economic development. Overall, it is seen that Utility infrastructure is an area where administrators are particularly engaged. The 3.70 scoring indicates a very strong relationship on this responsibility. The mayors and elected officials

are less engaged and likely leave the details of services like water and wastewater to the professional directors of these services. Capital project are found much the same way with the Administrator/managers having very strong responsibilities (4.61). Mayors (4.32) and Councilmembers (4.00) are also very strong participants, presumably through budgeting and providing for long term financing of these projects. Strategic Planning is an area where all groups participate in defining their responsibility for their jobs, with the lowest score being 4.23 with Councilmembers. Economic development is an area with jurisdiction for both the city manager and mayors rating a very strong relationship in this topical area.

The results of a MANOVA test indicate that there is a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in the attitudes professed about Utility infrastructure, Capital projects and Economic Development **[Wilk's Lambda = .747**; **F (8.00, 118.00) = 2.317; p= .024.**

Table 3-17: Utilities and Planning

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Utility systems and infrastructure maintenance	Administrators or Managers	3.70	1.357	33
	Mayors	2.37	1.300	19
	Councilmembers	2.92	1.605	13
	Total	3.15	1.492	65
Capital projects prioritization	Administrators or Managers	4.61	.827	33
	Mayors	4.32	1.108	19
	Councilmembers	4.00	1.291	13
	Total	4.40	1.028	65
Strategic planning	Administrators or Managers	4.64	.699	33
	Mayors	4.42	1.071	19
	Councilmembers	4.23	1.166	13
	Total	4.49	.921	65
Economic development	Administrators or Managers	4.18	1.044	33
	Mayors	4.26	.872	19
	Councilmembers	3.62	1.325	13
	Total	4.09	1.071	65

As a result, each question in this section was subjected to a post hoc test (Table 3-18) using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test to determine the relationships of group by the attitudes expressed about their position in the survey. What follows is the results of this post hoc analysis where the statistically significant differences occurred.

A significant p-value of 0.004 was found between Administrators/managers and Mayors at .004 regarding utility infrastructure. Both Mayors and Administrators found a high degree of significance regarding the level of involvement for utility systems and infrastructure maintenance. A post hoc Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test revealed the following about Utility Systems and the three groups charged with the utility operations and infrastructure maintenance (Table 3-18).

Of the three groups, the Administrator/managers were found to have substantial levels of involvement (3.70) with the utility systems. With a midpoint of 3.00, the Administrator/managers are found to have the highest level of involvement regarding the utility systems. At 3.70, this group was found to have a strong level of involvement. However, Councilmembers, at a 2.92 score may be considered as part of a group with the Administrator/managers representing significantly more involvement with this municipal service and depending on level of involvement by the Councilmembers. Because infrastructure is part of the municipal services that actually impact many constituencies, there is a higher degree of awareness of the infrastructure by the City Councilmembers such as streets, parks and water.

Table 3-18: Utility Systems and Infrastructure Maintenance Level of Involvement

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	19	2.37	
Councilmembers	13	2.92	2.92
Administrators or Managers	33		3.70

As a position of oversight over the Utility Director, the Administrators must pay considerable attention to this program due to related revenue collections and its basic regulated service as required within municipal government. Of the groups, Mayors and Administrators were found to be significantly different with Mayors mean measurement at 2.37, or involvement levels significantly less than the midpoint of 3.00 on a scale of 1 to 5. Councilmembers may equally be considered to be involved with both groups. Mayors and Councilmembers are split between both groups but found to be insignificant to the level of involvement with infrastructure.

Three additional questions were asked within this section regarding capital projects prioritization, strategic planning and economic development. None of these areas were found to be significant as to levels of involvement leading one to realize that each of these job duties were shared within the realm of work by the elected officials and the appointed administrators and city managers.

Capital projects prioritization would be a function conducted by the elected and appointed officials. A lowest rating would still be strong for Councilmembers at a 4.00 median, Mayors at a 4.32 median and the Administrator/managers at a 4.61 median. These are very strong levels of involvement and significantly above the midpoint. As only one subset was created, no significance was identified.

Strategic Planning is considered a necessity in local government today and is conducted by both elected officials and appointed officials. No significance was identified with all three groups in the very strong statements of involvement in the subject of strategic planning. Ranges were Councilmembers at 4.23, Mayors at 4.42 and Administrator/managers at 4.64. As only one subset was created, no significance was identified.

In summary, the participation levels of the mayors, elected councilmembers and city managers/administrators, indicate a significant pattern with the engagement of two subsets, with the Councilmembers actually being able to have a relationship in both groups. The identification indicated that the Councilmembers when participating in utility

systems and infrastructure maintenance, can and will be engaged with the City Managers more fully and the mayor when examining long term maintenance and capital issues.

Community Planning

The last area of review for these municipal government responsibilities is that of planning and community development. Planning is an important municipal function and is a function that engages both the elected officials and the administrator/city managers. Their responses to the planning topics may involve policy development, geographical change or infrastructure prediction.

Four areas were queried of the participants, including strategic planning and long-term vision, community redevelopment, neighborhood plans, and regional planning efforts (Table 3-19). Means were established for each of these, with all four areas indicating strong areas of involvement by the individuals and their groups. The combined mean for the strongest of these four categories was that of strategic planning at 4.45, a joint function of both executives and elected officials. A summary breakdown is shown in Table 3-19.

Table 3-19: Community Development and Planning

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Strategic planning and long-term vision	Administrators or Managers	4.43	.739	35
	Mayors	4.63	.831	19
	Councilmembers	4.25	.965	12
	Total	4.45	.807	66
Community redevelopment	Administrators or Managers	3.80	.994	35
	Mayors	3.79	1.134	19
	Councilmembers	3.33	1.435	12
	Total	3.71	1.120	66
Neighborhood plans	Administrators or Managers	3.57	1.065	35
	Mayors	3.53	1.389	19
	Councilmembers	3.00	1.414	12
	Total	3.45	1.230	66
Regional planning efforts	Administrators or Managers	3.51	1.121	35
	Mayors	3.79	1.398	19
	Councilmembers	2.75	1.422	12
	Total	3.45	1.291	66

As a group, the topic of strategic planning was greatest with the group of Mayors (4.63) Given that mayors are the face of the community, their leadership and direction is essential to cities. The two other groupings of City Managers (4.43) and Councilmembers (4.25) exceed the “very strong” ranking of 4.0 and indicate a high degree of involvement with the strategic planning topic.

The three additional areas of involvement have lower scores. The topic of community redevelopment had a mean score of 3.67 with neighborhood planning (3.46) and regional planning efforts (3.44) closely matching scores.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is **not** a significance difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes between and by the respondents
[Wilks Lambda = 0.610; F (8, 120) = .793; P= 0.610] revealed no significant differences among groups for level of involvement between Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrator/city managers in these four areas.

These four topical areas could involve elected officials and appointed officials in important roles with varying degrees of duty separation. However, the typical municipal operation would allow for planning of various community components to be a joint function of all city elected bodies and the senior executives or city managers appointed officials.

To summarize, in this statement of job duties and the level of involvement by the groups, we find the series of questions regarding tasks conducted in municipal government were responded to by 78 Mayors, Councilmembers and Administrator/managers. The responses aided in determining that which areas involved significant levels of participation between the three groups. It was determined that only a few of these tasks based on participation were significant with respect to the groups. Those areas of significance were Budget Preparation, Budget Adoption, Long-term Bond Financing, Grants, and Utility Systems and Infrastructure.

Each category was used to determine what tasks are part of significant participation to the mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers. Strong levels of participation by the administrators demonstrated that participation may not necessarily be the same with mayors and councilmembers.

City Administrator/Manager Leadership

The next section of survey statements were established to firmly clarify the role of the City Administrator/manager from the perspective of the administrator/managers themselves and from the mayors and councilmembers they work for. We have previously established the type of work participated in and the level of responsibility demonstrated by each group. Now, the perspectives about the role of the city manager or an appointed administrator come under review.

The survey engaged nine questions about the city manager . All nine inquiries received a mean score above 4.00 signifying very strong support for the city manager statements. The highest median score was found at 4.81 or nearly maximum recognition that the most involved subject of the city manager was that of overseeing the actions of the departments and employees. This very strong support also can demonstrate a strong desire by elected officials agreeing that the administrator/managers are charged with the oversight of city departments. The mean summary of all nine questions are found in Table 3-20.

The nine statements were developed to determine the character of the city manager from the perspective of the three groups: mayors, councilmembers and administrators. In examining the group and their descriptions of the city administrator/manager, the highest group average median scores were found to be 1) overseeing the actions of the city departments (4.81); 2) the manager cooperates with the governing body (4.75); and 3) providing key leadership for the direction of the city (4.64). All three of these top mean scores indicate a very strong interest in these three topics as elected officials or administrators.

Table 3-20: Role Characterization of City Managers

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The City Manager provides key leadership to the planned direction of the city.	Administrators or Managers	4.74	.760	38
	Mayors	4.39	.778	18
	Councilmembers	4.82	.603	11
	Total	4.66	.750	67
The City Manager provides influence for the strategic direction of the city.	Administrators or Managers	4.66	.781	38
	Mayors	4.17	.924	18
	Councilmembers	4.36	.674	11
	Total	4.48	.823	67
The City Council looks to the City Manager for leadership and policy options.	Administrators or Managers	4.58	.758	38
	Mayors	3.94	1.349	18
	Councilmembers	4.27	1.009	11
	Total	4.36	1.011	67
The City Manager or Administrator oversees all actions of the city departments and employees.	Administrators or Managers	4.71	.867	38
	Mayors	4.94	.236	18
	Councilmembers	4.91	.302	11
	Total	4.81	.680	67
The City Council looks to the City Manager or Administrator to analyze policy impacts and conduct implementation of programs.	Administrators or Managers	4.61	.790	38
	Mayors	4.50	.985	18
	Councilmembers	4.55	.688	11
	Total	4.57	.821	67
The City Manager generally cooperates with the governing body.	Administrators or Managers	4.74	.724	38
	Mayors	4.78	.428	18
	Councilmembers	4.73	.467	11
	Total	4.75	.612	67
The City Manager is accountable for all financial and budgeting matters.	Administrators or Managers	4.68	.739	38
	Mayors	4.22	.943	18
	Councilmembers	4.09	1.044	11
	Total	4.46	.876	67
The City Manager is generally active in initiating city regulatory matters.	Administrators or Managers	4.42	.889	38
	Mayors	4.50	.857	18
	Councilmembers	4.27	.647	11
	Total	4.42	.838	67
The City Manager is generally constrained in matters governing finances and taxes.	Administrators or Managers	3.53	1.084	38
	Mayors	3.61	1.420	18
	Councilmembers	3.91	1.221	11
	Total	3.61	1.193	67

In assessing further, the highest score relates to the oversight function that elected officials may feel obligated to address as part of their elected official function. Oversight of the city manager or city administrator is viewed as essential for efficient management. Mayors had the highest scoring with a 4.94 on a 1-5 scale for least involved to most involved. Councilmembers were close behind with a 4.91 score. As a duty, the city administrators had very strong involvement of oversight at 4.71. As a median score, for each group, the scoring was very similar.

The results of a MANOVA test indicated that there is NOT a statistically significant difference at the p<= 0.05 level in attitudes about the city manager and each respondents positions. A Wilk's Lambda test was conducted and confirmed no significance occurred with scoring [**Wilks Lambda = 0.630; F (18.00, 112.00) = 1.616 p=0.068].**

In the second highest scoring area, the mayors (4.78), councilmembers (4.73) and administrators (4.74) had comparable and almost equal scores. The statement concerned working together and having indications of cooperation. The average mean scores are indicative of close and comparable involvement with the City Manager.

The third area of highest scoring was that of providing key leadership for the planned direction of the city. The Councilmembers were the strongest group responding to this statement (4.82). The Administrators validated themselves with a mean of 4.74, as to leadership. Within close scoring proximity with the Councilmembers, it again implies that ability to work with each other. However, in observation of the Mayors, we found that the mean score of 4.39 with them was less, but nonetheless showing a slight separation from the City Council and city manager at the very strong support level.

The lowest comment regarding the character of the city managers/administrators was the level of constraint exhibited in matters of finances and taxes (3.63). The scores of the Mayors (3.61) and the Administrators (3.53) both indicated comparable levels of involvement by the City Manager regarding finances and taxes. Councilmembers were slightly above them at 3.61). Overall, the survey indicates close cooperation among the

elected and appointed officials. However, detail on the initial mean scores on responses demonstrated very strong levels of involvement for a large number of topics, mostly above 4.00 on a 1-5 ranking scale.

The second highest mean score of 4.75 indicates that the City Manager has generally cooperated with the governing body. A very strong nearly perfect participation score of 5 on the survey indicates that the cooperation levels with the governing bodies in small cities is generally good.

The third area of strong support and agreement was a 4.64 mean ranking for the statement that the City Manager provides key leadership to the city. Although further study and detail is warranted, the fact that the very strong median ranking for involvement in the city is encouraging for the Council-manager government plan and also points to develop of support for the Mayor-Council form of government to have similar or strong support for mayoral appointed administrators.

The lowest ranked median score for this series of City Manager questions was that of finances. Upon review, the 3.63 median score indicates strong recognition for the manager being constrained in finances and taxes. This “lowest” median score with 68 respondents indicates that the administrator/managers are not empowered to abuse the financial integrity of the communities in which they serve.

In this section, two statement questions were asked concerning relationships in particular with the City Council. Cooperation is a key relationship with the city council and it was found when divided by the groups of mayors, councilmembers, and city managers, that cooperation was a key issue with 4.78, 4.73, and 4.74 scores respectively. Essentially, this statement highlights that of those surveyed, whether individually or in groups that 67 respondents are in general accord as to the level of cooperation and involvement by the elected officials or administrators is found to be of the same opinion and the degree of that opinion is very, very strong.

In summary, all leadership involvement by the city manager/city administrators takes on many specific roles involving oversight of city departments, cooperating with the City Council and leading the community directions. The Councilmember and Mayor groups all indicated support for the city manager/city administrator's involvement in these issues.

Roles of Elected Officials

The next statement is similar to the previous one but focuses on the elected officials and their roles in the local government. Measurement occurred on a 1 rating of least involved to a rating of 5 for most involved. Ten statement areas were asked of the participants regarding elected official involvement in specified activities. No significance was found in the responses to the questions.

The strong working relationship of the City Council and their Mayor are critical to success and the response by participants is strongly indicative of the expectation. The ability to accomplish goals are strongly dependent upon that relationship. In the second highest scoring statement, the elected body has acknowledged that their involvement in constituent matters is important to the group. Although there may be a prohibition to actually accomplish directly, the Councilmembers indirect work with the city manager or city administrator allows the addressing of constituent concerns.

The unique response to the desire by respondents to achieve change in the status quo is a scoring close to the midpoint but indicates that change is desired in the middle of the range, being neither radical change nor slow change. When examined by elected or administrative status, it is found in the charts above that Councilmembers are the strongest group desiring change with the mayors slightly less than the Councilmembers. City managers/administrators were closer to the midpoint of the scale at 3.13, neither for nor against change. This indication may mean there is a desire for leadership and guidance before executing.

The mean summary scoring is demonstrated through Table 3.21. It reports summary statistics for all the survey item pertaining to the roles of elected officials and their level

of involvement in the ten topics represented. Although the pattern indicates that no significant probabilities, the responses provide a breakdown of the general responses.

The results of a MANOVA indicated that there is NOT an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the roles of the elected officials in municipal government by the respondent positions
[Wilk's Lambda score = .572; F (20.00, 88.00) = 1.416; P= 0.136]. As a result, there is no finding of statistical significance in this scoring.

Relying on the average mean scores and responses by Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrator/managers, the top three statement scorings were 1) Councilmembers are expected to have working relationship with fellow elected members (4.46), 2) Governing body members are expected to have an effective relationship with the City Manager (4.64) 3) Governing body members are expected to use the staff professional expertise.

For informational purposes, the highest administrative median score of 4.64 came on the need for an effective relationship with the City Manager. Interestingly, a very strong expectation among mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers exists for cooperation and working together. It may be conjectured that elected officials that prefer to encourage controversy are not encouraged nor is it desired for government stability.

The Mayors group scoring in this statement was even stronger with a scoring of 4.87. The relationship appears to be not only very strong but supports the necessity for success. This is a very strong score indicating importance within the elected official scores and is also a position of the administrator/managers in this strong position. The close scoring of the 56 respondents to this statement indicate a general accord on the need to have an effective relationship. All positions rated this matter as very important or strong level of involvement.

Table 3-21: Roles of Elected Officials

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
A governing body member is elected to achieve change in the status quo.	Administrators or Managers	3.13	.973	30
	Mayors	3.47	1.125	15
	Councilmembers	3.55	.934	11
	Total	3.30	1.008	56
City Councilmembers are expected to have a good working relationship with fellow elected members.	Administrators or Managers	4.50	.572	30
	Mayors	4.53	.743	15
	Councilmembers	4.27	.905	11
	Total	4.46	.687	56
An elected body member is elected by the public to maintain governmental stability.	Administrators or Managers	4.00	1.083	30
	Mayors	4.53	.640	15
	Councilmembers	4.18	.874	11
	Total	4.18	.956	56
Governing body members are elected to address managerial issues of concern to a constituency.	Administrators or Managers	2.93	1.202	30
	Mayors	4.00	.926	15
	Councilmembers	3.73	1.618	11
	Total	3.37	1.301	56
The elected body and Mayor should view the authorities of the municipality with a broad range of powers.	Administrators or Managers	3.77	.817	30
	Mayors	4.20	1.082	15
	Councilmembers	4.09	.944	11
	Total	3.95	.923	56
The governing body member should develop his/her own personal base of knowledge and research.	Administrators or Managers	3.97	.890	30
	Mayors	4.00	1.195	15
	Councilmembers	4.73	.647	11
	Total	4.13	.974	56
Governing body members are expected to keep taxes and financial needs low.	Administrators or Managers	4.10	1.094	30
	Mayors	4.07	.884	15
	Councilmembers	4.36	.924	11
	Total	4.14	.999	56
Governing body members are expected to have an effective relationship with the City Manager.	Administrators or Managers	4.57	.568	30
	Mayors	4.87	.352	15
	Councilmembers	4.55	.934	11
	Total	4.64	.616	56
Governing body members are expected to use the staff professional expertise to achieve goals.	Administrators or Managers	4.67	.547	30
	Mayors	4.87	.352	15
	Councilmembers	4.36	1.027	11
	Total	4.66	.640	56
The elected body should view the authorities of the municipality as with a limited range of powers.	Administrators or Managers	3.43	.935	30
	Mayors	3.27	1.100	15
	Councilmembers	3.64	1.120	11
	Total	3.43	1.006	56

The second highest group median score was recognized at 4.66, with this score answering the question of governing bodies being expected to use the professional expertise of staff. The professional staff is an essential element to successful municipal government. As seen in earlier analyses, the city manager and elected bodies will lead the groups to a certain extent, but then the need for the project background and understanding causes a reliance on the staff. The efforts to learn government procedures and services are limited by the City Council, so the use of professional staff becomes extremely important. Mayors (4.87) were particularly needy of the professional staff and the support that is given.

Most importantly, the City Council are expected to have a good working relationship with their fellow elected members. A third score at 4.46 was that of answers to expectations of the City Council having a good working relationship. The very strong scoring of Administrators (4.50) and Mayors (4.53) and Councilmembers (4.27) indicates the importance of the Council roles. Accomplishment can occur easier with strong working relationship and meeting expectations that strong working relationships exist.

Surprisingly, the lowest median response yielded a 3.28 or slightly above the general midpoint answering the question that an elected official is elected to change the status quo. At a median scoring of 3.28, the governing body is challenged when asked if elected to address constituent issues. This can mean that change is desired from elected officials from the city manager/administrators, but maybe not the community at large. This at least supports involvement in achieving change.

Two similar questions were included within this section of the survey that received responses. The questions were written to inquire as to whether the participants viewed the elected official's roles with a broad range of authorities or a constrained range of authorities. Expressed differently, did the participants look at their official roles liberally or conservatively? The breakdown indicates that of the two approaches to municipal government, the respondents leaned more strongly to the side of a broad range of powers with mean scores of 4.20 for mayors, 4.09 for councilmembers, and 3.77 for

administrators. Conservatism in local government or limiting the interpretation and actions associated with literal and limited interpretation can be found to be significantly lower in scoring than the liberal interpretation. On average, a group scoring of 3.43 for conservatism versus a 3.95 group scoring on liberalism may indicate the expected or actual approach to government at the local level, which will affect the roles of elected and appointed officials.

Overall, the questions of involvement with the elected officials yielded no points of significance between our three groups. However, the median scores may demonstrate a general agreement on approach to the relationships with administrators and fellow elected officials. The personalities and expectations of the elected official's roles are extremely important, but the results of the median scoring may indicate more cooperation than groups acting independently and separately.

Relations Between Elected Officials and Administrators

The comparative studies of the current state of job responsibilities and participation has examined several aspects of government functions as they relate to the mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers. In the next question, further exploration of the elected officials and the administrators has occurred. Sixty-seven valid participants responded to these survey questions. The questions were developed to confirm the expectations of the city manager or administrator position and how it cooperates with the elected officials Table 3-22).

The end result identified a lack of statistical significance on any of the four rankings, made on a 1-5 scale on a range from least significant to most significant. However, the median scores also reveal a very strong position of each of the participants. Table 3-23 reports the summary statistics for all four statements pertaining to the topic of relations between elected officials and the administrators. The responses found very strong positions/scoring for five statements. Four of the five had group median scores that exceeded 4.00. The scoring identified comments about the City Manager in accomplishing goals of the governing body, providing alternative policy considerations,

Table 3-22: Relations Between Elected Officials and Administrators by Positions

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The City Manager or Administrator works in accomplishing the goals of the governing body.	Administrators or Managers	4.81	.467	36
	Mayors	4.68	.582	19
	Councilmembers	4.83	.389	12
	Total	4.78	.487	67
The City Manager or Administrator should provide alternatives for governing body policy considerations.	Administrators or Managers	4.64	.543	36
	Mayors	4.47	.841	19
	Councilmembers	4.83	.389	12
	Total	4.63	.624	67
The City Manager or Administrator provides personal communications and sufficient directions to assure city program effectiveness.	Administrators or Managers	4.69	.624	36
	Mayors	4.42	.902	19
	Councilmembers	4.58	.669	12
	Total	4.60	.719	67
Governing body supports the performance appraisal of the City Manager/Administrator's activities.	Administrators or Managers	3.94	1.413	36
	Mayors	4.47	.772	19
	Councilmembers	4.83	.389	12
	Total	4.25	1.172	67
State open meeting laws inhibit an open relationship with the governing body as a group and the Administrator.	Administrators or Managers	3.47	1.298	36
	Mayors	4.05	1.268	19
	Councilmembers	3.92	1.311	12
	Total	3.72	1.300	67

Table 3-23: Relationships Between Mayors, Councilmembers, and City Managers.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Relationship between your community's elected officials and the City Manager or Administrator	70	1	7	6.11	1.222
Relationship between your community's Elected Officials and the Mayor	71	1	7	5.54	1.689
Relationship between the Mayor and the City Manager or Administrator	70	1	7	6.16	1.471
Valid N (list wise)	70				

providing good communication and supporting performance appraisal of the city manager. The highest individual group score is that of the Councilmembers at 4.83 in accomplishing goals for the governing body. Just below is a similar score with the Administrators at 4.81. With this close proximity of scoring, it appears that the support of each group is similar with similar expectations.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is NOT an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes submitted about the relationships between the city manager/administrators by the respondent's position
[**Wilk's Lambda = .800**; **F (10.0, 120.0) = 1.421; p=0.179].**

In deeper review, each question is closely aligned with the other group in very strong median positions. Closer examination of the first four questions reveals that a tight median between Councilmembers at a high of 4.84 and a low of 4.58 indicates a similar supportive response to the work of the city administrator. In the fifth question, the support is found to be strong, but when adding the conditions of open meetings and open records, it can be observed in general responses that the relationship with the City Manager is inhibited. Mayors also react in much the same way with similar mean scores on the first four questions, but when conducting the same under the auspices of open meetings and open records, the support deteriorates to a lower level. This would indicate a potential need for further research to determine the impact on the relationships between the elected officials and the administrator.

The study has identified three groups for analysis: Mayors, Councilmembers, and City Administrator/Managers. In order to accomplish goals and positive directions for communities, there must be positive relationships. The Statements 8, 9, and 10 provide for a straight up assessment of those relationships. Three questions were asked of the relationships between the elected Councilmembers and the City Manager; the elected Councilmembers and the elected Mayor; and the elected Mayor and the City Manager.

Table 3-23 reveals the scoring factor of these relationships. The rating system was expanded to a 1-7 scale with 1 being the lowest number and 7 being the highest number. There were seventy participants on each of these questions accounting for an actual equal number of responses. The ratings identified the group means below as very strong between the three groups. The relationship between the Mayor and City Manager was higher than the relationship between the Mayor and the Councilmember.

The group mean scoring for Statement 8 was 6.11 for the relationship between the City Manager and Elected officials. The mean group scoring for Statement 9 between the elected Mayors and elected Councilmembers was 5.59. The final mean group scoring for Statement # 10 between the Mayor and the City Manager was 6.16.
An interesting observation is the group score between the elected Mayor and the elected Councilmembers indicate the lowest of the three groups, but the highest scoring is that between the Mayor and City Manager. This can indicate political differences between the elected officials as a group. However, the scoring is over 1.5 above the midpoint (4.00) of the scoring range representing overall a very strong relationship.

When examining the groups individually, the administrator/managers were found to have the highest scoring in two categories of three. The administrator/managers had very strong relationships between both the groups of Councilmembers and the group of Mayors. This falls in line with the formal relationship of the administrators/managers reporting to the governing body. The very strong relationships indicated stability and adherence to the responsibilities granted in city charters to councilmembers and mayors. Interestingly, posing of these three questions point to the relationship of the City Councilmembers and Mayors as the relationship most susceptible to lower rating. Despite strong scoring with the City Administrator/manager relationships, the Elected to Elected relationships have an appearance of having a strong, but not very strong correlation on a 1-7 scale. The lowest score in this relationship was that of the Administrator/managers at 5.45, basically similar to the scoring of Councilmembers at 5.54 and Mayors at 5.89. The critique of this relationship between the Administrator perspectives to council relations stresses the importance of this topic.

The results of the MANOVA revealed that there is NOT an overall statistically significant difference between the three groups at the $p \leq 0.05$

[Wilk's Lambda = 0.846; F (6.0, 130.0) = 1.892; P= .087. With a finding of no significance, no post hoc tests were given.

In summary, the relationships and tasks associated with elected officials and city administrators in Tennessee are many. For the previous ten statements and sub-statements, we have defined through a rating system, many items of importance to the functions of these positions. We have examined their responsibilities and tasks and determined where areas of significance exist for comparisons between the groups of Mayors, Councilmembers and Administrators/Managers. We have examined the levels of participation in tasks and examined the group's participative levels of participation within the municipal government's responsibilities. Exploration of the character of the city manager has been assessed through levels of involvement. Conversely, the involvement levels of elected officials have been reviewed. We have studied the relations between the elected officials and the administrative managers for their significance.

CHAPTER FOUR
ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT BY ELECTED OFFICIALS AND ADMINISTRATORS

The continuation of the survey in the next group of statements relate to enhancing the earlier evaluations of effective responsibilities as it relates to Mayors, City Managers and Councilmembers in the pursuit of municipal goals. With the identification of significant skills needed by the three official groups, the responses received in the next sections address the situational approaches faced and chosen by the survey respondents. The series of statements on task preferences, governing body work relationships, and participation in specific tasks such as economic development are queried. The rating systems were expanded to provide additional comparative options and to pinpoint specific choices relationship more accurately. The rating system was established with a minimum rating of 1 as least effective and a maximum rating of 7 being most effective. Eleven statements were asked for responses and reaction (Table 4-1). There were on average, 71 responses from participants. The highest mean group score was 6.27, signifying a strong rating among respondents for the statement that governing body members are expected to provide influence on the direction of the local government. It is appropriate to identify that mayors, councilmembers, and managers have a very strong expectation of City Council leadership by this score.

As a group the ratings above the midpoint of 4.00 were expected, but other strong scores were found in the statement that the Mayor operates within his/her established role. The study has tried to anticipate that roles are changing among the three groups and this score of 6.13 indicates very strongly that the Mayor is following the charter and policy restrictions laid out for his position. A 6.13 mean group scoring out of 7.00 is a statement that such is true from Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrators.

The summary of Table 4-1 demonstrates the results of the reactions to the statements. A third and fourth statement regarding the governing body and mayor having a respectful and compatible working relationship demonstrates two consistent scoring that are similar

in scope (5.56 and 5.86). The expectation by administrators and constituencies that elected officials and mayors be able to work together is very strong.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is NOT a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the city council relationship statements **[Wilk's Lambda= 0.572**; **F (20.0, 88.0) = 1.416; P = 0.136]**. As a result, no post hoc test was conducted. However, descriptive statistics are revealed in Table 4-1.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the questions of elected official relationships and compatibility by respondent positions **[Wilks Lambda = 0.536; F (22.0, 104.0) = 1.732, p=0.035].** As a result, each question in this section was subjected to post hoc test using the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference test to determine which item had different attitudes by the position of the respondent. The following results of the post hoc analysis is shown for the each of the question where statistically differences did emerge.

Of the eleven statements, four were found to be significant and further testing occurred based on the p-values below:

- The governing body takes a short-term view of decision making: 0.018
- The governing body is quick in making decisions: 0.045
- The Mayor and Councilmember rely on financial data to guide decisions: 0.022
- The governing body regularly reviews community priorities: 0.028

The initial question regarding a short-term view of decision making indicates that administrators or managers have a stronger opinion (4.29) than the mayors (3.00) or councilmembers (3.30) when it comes to short term decision making (Table 4-2). However, all three groups are included within the same subset indicating high probability that the similarities of the positions are not markedly different. The strong set of information from the administrators would indicate that decision making is not usually made in a strategic mode. Perhaps this shall indicate that decision making is considered

Table 4-1: Relationship Between Elected Officials and Managers

Dependent Variable	(I) Position	(J) Position	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
All governing body members have a respectful working relationship.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	.36	.655	-.62	1.33
		Councilmembers	-.34	.787	-1.59	.90
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-.36	.655	-1.33	.62
		Councilmembers	-.70	.430	-2.05	.65
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.34	.787	-.90	1.59
		Mayors	.70	.430	-.65	2.05
The Mayor and Council have a compatible working relationship.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	.01	.999	-.89	.92
		Councilmembers	-.09	.983	-1.25	1.07
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-.01	.999	-.92	.89
		Councilmembers	-.10	.980	-1.35	1.15
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.09	.983	-1.07	1.25
		Mayors	.10	.980	-1.15	1.35
The Mayor operates within his/her established role.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	-.66	.182	-1.54	.23
		Councilmembers	-.06	.992	-1.19	1.07
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	.66	.182	-.23	1.54
		Councilmembers	.60	.469	-.62	1.82
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.06	.992	-1.07	1.19
		Mayors	-.60	.469	-1.82	.62
The governing body provides influence on the direction of the local government.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	-.49	.143	-1.09	.12
		Councilmembers	-.49	.299	-1.26	.29
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	.49	.143	-.12	1.09
		Councilmembers	.00	1.000	-.84	.84
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.49	.299	-.29	1.26
		Mayors	.00	1.000	-.84	.84
The governing body takes a short-term view of decision making.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	1.29*	.019	.18	2.39
		Councilmembers	.99	.223	-.43	2.40
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-1.29*	.019	-2.39	-.18
		Councilmembers	-.30	.885	-1.83	1.23
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	-.99	.223	-2.40	.43
		Mayors	.30	.885	-1.23	1.83
The governing body is quick in making policy decisions.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	.97	.057	-.02	1.97
		Councilmembers	.87	.235	-.40	2.14
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-.97	.057	-1.97	.02
		Councilmembers	-.10	.983	-1.47	1.27
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	-.87	.235	-2.14	.40
		Mayors	.10	.983	-1.27	1.47

Table 4-1: Continued

Dependent Variable	(I) Position	(J) Position	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
The governing body is accepting of group decisions.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	.16	.871	-.62	.95
		Councilmembers	.41	.588	-.59	1.42
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-.16	.871	-.95	.62
		Councilmembers	.25	.846	-.84	1.34
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	-.41	.588	-1.42	.59
		Mayors	-.25	.846	-1.34	.84
The governing body will compromise to insure decisions are made.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	-.15	.934	-1.17	.87
		Councilmembers	.30	.846	-1.00	1.60
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	.15	.934	-.87	1.17
		Councilmembers	.45	.724	-.96	1.86
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	-.30	.846	-1.60	1.00
		Mayors	-.45	.724	-1.86	.96
Governing body members individually engage in administrative oversight.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	.38	.718	-.79	1.55
		Councilmembers	-.47	.730	-1.97	1.02
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	-.38	.718	-1.55	.79
		Councilmembers	-.85	.421	-2.46	.76
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.47	.730	-1.02	1.97
		Mayors	.85	.421	-.76	2.46
The Mayor and Council rely on financial data to guide decisions.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	-.87*	.047	-1.73	-.01
		Councilmembers	-.97	.095	-2.07	.13
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	.87*	.047	.01	1.73
		Councilmembers	-.10	.978	-1.29	1.09
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	.97	.095	-.13	2.07
		Mayors	.10	.978	-1.09	1.29
The governing body regularly reviews community priorities.	Administrators or Managers	Mayors	-1.03*	.045	-2.04	-.02
		Councilmembers	-1.03	.144	-2.32	.26
	Mayors	Administrators or Managers	1.03*	.045	.02	2.04
		Councilmembers	.00	1.000	-1.40	1.40
	Councilmembers	Administrators or Managers	1.03	.144	-.26	2.32
		Mayors	.00	1.000	-1.40	1.40

Table 4-2: The Governing Body Takes a Short-Term View of Decision Making

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Mayors	20	3.00
Councilmembers	10	3.30
Administrators or Managers	35	4.29

only for term of office or utilizes a rational choice process, making decisions based on what is best for individuals or groups and not the long term city as a whole.

This would be contrary to the original Svara sphere charts (Chapter One, Figure 1-6) that require strategic planning and decision making as part of the responsibilities of elected officials. In that analysis, the spheres do not distinguish between long-term versus short term strategic decisions. The analysis, however, does not indicate significant differences between the ratings of effectiveness between the three groups. As such, only a single subset group can be firmly established.

Mayors and Councilmembers were found to be strongly aligned on this inquiry and based on the background of the groups. The Administrators or Managers at 4.37 were found to be similar in their opinion, but not to the degree to require separation from the elected officials on policy making approaches (Table 4-3). In assessing this finding, the mayor and councilmembers find themselves rated at a lower level under the midpoint regarding decision-making. As elected, a councilmember can take the role of a caretaker or trustee. They will then be desirous of approving ordinances, contracts, policies and appointments as decisions. Long term processes to make strategic decisions may be frustrating to the elected officials in their analysis of themselves.

The third question in this set (Table 4-4) was a statement of usage of financial data by the elected officials to determine decision making. Sixty-five responses yielded (Table 4-4) very strong scoring for all three participant groups, but the elected officials were the strongest. Mayors (6.10) and Councilmembers (6.20) stressed the need for strong

Table 4-3: The Governing Body is Quick in Decision Making

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Mayors	20	3.40
Councilmembers	10	3.50
Administrators or Managers	35	4.37

Table 4-4: The Mayor and Council Rely on Financial Data to Guide Decision

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Administrators or Managers	35	5.23
Mayors	20	6.10
Councilmembers	10	6.20

financial data as an aid in guiding their decision making. Both groups were significantly ranked, stressing the importance to their approaches to city goals. City administrators (5.23) were less strong in rating the need for financial data to be the sole deciding factor of decision making. The grouping of the elected officials and city administrators shows different reliance levels upon financial data.

The next analysis returns to the governing body's quickness in making policy decisions (Table 4-3). The Tukey's analysis again identifies a single subset group. However, there is slight separation between the administrators (4.37) and the elected officials (3.50, 3.40). Higher scoring of the administrators may be an indication of an impression that City Councils are elected to make decisions, thus a shorter period of time is taken to make that decision.

Reliance upon financial data held the degree of significance or probability was $p \leq 0.05$ and held a score at .022, or within the range of significance. The significance of the Tukey Honest Significance Difference test was very important to the mayors (6.10) and councilmembers (6.20) with very strong ratings. The statements underlying inquiry was to determine how much bearing economics or finances have upon the decision making.

The Tukey's Honest Significant Difference analysis held a very strong opinion in the use of financial material by Mayors (6.10) and City Councils (6.20). Mayors and City Councils are demanded to be fiscally responsible to the citizens as their representatives. There is considerable demand by the citizenry for sound fiscal management and this rating may be viewed as a major requirement by the governing body of fiscal accountability first and foremost.

The Administrator/managers still have a very strong median score but is not significantly different than the mayors and councilmembers. Why this group's score is not higher may be an indication that the administrator/managers may not believe that financial data guides the complete thought and decision making process which may also include social, or legal matters too.

The final statement demonstrating significance in this group (0.045) is that of establishing the Administrators and Mayors roles (Table 4-5), which were found to have a significant relationship when compared against the effectiveness of reviews and establishing community priorities. Because all ratings of the three study groups are similar, one subset was created within the Tukey Honest Significance Difference test. The review of community priorities pertains to the strategic function and planning function of the city council and is a subject of the effectiveness of the elected official's functions.

Table 4-5: The Governing Body Regularly Reviews Community Properties

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Administrators or Managers	35	4.57
Mayors	20	5.60
Councilmembers	10	5.60

One final note within this section of questioning was a non-significant statement that was raised regarding the Mayors operating within his/her established roles. It is easy for the mayoral position to consider acting in an assertive chief executive role, overshadowing the city manager. The administrators that are selected by the mayor have a different role in their relationship with the mayor and also the city council. If however, the mayor is a position within a Council-manager city, the role of the Mayor may assume duties more in the managerial and administrative nature of city government by encroachment. If not clearly understood, a mayor may take on the roles found in a mayor-council city. However, the close proximity of the ratings indicate a common understanding of positions and roles and find no statistical significance of this measure.

Information Sources for City Council

The next section of the survey continued to address work matters of the City Council. As the work of the city councils are examined, the control of information becomes more prevalent in decision making. The statements made to the survey participants attempt to explore where information is obtained and how it is supplied. The ranking of the questions consist of a 1-7 system, with 1 being the least likely to be used and 7 being the most likely to be used. Eight statements were provided and responses were requested from the participants. Mean values for the statements ranged from a high of 6.33 to a low of 3.43 for the amalgamated responders. Table 4-6 demonstrates the breakdown by groups.

An analysis and breakdown by groups has occurred by each particular group of mayors, councilmembers, and administrators/managers. However, the results of a MANOVA indicated that there is NOT an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the sources of information available to the governing bodies **[Wilks Lambda = .012; F (18.0, 114.0) = 0.800; P=0.697].**

Table 4-6: Sources of Governing Body Information

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The Mayor and City Council rely on the expertise of the professional staff.	Administrators or Managers	6.24	.751	38
	Mayors	6.39	.778	18
	Councilmembers	6.50	.905	12
	Total	6.32	.781	68
The City Council and Mayor rely on the expertise of external information sources and constituencies.	Administrators or Managers	5.39	.974	38
	Mayors	5.06	1.056	18
	Councilmembers	5.33	1.497	12
	Total	5.29	1.094	68
The governing body personally conducts separate research through a variety of community resources.	Administrators or Managers	3.92	1.583	38
	Mayors	4.22	1.865	18
	Councilmembers	4.33	2.348	12
	Total	4.07	1.790	68
The governing body uses the Internet as an alternative source for information.	Administrators or Managers	4.37	1.514	38
	Mayors	4.61	1.501	18
	Councilmembers	5.00	2.335	12
	Total	4.54	1.670	68
The governing body uses its authority to demand large amounts of information, reports, and records.	Administrators or Managers	3.29	1.769	38
	Mayors	3.78	1.768	18
	Councilmembers	3.25	1.545	12
	Total	3.41	1.721	68
The Mayor and City Council use their individual vocations to drive decision making.	Administrators or Managers	4.29	1.592	38
	Mayors	4.33	1.414	18
	Councilmembers	4.50	2.236	12
	Total	4.34	1.654	68
The City Manager is a key facilitator of information to the Mayor and City Council	Administrators or Managers	6.29	1.113	38
	Mayors	5.89	1.568	18
	Councilmembers	6.08	1.730	12
	Total	6.15	1.352	68
The governing body does not retain grudges after decisions are made.	Administrators or Managers	4.74	1.750	38
	Mayors	5.44	1.653	18
	Councilmembers	4.92	2.109	12
	Total	4.96	1.791	68
The Mayor and City Council allow the introduction of new policy by individual members.	Administrators or Managers	5.37	1.303	38
	Mayors	5.72	1.602	18
	Councilmembers	5.00	1.477	12
	Total	5.40	1.416	68

Despite the lack of significance, two observations occur within this set of statements for researchers to react to. The statement with the strongest response was confirmation the Mayor and City Councilmembers rely on the expertise of the professional staff (Table 4-6). With the 1-7 scale, it should be noted that Administrator/managers rated this statement with a mean of 6.24. Mayors noted this statement with a mean rating of 6.39 and Councilmembers with a very strong mean rating of 6.50. With 68 respondents, these descriptive statistics, although not found significant, do point to a strong response and belief by the respondents. In the journalistic world seen today, often, governing bodies are observed as adversaries to the existing staff, professionals and sometimes the city managers themselves. This rating does exemplify that there is indeed a very strong reliance on staff for providing recommendations and findings to the decision makers.

The second observation is a very strong response to the statement that "the city manager is a key facilitator of information to the Mayor and City Council." Administrator/managers had a high median score of 6.29, while the Councilmembers were slightly lower with a median of 6.08. The group of Mayors held at 5.89 as their mean scoring (Table 4-6). Demonstrating that information is sought out in conjunction with the city manager and accompanied with the reliance on the professional staff, this rating indicates that the sharing of information between councilmembers and mayors and administrators is critical for the decision making required of the city organization. The statistical search in future projects may be predicted to achieve similar results in larger, more comprehensive studies.

A final observation on this set of statements should be made. The second statement indicates very strongly that governmental work is not static and waiting for state laws to tell them what to do. Using "home rule" powers does allow for governing bodies and managers to work outside of "general law" only restrictions on a city government (Table 4-6). The responses by Mayors (5.56) and Councilmembers (5.73) and Administrators (5.68) visually demonstrates a generally common response to the survey that they will respond to the state, but will also take necessary action as needed for their community.

Policy Action Statements

In this next set of statements, groupings were developed to ascertain the policies that would most likely or least likely be used to seek policy change. Six statements were submitted to the participants for review. A mean score was achieved as amalgamated groups with a high of 5.99 and a low of 4.33. These scores were based on a 1-7 scale with 69 participants on each question. The division of the responses in their appropriate groupings is submitted as Table 4-7.

A review of the six statements reveals the strongest response to the development of policy was that of federal or state law changes impacting the local governments. Administrators (5.68) Mayors (5.56) and Councilmembers (5.73) all had very strong opinions on the development of policy as influenced by governmental environment and influences (Table 4-7). An average mean of 5.66 indicated a strong engagement of all three groups. The least effort for the development of policy came from individualized policy change based on personal knowledge or evidence. The Mayors were the most inclined to this approach at 4.67, with Councilmembers at 4.55 and administrators close to the midpoint at 4.11. As the least policy development process, it is noted that individual policy initiation is significantly below the strongest statement from federal or state law changes. As an example, without state or federal leadership, a policy such as outlawing plastic bags, may be subject to presentation by a councilmember outside of state restriction.

A Wilk's Lambda indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in average response across the three groups [**Wilk's Lambda = 0.650; F (12.00, 118.00) = 2.363; P=0.009].** As a result, each question in this section was subjected to a post hoc test using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test to determine which items had different attitudes by the position of the respondent. The results of this post hoc analysis is shown for each of the questions where statistically differences did emerge.

Table 4-7: Changing Local Policy

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The governing body relies on professional staff to propose and define policy change.	Administrators or Managers	6.32	.702	38
	Mayors	5.56	.922	18
	Councilmembers	5.64	.809	11
	Total	6.00	.853	67
The governing body allows change in state or federal law to guide needed change in local policy.	Administrators or Managers	5.68	1.397	38
	Mayors	5.56	1.097	18
	Councilmembers	5.73	.905	11
	Total	5.66	1.238	67
The governing body usually waits for priority issues to surface before instigating public policy change,	Administrators or Managers	5.08	1.383	38
	Mayors	3.72	1.526	18
	Councilmembers	4.73	1.348	11
	Total	4.66	1.513	67
The governing body provides policy input after governing body studies, task force findings, or community debate.	Administrators or Managers	4.97	1.365	38
	Mayors	5.72	1.074	18
	Councilmembers	5.64	1.502	11
	Total	5.28	1.346	67
The governing body members individually initiate policy change based on personal knowledge and experience,	Administrators or Managers	4.11	1.410	38
	Mayors	4.67	1.645	18
	Councilmembers	4.55	1.635	11
	Total	4.33	1.511	67
The governing body utilizes the advisory expertise of city boards and commissions to instigate policy change.	Administrators or Managers	5.34	1.214	38
	Mayors	5.56	1.149	18
	Councilmembers	5.55	1.508	11
	Total	5.43	1.234	67

Of the six statements being asked for response, the survey analysis achieved two statements of significance indicating that a high probability exists for relationships between the groups. The identified questions were:

- The governing body relies on professional staff to propose and define policy change
- The governing body usually waits for priority issues to surface before instigating public policy change

A Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test was run with the following breakdowns among our three groups (Table 4-8).

Two subsets were established within the groups of mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers relative to reliance on the professional staff. Based on a 1-7 scale, a very strong relationship is established for this statement with the city managers (6.32). This statement is strongly supported by the administrators as they establish a true relationship for development of policy for use by the governing bodies. Mayors and Councilmembers are very strong in this relationship also, but not quite as strong as the administrator/managers. Overall, the governing body adheres to and relies upon the professional staff to help in making change and the professional employees are who is relied on the most for data and information.

The second statement was also run with the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test and the following breakdown was developed among our three groups (Table 4-9). In this case for policy development by waiting for priority issues, it is interesting to note that the Councilmembers are found to be part of two subset groups. At a lower score with the administrators, the councilmembers are highly probable to go along with the manager in awaiting priority issues. The mayors are less so than the Councilmembers, so in this subset, we may find the councilmembers "pushing" the mayors into action based on information that they have from financial, political, and public service sources.

Table 4-8: Governing Body Relies on Professional Staff to Propose Policy Change

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	18	5.56	
Councilmembers	11	5.64	
Administrators or Managers	38		6.32

Table 4-9: Governing Body Waits for Priority Issues Before Instigating Policy Change

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	18	3.72	
Councilmembers	11	4.73	4.73
Administrators or Managers	38		5.08

Administrator/managers were found to be the strongest grouping (5.08), but it also was significant that the Councilmembers were also strong and could be grouped with the city administrator/managers (4.73) (Table 4-9). Mayors were found to be below the midpoint of a 4.00 scoring and with the 4.73 scoring of the Councilmembers, and its proximity to the midpoint, they could also be assumed to have a common concern for public policy change. Although the two elected official groups identify with each other, it still relies on public policy change to come from the administrator/managers as the strongest source of policy development relationships.

City Council Oversight Functions

In the next set of seven statements, the participants were asked to assess the oversight function of the City Council over the administrator/manager. The participants were asked to view seven statements and determine that which is least similar to those most similar. The statements were reviewed on a 1-7 scale. Of all seven statements, it was found that none were significant and merited further analysis. Table 4-10 demonstrates the breakdown of each group of respondents.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there is NOT a statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in the attitudes about managerial oversight. A Wilks Lambda testing revealed a p=0.223 multivariate score, detailing a lack of significance.

The pattern of response would indicate that most respondent groups were gathered on either side of the midpoint scoring of 4.00. The midpoint was a good indication of management oversight being an accepted function, but not one that pushes a maximum scoring amount. Surprisingly, response #1 in Table 4-10 indicates that no oversight is exerted in their role. Although it would seem that the Mayor (3.06) would exert oversight of the administrator, it would indicate that there is less of that function than expected or assumed. Councilmembers (4.40) had a much higher probability of exerting oversight influence upon the management. The administrators themselves (3.33) indicated in much the same way as the Mayors and considerable less than the midpoint. The option of a Councilmember committee was identified in response #2. The results contained a very large differential between the Mayors (3.88) and the Councilmembers (5.20). This is perhaps an indication of joint group oversight being a preferred option. As a group, a council governing body is tied to oversight in a committee format so one Councilmember does not have higher sway over any other Councilmember.

The oversight function may be one created by city charter or policy. The Mayor will play a key role in this function as the leader of the governing body. In this set of questions, the Mayor was seen to have some of the highest scorings: Exercising oversight through state law (5.63), oversighting in public manner (5.50), providing oversight by organizational policy (5.75) and providing suggestions to the city administrator (5.19). With these strong scores, the mayors are identified as an absolutely critical position to exercise this function. If we examine the scorings from the councilmembers, we may note that they take lesser interest and perhaps a lesser role in oversight, unless included upon a committee.

Of note, the annual evaluation process had some of the highest median scores of this question showing that the responsibility of oversight is important to the Councilmembers

and Mayors surveyed. A score of 5.50 for mayors, a 5.40 for councilmembers and a 4.07 for the administrator/managers indicated very strong support for the fiscal and managerial responsibilities of the questions (Table 4-10).

Rating of Municipal Tasks

The next section of statements required assessment of the tasks that elected officials and administrators might find themselves conducting or desire to conduct. The tasks were rated on a 1-5 scaled with 1 being a task of lowest interest and 5 a task of highest interest. On average, 68 respondents were responsive to their rating of the task and established a group mean from a high of 4.53 to a group low of 2.77. The highest task was that of creating a strategic plan for the city. The lowest task was that of selecting a financial city auditor. Sixteen tasks were assessed with the intent of discovering any pattern of tasks that the mayors and councilmembers would like to do that may be different from the administrator/managers. Table 4-11 is a summary of those tasks and breakdown by groups including the mayors, city manager/administrators and councilmembers.

A second run of responses to the 16 differing tasks were tallied and divided among the three groups: Mayors, Councilmembers and Administrator/Managers. Of the sixteen tasks, four held a median group ranking above a 4.00 midpoint or a very strong position of interest for these duties. Coincidentally, the tasks were recognized as a strongly common duty of all our groups to conduct. The descriptive of the four highest rated tasks were:

- Develop a new master plan for the community
- Create a strategic plan for the city
- Review utility rates and capital improvement plans
- Develop a multi-year financial model

Table 4-10: Managerial Oversight

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
No oversight of management is exercised in my role.	Administrators or Managers	3.33	1.840	27
	Mayors	3.06	1.806	16
	Councilmembers	4.40	2.221	10
	Total	3.45	1.927	53
Oversight is provided cumulatively as one member of several city governing body representatives on an issue by issue basis.	Administrators or Managers	4.19	1.520	27
	Mayors	3.88	1.996	16
	Councilmembers	5.20	.919	10
	Total	4.28	1.634	53
Provide individualized advice and suggestions to city administrator.	Administrators or Managers	5.15	1.460	27
	Mayors	5.19	1.424	16
	Councilmembers	4.70	2.263	10
	Total	5.08	1.603	53
Provide managerial oversight as allowed legally and required by organizational policy.	Administrators or Managers	5.15	1.537	27
	Mayors	5.75	1.291	16
	Councilmembers	4.50	2.506	10
	Total	5.21	1.714	53
The City Council exercises oversight through evaluation process of City Administrator.	Administrators or Managers	5.00	2.075	27
	Mayors	5.63	1.746	16
	Councilmembers	4.90	2.514	10
	Total	5.17	2.054	53
The governing body exercises oversight through state law requirements and contractual requirements.	Administrators or Managers	4.89	1.577	27
	Mayors	5.63	1.500	16
	Councilmembers	4.60	1.838	10
	Total	5.06	1.622	53
Oversight expectations by the community are exercised in a public manner.	Administrators or Managers	4.07	1.859	27
	Mayors	5.50	1.673	16
	Councilmembers	5.40	2.011	10
	Total	4.75	1.931	53

Table 4-11: Review of Tasks for Elected Officials and Administrators

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Develop a new master plan for the community.	Administrators or Managers	4.16	.898	31
	Mayors	4.36	1.151	14
	Councilmembers	3.67	1.303	12
	Total	4.11	1.064	57
Review utility rates and capital improvement plans.	Administrators or Managers	4.29	.938	31
	Mayors	4.29	1.139	14
	Councilmembers	4.33	.985	12
	Total	4.30	.981	57
Develop a multi-year financial model.	Administrators or Managers	4.19	1.046	31
	Mayors	4.21	1.311	14
	Councilmembers	4.17	1.115	12
Create a strategic plan for the city.	Administrators or Managers	4.52	.724	31
	Mayors	4.57	.514	14
	Councilmembers	4.50	.674	12
	Total	4.53	.658	57

The results of a MANOVA test indicated that there is NOT an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the tasks of interest that the respondents by position would be interested in

[Wilk's Lambda = 0.442; F (32.00, 78.00) = 1.229; P=.229]. There was a finding of no significance, so further post hoc testing did not occur. If post hoc testing would have occurred, a Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test would be used.

In review of each task, it was found the individual group scorings were primarily the same with the Mayors having the highest score in 3 of the 4 task areas. Only a slight separation on the review of utility rates and capital plans had a slight reduction in the scorings of the mayors below the councilmembers. Councilmembers were lowest on 3 of the 4 task areas. Administrators were in the middle on 3 of 4 scores. However, examining the highest rated tasks, it is a strong statement via mean scores above 4.00 that these functions were noted as significant to the survey participants.

Of those tasks found to be the highest rated, it should be noted that the tasks preferred fit into the designations of the Svara figure in Chapter One, likely indicating the desire for strategic mission work and planning as a primary desire on the part of a City Council and

their administrators. No tasks selected were of the managerial or administrative nature. An implication may be that the surveyed respondents view their official functions are to be long term in nature. The lowest score by a group was that of the Councilmembers (3.67) toward developing a new master plan for the community. Said scoring is above the midpoint, but in strong position versus a very strong position.

Involvement in Public Activities

The degree of activities in which a public official is involved are many. The level of involvement can be great or small. In this section, it was tried to be determined what areas occupied a significant level of time from such topics as creating a budget to evaluating the administrator and his staff. In this section, participants identified levels of involvement from least involved to most involved. The topics of review and their mean scores are outlined (Table 4-12).

In examining these areas of involvement, the Administrator/managers were found to be extremely strong in recognized administrative matters such as economic development and recruitment. Equally so with creating a budget. Mayors were involved with more political matters such as lobbying and obtaining legislation at state level. Administrators were the strongest in addressing morale of the organization, with elected officials having less concern of this aspect of the city government. Interestingly, while a Mayor and Councilmember are tasked with evaluating the Administrator, they may not like to do so and tend to at a level of least involvement.

The results of the MANOVA test indicated that there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the degree of involvement for the tasks inquired about [**Wilk's Lambda = 0.362; F (24.00, 94.00) = 2.589; P= 0.001].**
Statistical significance was identified. As a result, each question in this section was subjected to post hoc test using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test to determine which items had different attitudes by the position of the respondent. In assessing the results, the lead statements where significance was identified, the post hoc analysis for each of the following statistically significant differences did emerge:

Table 4-12: Active Involvement by Elected Officials and Administrators

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Establishing long-term strategic plans for the community.	Administrators or Managers	6.25	.906	36
	Mayors	6.14	1.167	14
	Councilmembers	6.09	1.221	11
	Total	6.20	1.014	61
Economic recruitment and economic development.	Administrators or Managers	5.86	1.533	36
	Mayors	5.79	1.122	14
	Councilmembers	5.00	1.673	11
	Total	5.69	1.489	61
Political relations between state and federal agents.	Administrators or Managers	5.08	1.962	36
	Mayors	5.36	2.205	14
	Councilmembers	4.45	1.916	11
	Total	5.03	2.000	61
Lobbying and obtaining legislation at state level.	Administrators or Managers	4.92	1.918	36
	Mayors	5.50	2.066	14
	Councilmembers	4.00	2.280	11
	Total	4.89	2.042	61
Creating a budget on an annual basis.	Administrators or Managers	6.56	1.107	36
	Mayors	6.36	1.008	14
	Councilmembers	5.36	1.912	11
	Total	6.30	1.321	61
Monitoring finances and financial progress.	Administrators or Managers	6.39	1.202	36
	Mayors	5.93	1.141	14
	Councilmembers	5.09	1.700	11
	Total	6.05	1.359	61
Encouraging morale in city operations.	Administrators or Managers	6.58	.806	36
	Mayors	5.07	1.940	14
	Councilmembers	4.82	2.183	11
	Total	5.92	1.626	61
Develop new policies to incentivize market-based housing.	Administrators or Managers	3.83	2.091	36
	Mayors	4.00	1.961	14
	Councilmembers	3.18	1.834	11
	Total	3.75	2.005	61
Developing new organizational structures and efficiencies.	Administrators or Managers	5.94	1.264	36
	Mayors	4.36	1.499	14
	Councilmembers	3.91	1.973	11
	Total	5.21	1.694	61
Adding new or modifying existing services.	Administrators or Managers	5.92	1.105	36
	Mayors	4.50	1.401	14
	Councilmembers	4.18	1.888	11
	Total	5.28	1.529	61
Raising and identifying new revenue sources.	Administrators or Managers	6.06	1.145	36
	Mayors	5.71	1.490	14
	Councilmembers	4.36	2.203	11
	Total	5.67	1.568	61
Evaluating administrator and department supervisory staff.	Administrators or Managers	6.25	1.228	36
	Mayors	5.00	2.038	14
	Councilmembers	3.73	2.149	11
	Total	5.51	1.876	61

- Economic Recruitment and economic development
- Lobbying and obtaining legislation at state level
- Creating a budget on an annual basis
- Encouraging morale in city operations
- Developing new organizational structures and efficiencies
- Adding new or modifying existing services
- Raising and identifying new revenue sources
- Evaluating administrator and department supervisory staff.

In economic development, the close proximity of each group to each other has only identified one subset for identifying the probability of relationships. All three groups are similar, with the Mayors and Administrators being the closest in significant. There is no difference in their work in the economic development area. On a 1-7 rating scale, the scoring points to a very strong level of involvement in the matters.

Economic Development has seen increased involvement in economic development since the 1990s in cities across the country. It is not surprising that the diversification of a community is seen through this response. There is an indication of an important relationship for Mayors and their administrators to work together in this arena, with the City Council being very supportive but not as active.

Lobby and legislative activities also points to be a significant function (Table 4-13). The mayoral group in particular has a very strong level of involvement in lobbying efforts. In lobbying, we see a greater role of the Mayor in supporting this activity. The City Administrator/managers are less involved in the work with the City Councilmembers continuing to be supportive but less active.

Administrators are a close second with very strong symptoms to be actively involved in lobbying. Again, the differences as identified by Tukey's test show no significant differences, so there is only one subset group (Table 4-13). City Councilmembers,

while perhaps less engaged in this area, nonetheless have a strong level of engagement at the midpoint of the scoring range.

The level of involvement in this activity may be critical when compared to the discussion of roles that are more political in nature and deals with political entities at the state level. The 1.5 differential may statistically represent the significant difference between a median level of involvement and being very involved in these groups. Typically, the Mayor would be more involved with lobbying work and legislation development.

The responsibility for morale in the city operations (Table 4-14) was shown in earlier statements that it falls on the responsibility of the city managers to address the emotional condition of city employees. This earlier finding is reconfirmed with the Administrator scoring subset of 6.58. The second subset is the relationships between the Mayors and Councilmembers which both remain on equal footing when dealing with the employees. If the earlier positions of elected officials showed little connection or concern for the employees, then both groups, whether mayor or councilmember are strong in support, but not to the degree of the city manager/administrators.

Table 4-13: Lobbying and Obtaining Legislation at State Level

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Councilmembers	11	4.00
Administrators or Managers	36	4.92
Mayors	14	5.50

Table 4-14: Encouraging Morale in City Operations

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	11	4.82	
Mayors	14	5.07	
Administrators or Managers	36		6.58

Two subsets above were established by the Tukey test demonstrating involvement in the development of new organizational structures. Councilmembers and Mayors are found through their responses to rate at the midpoint, while the logical responsibility of this topic is found in the second subset of the Administrators at 5.94 (Table 4-15), a very strong rating for the purpose of organizational development. Since the form of government structure is often in the purview of the city administrator for purposes of efficiency and cost, the subset truthfully identifies the involvement differences between the three groups.

The groups also identified that the development of new organizational structures and efficiencies was an essential role of the groups to which significance was identified (Table 4-15.). Once again, the Administrator/managers are identified as the key group in organizational structure review and process review. Mayors are involved with this task but not as significantly as the Administrators which must have a very strong level of involvement and their experience is counted on to provide efficiencies and legalities. Councilmembers are found more at the median level of involvement with this function. They are included in the same subset as the mayors.

Table 4-15: Developing New Organizational Structures and Efficiencies

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	11	3.91	
Mayors	14	4.36	
Administrators or Managers	36		5.94

All three groups were identified as having a very strong degree of involvement in this municipal activity of budgeting (Table 4-16). As earlier testing identified, the Administrators prepare the budget and the Council and Mayor are greatly involved in the Budget Adoption process. The post hoc analysis shows that two subsets may be established showing the relationship between the groups. However, the Mayor groups may be distributed to either group for purposes of involvement in the budget process. Typically, the budget shall be adopted and approved by the City Council, but there will be smaller less involved engagement in the preparation or creation of the budget (Table 4-16). The Mayors (6.36) and (5.36) and the City Managers (6.56) all are involved with very significant engagement in this municipal process.

In the statements after the subject of lobbying (Table 4-12), the post hoc test established confirmation that groups had differing statistical significance for the topics. The first topic of encouraging morale in city operations revealed that Councilmembers and Mayors were statistically significant at a median level of involvement for improving morale. As the City Council is the controller of the purse strings, the level of engagement by the elected officials is significant. However, the administrator/managers are even more highly involved with a statistical score of 6.58, indicating a great level of involvement in maintaining morale of employees (Table 4-14).

We see a similar path as morale in working with new administrative structures (Table 4-15). In this Tukey's Honest Significant Difference analysis, statistically significant test value **[Wilk's Lambda = 0.783; F (24, 96) = 2.589; p= 0.001].** Mayors and City Councilmembers have different average responses when compared to the Administrators. The Administrator/managers have a high degree of involvement for modifying existing services as seen when developing services. With the Mayors and Councilmembers, we will see a level similar level of involvement as a group.

The subject of raising revenue was inquired about to the participants. Our testing has revealed a level of significance for this involvement. In examining the topic, it is found that the Mayors and Administrator/managers are more similar as groups than the

Councilmembers (Table 4-17). The level of significance for involvement in this topic is greater with the two groups than the Councilmember group.

In summary of these responses, the level of involvement of mayors, councilmembers and administrators in the activities described by responses to the sixteenth questions gives a broad indication of the definitive jobs found in the municipal environment today. We have found the addition of new work through the activity of economic development taking both political leadership and administrative leadership to accomplish. The exploration of budgeting and discovery of new revenues add to the expected involvement of elected officials and appointed administrators. The political realm of lobbying and representing one's community at the state level is indicative of another level of involvement by the municipal official. In this arena, we find the activity levels of all elected officials and the city managers to be of significance in describing their level of work on the four platforms of *Strategic Mission, Planning, Administration and Management.*

Table 4-16: Creating a Budget on an Annual Basis

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	11	5.36	
Mayors	14	6.36	6.36
Administrators or Managers	36		6.56

Table 4-17: Raising and Identifying New Revenue Sources

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	11	4.36	
Mayors	14		5.71
Administrators or Managers	36		6.06

Leadership Activities

The next grouping of statements identify a large number of leadership duties in which the participant groups are involved as public leaders. The listing of duties included eleven functions of government for all groups. Sixty-six respondents replied to these inquiries with a ranking system set with one as the lowest and seven as the highest score (Table 4-18. Participants were asked of the duties from least frequent to most frequent.

The top five leadership activities based with the highest group mean score were:

- Preparing for and attending council meetings: 6.76
- Attending community events: 5.82
- Participating in community and internal committees: 5.74
- Working with other governing body members: 5.67
- Idea and innovation generation: 5.62

Upon review of these five statement areas, further calculation of mean scores by each participant group found the preparing for and attending council meetings was by far the strongest level of involvement and very frequent duty. Grouping scores were within .01 or .03 of the 6.76 group mean. It would indicate that this function is the strongest and most frequent duty by all groups. Attendance at community events was found to have strong support for high frequency involvement, particularly the mayoral group.

Mentoring staff was a major score of the administrators at 6.24 as the position at the leadership level of the organization. This difference was almost 3 full points higher than his counter parts, the Councilmembers and Mayors.

Table 4-18: Activities of Public Leaders

	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Informing constituents of government actions.	Administrators or Managers	5.45	1.155	38
	Mayors	5.67	1.345	15
	Councilmembers	5.54	1.664	13
	Total	5.52	1.292	66
Attending community events.	Administrators or Managers	5.58	1.308	38
	Mayors	6.47	.834	15
	Councilmembers	5.77	.927	13
	Total	5.82	1.189	66
Mentoring staff and directing staff.	Administrators or Managers	6.24	1.218	38
	Mayors	3.00	1.690	15
	Councilmembers	3.31	2.057	13
	Total	4.92	2.151	66
Meeting with state and federal officials.	Administrators or Managers	5.34	1.529	38
	Mayors	5.20	1.897	15
	Councilmembers	3.92	2.139	13
	Total	5.03	1.806	66
Working with other governing body members.	Administrators or Managers	6.05	1.272	38
	Mayors	5.53	1.995	15
	Councilmembers	4.69	1.888	13
	Total	5.67	1.649	66
Idea and innovation generation.	Administrators or Managers	5.87	1.234	38
	Mayors	5.67	1.633	15
	Councilmembers	4.85	2.154	13
	Total	5.62	1.567	66
Reviewing and improving past business practices.	Administrators or Managers	5.89	.953	38
	Mayors	5.00	1.773	15
	Councilmembers	4.15	2.075	13
	Total	5.35	1.574	66
Media relations and information sharing.	Administrators or Managers	5.45	1.389	38
	Mayors	5.33	1.718	15
	Councilmembers	3.31	1.932	13
	Total	5.00	1.772	66
Preparing and attending City Council meetings.	Administrators or Managers	6.76	.490	38
	Mayors	6.73	.594	15
	Councilmembers	6.77	.832	13
	Total	6.76	.583	66
Engaging with individuals on economic development projects.	Administrators or Managers	5.79	1.647	38
	Mayors	5.73	1.580	15
	Councilmembers	4.85	2.115	13
	Total	5.59	1.745	66
Participating in community and internal committees.	Administrators or Managers	5.53	1.289	38
	Mayors	6.53	.640	15
	Councilmembers	5.46	1.898	13
	Total	5.74	1.373	66

The mayoral group was found to be the most frequent group engaged with community events and community committees. Another very strong working area is that of working with other governing body members and the encouragement of idea/innovation generation which are strong elements of the Administrator/Manager group. Overall, the pattern of participation and involvement by the three groups indicates the external public items such as meetings, community committees and informing constituents plays a vital role in the public visibility and involvement of this group.

As part of this statement area, the results of the MANOVA indicated that there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in attitudes about the level of public leadership involvement. An analysis was conducted on the respondent position results **[Wilk's Lambda = 0.232; F (22.00, 106.00) = 5.175 P= 0.001].** where significance was found for the multivariate tests. As a result, each question in this section was subjected to post hoc testing using the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test to determine which items had different attitudes by the position of the respondent. The following results of this post hoc analysis for each statement where statistical differences did emerge.

Statistical significant differences were found on the frequent activities of the three groups: Mayors, Councilmembers, and Administrator/Managers. To determine the impacts on these groups, the post hoc Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test had findings which were similar but different than the topics from the "Top five" of the group means rankings. Topics of significance were identified by probability values of those measurements meeting the level of $p \leq 0.05$:

- Attending community events: 0.036
- Mentoring staff directing staff: 0.001
- Meeting with state and federal officials: 0.037
- Working with other governing body members: 0.026
- Reviewing and improving past business practices: 0.001
- Media relations and information sharing: 0.001 and 0.004

The topic of attending community events is a central function of elected and administrative leadership. As a public leader, there are strong expectations of the leader to engage in the public events. In Tukey's test (Table 4-19), the job duty was essential to each group being tested with the Mayors (6.47) being the very strongest level of frequency for the job duty. Councilmembers at (5.77) were identified as something less than the mayoral rating, while the Administrators/City Managers (5.58) were almost a full point differential. This subset saw no significant difference in the scoring and only identified this being one common group for this statement and matter.

When the group mean analysis was identified for the "top five" responses, the job of Mentoring staff and directing staff was not seen as significant. However, upon review of the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test it was found that significant separation occurred between the elected officials and their city administrators. At 6.24, the Administrator/City Managers held very strong views on the mentoring of staff while mayors and councilmembers were a full 3 points below the administrator rating (Table 4-20). Because many city governments have strong limitations on involvement by city elected officials, by charter or rules, the Administrators do take a stronger role in the development of staff and this Tukey statistic validates this is true. If, by restriction, the elected officials are limited to interact with personnel, the test is found to be true whether in mayoral status or a councilmember, with the elected officials having more in common than the city managers.

Table 4-19: Attending Community Events

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Administrators or Managers	38	5.58
Councilmembers	13	5.77
Mayors	15	6.47

The intergovernmental job of the three groups can be aggressive or passive. Nonetheless, the elected officials or the administrators will interact with state and federal elected officials at differing times. The presentation during these interactions may be a combination of elected and administrative officials or it may be entirely elected in its composition. In observing Tukey's test of this significant activity (Table 4-21), we find that two subset groups are established: one with elected officials and the second one with the Mayor and City Manager/Administrator. The Mayor group is one that is significant to both sectors with a scoring of 5.20 at very strong levels of frequency. Administrators/Managers are slightly higher in Subset 2 with a 5.34 score in very strong frequency. With the Mayor being the lead elected official, he assists with the elected group where Councilmembers are scored at 3.92, or just below the midpoint of 4.00. Overall, this mentoring category indicates similar levels of involvement for the Mayors and City Managers as a subset, while the Councilmembers are in a more moderate role.

The next statement involves the ability to work with other governing body members Table 4-22). A civil attitude and willingness to participate on common knowledge and known positions relating to policy can be of great importance. As found in the earlier group rankings of mean scores, this topic elevated to an important group scoring of 5.67, a very strong score out of 7.

Table 4-20: Mentoring Staff and Directing Staff

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Mayors	15	3.00	
Councilmembers	13	3.31	
Administrators or Managers	38		6.24

Table 4-21: Meeting with State and Federal Officials

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	13	3.92	
Mayors	15	5.20	5.20
Administrators or Managers	38		5.34

Table 4-22: Working with Other Governing Body Members

Tukey's Honest Significant Different Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	13	4.69	
Mayors	15	5.53	5.53
Administrators or Managers	38		6.05

Table 4-23: Media Relations and Information Sharing

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
		Subset	
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	13	3.31	
Mayors	15		5.33
Administrators or Managers	38		5.45

As seen again in the Tukey's Honest Significant Difference chart, Administrators come with the strongest score at 6.05. The Mayor is viewed as a similar position in this subset group at 5.53. However, on close examination, the Mayor is identified as a position to serve jointly in two subsets, when paired with Councilmembers along with a scoring of 4.69. The findings of the test indicate that working with other governing body associates is more prevalent with the Mayor position and the Administrator/Manager position than the Councilmembers themselves. It also indicates that the mayoral role may be more flexible in working with others, because their success is dependent a cohesive operation. It is easier to be certain that the Mayor and Administrator is working closely and substantially similar, while the Councilmembers may not be as engaged for this task.

The last statement to be reviewed is that of Media Relations and Information Sharing. This particular statement was not identified as a group mean "top five". However, the reputation and appearance of the city government is strongly dependent upon how information is conveyed to the community, region and citizens.

As is usually found in modern municipal governments (Table 4-23), the Mayor (5.33) takes on a particularly strong role in representing the City through his media relations

(Table 4-25). The Tukey's Honest Significant Different test clearly identifies and equates this role with the City Administrator and City Managers (5.45) as a subset group. At roughly the same score, the Mayor and Manager are found to be in similar scoring levels with each other as information sharing participants in the greater community. However, the post hoc analysis indicates that Mayors and Councilmembers have average group responses that are significantly higher than the average response of councilmembers. This difference is seen in day to day information sharing and in being the representatives for the municipal government. In comparing the City Councilmembers (3.31), they exist in their own group and are found to score below the midpoint of 4.00. The significance with the Mayor and Manager are seen when simultaneously active providing information to the media, but both are significant within this frequent job requirement. It is found to be a true and unique reflection of local government.

In summary, as identified in the Leadership section, there are many activities a leader is engaged with that establishes awareness of the local government. Significant levels of involvement with duties such as media relations, mentoring, and working with a governing body make a substantial impact on the individual responsibilities of mayors, councilmembers, and administrator/managers. The post hoc tests have shown that specific leadership roles are different when assessed within defined groups, but when taken with the totality of larger combined groups, the true picture of the relationships can show merger or separation between the groups. Administrators play the strongest role, but the mayors play a similar role statistically. Councilmembers are lessened in their roles and deploy their levels of involvement at a moderate level. The Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test has demonstrated that such is the case for most community levels of involvement.

Official Involvement in Economic Development

In the final three statements of the survey, efforts were made to directly identify the three group's involvement in three technical areas: economic development, finance and budgeting, and political leadership. In the first statement, participants were asked to select one (1) statement that represents their level of involvement with the city

organization in the field of economic development. Economic development is understood to mean the adding of economic value to a community and its individuals. The statement was asked in this way.

> "The City Council or Mayor and City Managers participate in economic development, as characterized by the generation of new business within a community. Please select the one (1) statement that best represents your level of involvement in economic development."
>
> - Always involved and rely on professional staff and consulting experts
> - Significantly available for economic development matters
> - Regularly serve as member of a recruitment team or community group
> - Occasionally a participant
> - Not applicable or unsure

Economic Development is a "new" and developing responsibility of city government. Rather than have economic factors influence the future of the city, city governments have chosen to create their own destinies and engage on influencing the location of new value additive industries to the community's economic. Sixty-four participants of this question provided mean scores in response to the question. City Administrators/City Managers had a mean score of 3.38. Councilmembers had a mean score of 2.58, while the Mayor's scoring was a 3.46. The average scoring as a group was a 3.25.

Due to the style of the question/statement changing the response by the participants from a ranking system, an ANOVA process was used to mathematically identify significance and relationships among the official groupings. The results of the ANOVA indicated that there is an overall statistically significant difference at the $p \leq 0.05$ level in the outlook chosen for economic development (Table 4-24). The probability value for the ANOVA was found to be 0.035 between the groups, thus meeting a high probability factor. As a result, the statements were subjected to a post hoc test using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test. A statistically significant relationship was identified between the Administrator/managers and the Councilmembers. This determination identified which groups had differing involvement perspectives regarding economic development. The

dependent variable showed through the Tukey Honest Significant Difference test that the relationship between the City Councilmembers and the Administrators (p=0.043) was the only finding of significance.

Table 4-24 indicates that the Administrator/managers may act within both subset groups, one containing the Mayors and one containing the Councilmembers. Subset one shows the Administrator/City Managers scoring slightly above midpoint, with the Councilmembers significantly lower. In this group, the Administrators are below the midpoint, roughly splitting the assessment by the Councilmembers and Administrators. The scoring proximity of the Mayors and Administrators is roughly the same and allows the Administrators to act in low key or higher key role in economic development.

In the second subset, the Administrators may participate in economic development at the same level as the mayoral group (Table 4-24). At 3.37 for Administrators and 3.46 for Mayors, they are found to be, in general, the same relationship. In this case, the City Managers are able to work in the confines with either group for economic development or the economic development project. In many instances, the Mayor however, will become the salesperson on the project and "sign the deal".

Table 4-24: Official Participation in Economic Development, as Characterized by New Business within a Community

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test			
Position	**N**	**1**	**2**
Councilmembers	12	2.58	
Administrators or Managers	37	3.37	3.37
Mayors	15		3.46

Official Involvement in Finance and Budgeting

A significant portion of the duties of mayors, councilmembers, and administrator/managers is that of municipal finance. In most city charters, the responsibility of budgeting is specifically delineated, and rules are established for response by the administrators and their elected body counterparts. The financial solvency of the municipal corporation is directly proportional to the confidence that may be held for a community in the financial oversight provided by their administrator and elected officials. Therefore, the actions taken by the officials in this arena is an essential question that helps to verify the outlook of the group participants in addressing their level of involvement.

The statement inquired as to the level of involvement found by the mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers and which statement is more representative of that involvement level. Six statements were offered to the 64 participants for their selection. Nearly one-third of the participants (31.1%) chose the statement to conduct actions as required by City Charter and State law. Said response would be a desired response to matters regarding finance and budgeting. Most respondents would want to adhere to the law, where specifics are required to be met and either they are or they are not. Yet, many other answers were chosen.

The second, third, and fourth most common answers were variations of budgetary and financial process. For instance, the second most common statement (14.9%) was that of providing directions on the budgetary goals/programs at the beginning of the budgetary process. Since the budgetary document is the most important directional vehicle available to elected officials, input to the budget document can help to shape the long term and immediate directions of the municipal government. Another large group of respondents (14.9%) also identified that a line item review approach was a most important part of the involvement in the budget and finance processes. Granted importance of this process, the fourth highest respondents (13.5%) indicated the use of an internal committee structure to meet the goals of the community was a best response.

In Table 4-27, rather than testing for significance, a crosstab was conducted to determine the distribution of the mayors, councilmembers and administrator/managers responding to the statements. There were 74 total possible respondents in this section: 63 or 85.1% answered while 11 or 14.9% did not. The measures provided the percentage breakdown for each statement posed above as compared to the largest statement responded to involving adherence to state law and city charter. In examination, we find the strongest correlation for the City Managers/administrators is that of following the state laws and city charter where 31.1% favored positively to this statement. Naturally, this is a professional requirement of city administrator/managers and a necessary duty, but well at 56.5% identified this as the most appropriate single statement identifying their engagement in the budgetary and financial operations of the City. Mayors and Councilmembers were at identical levels for this statement (21.7%).

In examination of an advisory role on oversight of budgetary goals, it should be noticed that 81.8% of the respondents were City Managers, stating their responsibility for goals and directions. Nine out of eleven respondents were City Managers indicating a strong responsibility to address goals and budgeting. Although eleven respondents chose this statement, it represented 25% of those in the position of administrator.

The actions of the elected officials would be a greater concern (Table 4-28). We found that most of the elected official responses were generally neutral with limited response to the statements. However, mayors represented the greatest percentage of responses in the statement about line item review during budget adoption (45.5%). There were no responses from the Councilmembers. Dependency on the professional staff was greatest when examination of the interest of the elected Councilmembers representing 3 of 8 or 37.5%.

Table 4-25: Economic Recruitment and Economic Development

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference Test		
		Subset
Position	**N**	**1**
Councilmembers	11	5.00
Mayors	14	5.79
Administrators or Managers	36	5.86

Table 4-26: The City Council or Mayor Participates in the Financial and Budgeting Systems as Required a City Budget for Approval. Please select the one (1) Statement that Best Represents Your Level of Involvement in Finance and Budgeting

	Frequency	**Percent**
Conduct actions as required by City Charter and State law.	23	35.9
Provide advisory role on oversight of finances/budget through governing body committee structure.	10	15.7
Provide budgetary goals/direction at the beginning of a fiscal process.	11	17.2
Primarily provide line item review of city programs during budget adoption.	11	17.1
Promote service and efficiency audits of city budgets and programs.	1	1.6
Rely upon professional staff and consulting experts on financial matters.	8	12.5
Total	64	100.0

Table 4-27: Summary of Budget/Finance Responses

The City Council or Mayor participates in the financial and budgeting systems as required by City Charter or Ordinance. The City Manager or Administrator presents such financial reports and a city budget for approval. Please select one (1) statement that best represents your level of involvement in finance and budgeting.			
	Position		
	Administrators or Managers	**Mayors**	**Councilmembers**
Count	13	5	5
Conduct actions as required by City Charter and State law.			
% within Position	36.1%	33.3%	41.7%
Count	5	2	3
Provide advisory role on oversight of finances/budget through governing body committee structure.			
% within Position	13.9%	13.3%	25.0%
Count	9	1	1
Provide budgetary goals/direction at the beginning of a fiscal process.			
% within Position	25.0%	6.7%	8.3%
Count	6	5	0
Primarily provide line item review of city programs during budget adoption.			
% within Position	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%
Count	3	2	3
Rely upon professional staff and consulting experts on financial matters.			
% within Position	8.3%	13.3%	25.0%
Total Count	36	15	12
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4-28: Political Leadership Descriptions

	No		Yes	
	Count	**Row N %**	**Count**	**Row N %**
I will make public policy when community consequences are known.	61	92.4%	5	7.6%
I will fully understand financial impacts upon constituencies.	41	62.1%	25	37.9%
I will incorporate public participation processes to insure public support.	48	72.7%	18	27.3%
I will conduct enough analytics to justify public policy positions.	43	65.2%	23	34.8%
I will provide transparency while information is assembled for decision making.	40	60.6%	26	39.4%
I will assess fellow City Council opinion to ensure that I am not alone.	55	83.3%	11	16.7%
The elected body will use a keen sense of timing on critical issues.	61	92.4%	5	7.6%
I shall compare solutions with other sister city organizations.	52	78.8%	14	21.2%

In summary, the selection from the statement choices on finance and budgeting reveals that the primary responsibility of upholding the charter and state law have top priority in among all three groups. Although some groups choose other areas to prioritize in the budget process, the overlying responsibility of elected official and professional administrator alike is to complete and follow mandated processes.

Political Leadership

The final question of the survey engages perspectives on political leadership. Using basic summaries of the responses to the best two statements that represent the perspectives of the individual respondents, there were 66 respondents to this question. Of the responses, it was found that the highest percentage level of responses was to two statements: I will fully understand financial impacts upon constituencies (25 responses at 37.9%) **and** I will provide transparency while information is assembled for decision making (26 responses at 39.4%).

In examining these two responses, in Table 4-29, we see that financial awareness is critical to political leadership. Knowledge on how this relates to actions will be critical whether in the mayoral group, councilmember group or the administrator/manager group. Transparency has also been selected as a critical element of political leadership in today's municipal government environment.

Looking at the third-place statement, it is observed that the desire to conduct enough analytics to justify public policy positions is supported (23 responses at 34.8%). Such an overview of examination can indicate the difference between those cities that are making decisions and moving ahead and not trapped in the situation of continuous analysis. This will be critical for successful democracy as answers to public policy questions and political leadership are not always clearly answered. An additional statement on the list was that of making public policy when consequences are known. Only five participants chose that position. The process of decision making does not require total knowledge of consequences and when these choices are seen side by side, the idea of progress and moving ahead can obviously take place when such choices are made.

The remainder of questions are summarized in the following Table 4-29 and indicate the varied perspectives that can be achieved in strong political leadership whether elected or appointed. Interestingly, a keen sense of timing on critical issues was lightly considered, while many managers and administrators indicate that timing is a critical factor for developing policy and policy changes.

In summary, the survey review has taken Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 to summarize the responses by the participants groups of City Administrators/City Managers, Mayors and Councilmembers to the survey questions. Information has been shared on elected official and administrative official perspectives. Scoring and ratings of these questions and statements have yielded a wealth of information regarding the approaches and thoughts that each group and the combined groups have identified.

Twenty statements and questions were raised with a concentration on relationships and probabilities between the groups. As the positions have been examined, the survey has exposed participation levels, involvement levels, significances, relationships, uses, interest levels, and frequency levels. The broad summary of data may help to identify the changes that may be occurring, have occurred or outlined the duties of today's elected officials and administrators. The next Chapter will outline the findings that we have just discussed.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As has been pointed out throughout this study, research and surveys were conducted in the 1980's to assess the roles and responsibilities of city managers and their councilmember counterparts. Surveys occurred in the states of Ohio (1988) and North Carolina (1987) with city managers, as well as a separate study of twelve city councils and the activities of those elected officials and their relationships to the administrators of their cities (1991). These efforts have been delineated in an article: "The Search for Meaning in Political-Administrative Relations in Local Government" by Dr. James Svara. In them, the activities discussed were identified as part of the Four Dimensions of the Governmental Process. The Four Dimensions were Mission, Policy, Administration and Management. (Svara, 2006) In review of these activities, the roles of the current survey participants from Tennessee, particularly city managers, mayors and councilmembers were highlighted as to their preferences and responsibilities. These four dimensions simplified the sometimes complex roles of elected officials and manager/administrators and surmised the general responsible areas of work associated with the elected and appointed officials. In theory, while the city administrators waited for policies to be developed, the execution of those policies were contained in the arenas of Administration and Management. The deeper thoughts of Mission and long term direction of communities was the arena of the elected leaders of the government.

Utilizing the background of these efforts from prior years, the survey developed for this project was designed with the idea of further defining the roles of mayors, councilmembers, and city managers or city administrators. Further background review of research during the interim from the 1985/1987 studies to the present revealed that limited research has been conducted to the present year in 2019, excepting relevant descriptive of the "State of the Profession" report to ICMA in 2012. The results of limited study of elected and appointed officials during the interim necessitated that question of whether changes and influences have occurred in the local government environment that would characterize changing roles in these elected and appointed positions.

Review of municipal research has shown that it has mainly concentrated on larger communities where broader assumptions may be made about municipal government. However, limited research has concentrated on the world with smaller cities where city managers are concentrated and staffs are limited. To recall, the survey was sent to 220 elected and appointed officials in Tennessee. The general intent did not want there to be more than one mayor, one city administrator and 1-2 city councilmembers. This way a broad representation of cities would be observed in the numerical test group. The surveys were sent to these individuals all serving in Tennessee local government. Councilmembers were selected at random and individualized survey instruments were sent to each individual. Approval of the format from the University of Tennessee was approved by its Institutional Review Board and it was noted as optional for any individual to participate. Sixty six participants completed the electronic survey of 20 statements and sub-statements. Participation occurred with some of the earlier questions which may have increased the participation, but they did not complete the full survey.

Small cities tested for the survey were defined as having a population of 75,000 or less. The lowest population accepted was that of 5,000 in population. Five major cities in Tennessee were excluded including Knoxville, Chattanooga, Murfreesboro, Nashville and Memphis. The concentration on smaller cities lent the survey to future use in other states with smaller inventories of cities such as a Kansas or Indiana. However, the majority of cities in Tennessee are smaller and consist of small staffs with the city administrators serving in a strong city manager role in a council-manager form of government or a strong support role as an administrator supporting a mayor-council form of government.

The compiled statistical information about the respondents is wide and diverse for such a small group of 66 basic participants. Of those responding, 39.4% were from cities of 5,000 to 14,999; 24.2% were from cities of 15,000-29,999; 16.7% were from cities of 30,000 to 49,999; and 19.7% were from cities of 50,000 to 75,000.

When asked how often the mayor and city councilmembers met, we discovered that most city councils met twice a month representing 66.7% or 2/3 of the respondents. The

classification description of the types of cities were Urban-16.9%; Suburban – 53.8%; and Rural 29.2%. Only 35 respondents were involved with a city school system or 53.8% of the total of the 66 communities surveyed, where the city manager or city administrator represented 80.3% (53) of the total respondents. 19.7% (13) were identified as women. When experience was examined for the city manager or city administrator, it was found that 43.9% (29) had 0-10 years' experience as city administrator. In the 10-20 years' experience level 22.7% (15) were represented by this city administrator experience level. In the final grouping at 20+ years, 33.3% (22) years of experience were represented. This breakdown indicates that a shortfall of experienced managers may be faced in the future with this final group, signaling that succession planning is a critical issue, as the national availability of managers is seeing the same situation ahead.

In assessing the demographic breakdown of 66 respondents, the City Councils and Mayors were found to be predominantly White with African-American as the second highest group. Asian American were a third group and similarly aligned those signaling "Other" in the fourth group with the same scoring. No Native Americans or Hispanic were among those participating in the survey. The participant group's background came in highest in descending order with 1) business background, 2) education background, 3) government background and 4) trades background and 5) a non-profit background.

The breakdown in ages of the City Councils and Administrators was also asked. Of the participants surveyed, in descending order, the largest group started at 51-65 years; 66+ years was second; 36-50 years third and below 35 years in fourth place.

Primarily, two forms of government are involved in the case of participants with this survey: Mayor-Council form of government and Council-Manager form of government. The former is the traditional form of government established during the earliest days of our republic. However, in the Progressive Era of the early 1900s, the Council-Manager form of government was designed in 1912 in Staunton, Virginia. This efficient change allowed for the professional manager to become the chief executive of the municipal organization, leaving the City Council and Mayor to become the "Board of Directors"

providing policy and budgetary guidance to the city administrator or manager. Another development was the hiring of an administrator in the Mayor-Council form to be the executive or chief of staff and conducting the operations of the city organization. In this case, the administrator was given or delegated only the authorities that Mayor was willing to share and was subject to change after each change in election. The City Manager in the Council-Manager form however, was charged with the chief executive responsibilities for the overall city operations, with all matters being coordinated through his office, leaving the Councilmembers and Mayors to provide strategic mission guidance and policy guidance. In Tennessee, the Council-Manager plan is scattered across the state. However, the largest concentration of these cities is found in Eastern Tennessee. A smaller concentration is found in and around the Nashville area and in suburban Chattanooga. Several suburban cities are found in the greater Memphis area. The core cities and the Metro city in the case of Nashville, have remained with a strong mayor form of government, but the smaller suburban cities surrounding the major cities are concentrated areas of the Council-Manager form of government. Those cities that are less than 10,000 population are only allowed to have the Mayor Council form of government. With the population variations allowed in the studies there will be responses from cities having both forms of government.

This report has attempted to identify the patterns of municipal government responsibilities and duties by the city administrator/city managers and councilmembers and mayors. The report is charged to examine the defined roles of elected officials and determine if encroachment upon those official duties is occurring. The report also seeks to determine if there is a lesser level of engagement by municipal elected officials due to assumption of duties by the administrator. The report seeks to find if there are differing levels of participation in the activities of the city or whether these actual roles compare to the perceived roles of these key positions.

Observations on the Responsibilities of Officials

Confirmation of the duties found in municipal government and who does them is a critical issue of this report. The Councilmembers are tasked with the development of policies

and efficiencies that enhance the quality of life and economics of the community. Their engagement in this environment becomes critical in addressing the adaptability of the community to a changing environment.

It is noted in a question about being responsible that in supporting the adopted policies of the surveyed group, it was found the commonalities with the Administrators are strong. The City Councilmembers take a strong position in supporting the policies by backing the city administrator in upholding what has been decided. This can mean long time decisions and processes are supported and it can also mean a willingness to adapt to the latest technologies to be implemented in the City. The Councilmembers were much stronger in authority than the Mayors in these instances. The Administrators are charged with upholding the policies of the city and executing them to perfection. The Councilmembers are those that hold the keys to policy change, so this becomes an important duty to not only change policy but hold fast on policy which is proven. Constant policy change can be an indication of a lack of study and understanding of the problem to be addressed. The study found that mayors were less inclined to be responsible for the way things are, but find themselves in a position as a leader, change agent and overseer of the city. The Councilmembers, however, are found to be important in being those that develop the policies and are held accountable at each election for those decisions.

Further focus on the responsibilities of the elected officials led to the statistical conclusion that Mayors and Councilmembers are the deciding influences on which services are to be provided for in the community. As a group, they decide whether a service is to be provided or not. This ability is closely guarded with a very strong showing of sensitivity towards this authority. A significant relationship was found between the Administrators and the Councilmembers showing the responsibility for the policies that create outcomes, but the Administrators were very, very responsible for the everyday daily business of the organization.

The Mayors indicated that they were responsible for engaging in the decision making process that decided levels of service and insuring that positive outcomes were achieved

as part of the decision making and then, significantly knowing that all three groups were responsible for insuring that the services actually were provided for.

An interesting finding about the Administrators occurred with their responsibilities. They alone were identified as responsible for the conduct of daily business. There was no statistical encroachment into this responsibility by the elected officials that were included in the survey. The response was close to the perfect score: 4.92 out of 5.00. A second observation in the area of responsibilities was the strong total acceptance of the responsibility for the employees by the administrators. The uniquely significant relationship was established and identified, but the Mayor and Councilmembers were not at the highest levels of assumed responsibility despite any political statements as to significant devotion to municipal employee groups. Instead, we find that the administrators are the persons engaged with municipal employees, and city council and mayors generally view this as a responsibility of the city manager.

Observation on the Duties of Officials

Significant relationships were found among the duties of the elected officials and appointed officials in the survey. In reviewing the findings of the Four Dimensions of the Governmental Processes, it was found that the strength of the administrator/city manager was still found in 1) the management of resources and 2) the administration of rules and regulations. As found in the Dichotomy/Duality model, the findings of this study indicate that the arena of management and administration was equally strong with lesser engagement by the elected officials. Testing this theory against the actual responses of the survey participants demonstrated under the Tukey Honest Significant Difference test, administration and elected officials were indeed under separate sub unit groups with a strong finding of separation between the two groups. The Administrators were found to have been their own independent group in administration of resources and priorities and having the ability to assign those resources. In the area of management, the city managers once again had the duty of organizing, changing and implementing the rules and regulations of the organization. Both duty areas find an almost perfect mean score of 4.84 out of 5.00 confirming that this is a major duty of the administrators.

The remaining two areas of the Four Dimensions of Governmental Processes were that of Policy and Mission. Policy initiatives were strongly found to be a duty of all three groups in the analysis with the Councilmembers being the largest at 4.36. When addressing policy, all three groups were not found to be statistically significant. Instead, the administrators (4.16), mayors (4.15) and councilmembers (4.36) addressed policy as a group or one subset. A similar analysis of the important role of mission and strategic direction also was found to be a strong matter of shared duties with Mayors having the highest indicative score at 4.77. In today's municipal government, direction and strategic identification of goals is critical, but involves the insight of the elected officials, both mayor (4.77) and councilmembers (4.45), and the administrators (4.21) to provide insight, experience and recommendations for the municipality.

Observations on Official Activities

After an initial review of job responsibilities and job duties, the overall survey concentrated on various activities. Financially, it was observed that a high degree of significance and probability exists in four distinct financial actions: budget preparation, budget adoption, long term bond financing and grants. Administrators (4.63) were found to have the predominant role in the preparation of the budget and were significantly more engaged in this work. In Council-manager forms of government, one of the usual responsibilities of the city manager is the presentation of a budget annually to the city council. This scoring validated this important function in the managerial and administrative dimensions of the government processes. When it came to budget adoption, the city council/mayor groups (4.67, 4.83) came forward with great scoring strength. Since the administrator/managers had previously presented the budget, the adoption process was clearly identified in the Tennessee communities as a major activity and duty. When it came to the thoughts of long term financing through municipal bonds and specialty debt, roles shifted to a shared subset group, with the Mayors (4.11) and Administrators (4.53) developing the planned course for issuance. These two professions shared the activity of developing the plan as defined by the survey participants. This overlap of policy and administration is one of the prime areas observed by the survey for shared duties. This would highlight the observation of the "purple zone" that is described in recent literature. (Alford, 2017).

Grants were found to be a separate financial issue that fell within the oversight of the administrators (4.05). Grants are important financial products for attaining city goals, but the development and initiative taken for said grants is usually led by the administrators. This was verified by the Tukey Honest Significant Difference test shown on this topic. When examining financial duties among the three groups, the administrators were found to lead these significant findings in three of four topical areas.

The survey examined the topic of Public Safety, since this is a primary function of local government. Activities of police, fire and ambulance departments are critical duty areas. Analysis showed no determinations of statistical significance. However, one topic in this section noted an opportunity to respond to constituent inquiries and complaints. Surprisingly, it was found that the administrators (4.42) were the highest scoring constituent group with the mayors (3.88) and councilmembers (3.83) following. In examining this it may be that complaints in small cities are viewed as administrative responsibilities and not matters governing the policy or mission areas. Accepting the call can occur with the elected officials, but it is quickly handed off to the professional staff employees, including the administrator to handle.

The quality of life in a community is based on developing a citizenry that is healthy and satisfied with its benefits over other communities. The survey identified Parks, Library services, Festivals and Housing as reviewable services that impact quality of life. After participation, it was found that each constituent group rated these duties as lower than previous topics such as Public Safety and Finances. Parks and recreation services were found to be very strongly rated as a duty by the administrators (3.95). This is perhaps due to this being a managerial function in determining what is done and how it is done. In three parallel topics of Library (3.28), Festivals (3.64) and Housing (3.18), it was found that the Mayors were the primary group atop the scoring, but significantly lower than other duties. In review, the mayors are advocates of services and the library is one of those services that is reliable and engaging with constituents. Although not as visible as other services, it adds to the quality of life. Whereas an administrator may devalue the costs of the service, the mayor must point to the service as essential function of government.

Interestingly, festivals rated high, with the city councilmembers (3.36) close behind. This quality of life matter is an opportunity for the elected officials to officially engage with the public and determine needs and goals. Housing is a growing topic in many communities but it may be found that lower mayoral scores (3.18) can indicate that interest or knowledge is divested in other groups such as a housing authority or that a political reliance upon the private housing market to resolve matters is a better approach to this topic.

One area of statistical significance was found in the area of utilities and planning. Utilities may include streets, water lines, sewer lines, or electrical systems. The significance was found in the relationship between the Mayors and Administrators when talking of utility infrastructure or infrastructure maintenance. These are topic that are not glamorous, but they do point to necessity and care in elected official and administrator duties. In the analysis, it was found that two subsets were identified demonstrating that the Councilmembers (2.92) were interactive in both groups. While working with the city managers (3.70) in addressing and prioritizing utilities, and supporting their financing, the Councilmembers (2.92) were also leading the Mayor (2.37) through this duty by backing the mayor for funding, rates and project clarity for constituents. Additional topics of Capital Projects, Strategic Planning and Economic Development found each participant group generally active at the same level of support creating only one subset within the respondent data.

Observed Characteristics of Administrators and Elected Officials

We have studied the characterization of the city managers and city administrators in this report. The rating system of this question established mean perspectives by the groups regarding this position. Nine characteristics were surveyed, but it was found that the mean scoring elevated the critical roles in three areas: providing key leadership to the city, overseeing all actions of the city, and cooperation with the governing body. On a scale of 1-5, Councilmembers described their understanding of the city manager key leadership role as very, very strong (4.82). In self-evaluation, the city managers (4.74) graded themselves as important to the leadership system. Mayors (4.39) scored this

responsibility as less perhaps due to the concept of sharing leadership and further defining the leadership needed.

It became very clear from the Mayor's perspective (4.94) and the Councilmember's perspective (4.91) that it was highly recognized by the groups that the city managers do and are responsible for overseeing all actions of the city. The strength of these answers leave little room for doubt as to this expected characteristic of the city manager/administrator. Finally, with respect to the governing body, the mayors (4.78), councilmembers (4.73) and the managers themselves (4.74) all viewed the essence of cooperation as an essential characteristic of the City Manager.

As we turned to ten characteristics of the elected officials, the three highest rated characteristics were found to be: having a good working relationship with fellow councilmembers, having an effective relationship with the city manager and use of professional staff to achieve goals. The first of these topics indicated that all three groups generally scored in the same rate with mayors (4.53), city managers (4.50) and councilmembers (4.27) in general scoring agreement that working relationship is the critical element for progress and goal achievement. If a city council is found to not have this relationship, the community can easily go toxic and take years to change its reputation. In the case of city managers, the stronger the working relationship, the more that can be accomplished.

The city manager, as identified above, is expected to oversee the actions of the organization. This is accomplished best with the strong working relationship that was found in the assessment of the Tennessee officials. Mayors (4.87), in particular, need this strong relationship to be successful in accomplishments. Administrators (4.57) assessed the need for strong relationship as critical, while Councilmembers (4.55) mirrored the level of importance of this elected official characteristic.

Although scoring lower, two statements were offered on characteristics to determine if the outlook and perspective of the elected officials were important. The two questions asked

if the powers of a city council should be looked at as liberally construed or conservatively construed. This makes a difference in whether a City Council and Mayor will be creative and innovative in its approach to governing. The municipalities are always constrained by state and federal laws. But, in some instances, the City may have the flexibility to interpret their policy endeavors. The questions identified as a mayor, councilmember and administrator group a mean of 3.95 for a liberally construed perspective. The same combined group provided a response to a conservatively construed powers on average at 3.43. This difference by the same group deserves further study as determining how outlooks and personalities come together as an elected body and professional administrator. These combined personalities may make significant difference between those cities that move forward and those that don't.

As described, the relations between elected officials and their administrators are significant. Success is dependent upon understanding of duties, characteristics and duties and perspectives. In examining five statements on the work role, the three groups of city managers, mayors and councilmembers again agreed that the city administration is indeed the responsibility of the city manager. As policy decision makers, the elected officials find significance in the role of the manager to provide policy alternatives for consideration. This allows the elected officials to hear constituents, compromise in solutions and encourage innovation.

One overview of the mayors and councilmembers is the strong role and responsibility of oversight. It was stated that significance in supporting performance appraisal is critical for monitoring the manager's activities. Mayors (4.47) and Councilmembers (4.83) indicate the level of importance they see this responsibility. A side assessment of the significant roles of the city manager strongly indicated from the Mayors (4.05) and the Councilmembers (3.92) that the open relationship they may have with the administrator is inhibited by the open meeting laws of the state. A quick check of the overall relationships between administrator/mayor (6.16), administrator/councilmember (6.11) and councilmember/mayor (5.59) indicate that relationships among the groups are very strong on a 1-7 scale. Given that relationships have already been identified as critical

aspects of success, the finding of the surveyed group lends confidence to the small cities that such relationships are desirous or actually exist.

The sense of accomplishment is essential for the citizens of a community to feel successful. This is expected from an elected body and the city administrator is expected to work closely in the accomplishments of goals. The effectiveness of reaching goals was tasked and there was a finding of no significance. However, the strongest group mean findings of the survey indicates that the governing body provides influence on the direction of its local government (6.27). From the perspectives of each of their communities, the full group of participants agreed that the Mayor operates within his/her role (6.13). Finally, the council identified that they were accepting of group decisions (5.71). All three of these questions indicate a direct working relationship that can be positive and progressive.

Statistical significance in this assessment indicates that the governing body (3.30) takes a short term view of decision making and is quick in decision making. Elected officials (3.50) rated themselves low, but the administrator (4.29) (4.37) rated the electeds high on both accounts. The strongest responses to statistical significance findings were that of relying on financial data to make decisions and regularly reviewing community priorities. The Tukey Honest Significant Difference test indicated single group subsets with strong scores by all groups but the strongest in these statements were the elected officials. (6.20) and (5.60).

The decisions made by a city council or their administrator rely on a variety of information sources. Nine statements were tested with the survey participants to determine where they rely on information. Given the rise in such sources as the Internet and social media, it was important to find how the officials gather information. There was no finding of statistical significance in the responses, but the greatest level of response occurred in two topics: City Manager is the key facilitator of information (6.15) and the Mayor and City Council rely on the professional expertise of the staff (6.32). Other options to consider were the experience base of elected officials, open record requests and use of the Internet. The findings were encouraging that the elected officials and administrators

relied on the development of strong, experienced organizations and a strong city manager to facilitate the dissemination of information.

If the City Council is to take action on a policy the source of that policy must be developed. As expected, with support of professional staff, it was probable and statistically significant that the governing body relies on that professional staff for the policy initiatives it must decide upon. That relationship was particularly strong between the mayor and the city manager, less so with the councilmember. A Tukey test indicate a very strong probability of reliance (6.32) upon the city manager by the governing body for policy recommendations.

In further assessment, it was found that the governing body would usually wait for priority issues before triggering policy change. The Tukey test results indicate two subset groups with the Councilmembers serving in both groups. As an elected body, it can be determined that the group can await policy recommendations to happen, such as the updating of a building code. In the meantime, an action to address such matters as small cell towers may require immediate action due to market conditions. The two areas of policy indicate strong probabilities that such actions may need to be instigated before action is taken. This requires both elected officials and appointed officials to work together to accomplish said goals.

As we assessed the roles and duties of elected officials and administrators, the subject of oversight was a matter to examine. Oversight is a function of the superior relationship between the elected bodies over the city administrator. Examining seven varied statements, there was no finding of statistical significance. The general mean scoring of the statements indicates on a 1-7 scale that the mayors were more involved with this function than the councilmembers. Mayors provide oversight officially (5.75) and they provided individualized advice to the managers (5.19). Mayors followed the law and contractual procedure to insure the oversight function is conducted (5.63), all the while conducting it in a public manner (5.50). These responses indicate the importance taken by the mayors to address the required duties of their job. Variation in these duties was

not observed, or a lower scoring would have been seen. The indication is that strong scoring will indicate and further define the role of the elected mayor in the role of oversight.

Overview of Official and Preferred Tasks

City administrators, mayors and councilmembers are faced with numerous tasks that may be done. Many of these tasks are required officially and some are done because they are preferred. In assessing tasks, the survey participants were offered a series of possibilities. In observing the preferences for official tasks, the preferences became: create a city strategic plan (4.47), review utility rates and capital plans (4.28), and examine ways to reduce costs (4.24). In reviewing these "top 3" selections, we will note that the preference **officially** is to conduct work that would be considered as mission driven in the Dichotomy-Duality model of Svara. The specific, tangible items to consider officially were not of significant interest. The lowest ranked official task to be rated was that of developing a rental housing policy. Even though the consideration of 16 possible official tasks was made, the tangible possibilities were rated lowest over the intangible tasks that were chosen. To research, this may indicate an innate desire by individual elected officials to remain at a higher attainment level of tasks given the responsibility of their positions.

The second listing of tasks was presented as one not of official consequence, but a listing of preferences. In the multivariate tasks, statistical significance was not identified by a Wilk's Lambda test (0.362). The level of involvement was the subject of the rating and numerous matters were discovered about our three groups. A tangible product was identified in the creation of an annual budget. Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test revealed that the Mayor (6.36) was identified as a probable participant in both groups The Mayor is actively engaged in this budget document as it represents his/her leadership and direction to the community. The City Administrator is almost equal as a strong participant at (6.56). The city manager/administrator is found to be responsible for the entire organization. A test for significance in the encouragement of morale was tested. As a group, the city administrators were found to be the strongest response to addressing morale (6.58) affirming his/her level of responsibility. Mayors (5.07) and councilmembers

(4.82) also have strong allegiance for the morale of the organization, but the difference indicates that the city manager must be considered closely as the key leader in addressing the attitude and response by the organization.

Three other areas of significance helped to identify the key preferences of officials in their work with city government. Mayors, councilmembers and administrators would prefer to work in the addition or modification of services. As time changes, new ideas shall be a challenge and implementation of those ideas can become critical. Another finding was that of raising and identifying new revenue sources. Again, considering this action at a strategic intangible level, the addition of revenue to the municipality can provide services that are unaffordable, require maintenance of assets, and obtaining of additional support through grants and bonds.

The final area of preference was the intangible act of evaluating the administrator. Established by law or contract, the evaluation of the city manager can shed light on the intended direction of the community and it allows the full expression of strategic and policy directions to be conveyed to the individual that can support the organization in attaining those goals.

Leadership

As public leaders, city councilmembers, mayors and administrators are engaged in acts throughout the community. It was found that in the public leadership roles, the active involvement in those roles can affect the municipality. Eleven statements were proposed concerning the participants outlook on public leadership. In the analysis, statistical significance was discovered on a number of topics indicating a high probability of engagement in the topic. The Tukey's Honest Significant Difference test organized based on groups and where each group fit. Initially, the perspective on community events lead to identify that the Mayor's key role (6.47) in this matter created one subset group for this leadership role. Given the public presence of the Mayor this naturally is a role of the Mayor, officially and personally. Confirmed again, the city managers/administrators find

that they are the leaders of the organization and the role of mentoring staff and directing employees falls to him/her (6.24).

The municipalities of Tennessee must work with state and federal officials. It was found to be highly probable that Councilmembers and the Mayors would be considered a group. When identified, two groups were identified with the Mayor (5.20) being subject to the probabilities of being in both groups according to the Tukey's test results. As the leader of the City Council, his scoring rose to a higher level that aligns with the city manager. Overall, it can be observed the Mayor plays a key role in this public leadership responsibilities. In another function, the significance was identified that the Mayor and City Manager were equated into a group as it relates to media responsiveness and sharing. The Mayor (5.33) and the Manager (5.45) both serve in the similar role in addressing this public leadership role.

In the beginning of the development of this survey, we identified that limited research has been done in this field of study. At the 100th Anniversary of the International City/County Management Association in 2012, the latest survey was conducted on U.S. managers trying to identify what it is that is done in the workplace today. Since this survey was one done on a nationwide basis, the large populations were added to the small populations and differing states with more managers contributed on the same basis as managers from states with small populations. The premise of this report was to see if there were differences in the roles of the elected officials and city administrators of a less populated state like Tennessee with many smaller cities. We have attempted to develop that field of knowledge by conducting a detailed survey of perspectives on various roles, tasks, and responsibilities.

We discussed the idea of elected officials liking to address tangible issues, but through the course of our survey, we observe tendencies to stay in the mission-driven, policy-driven areas of activities. The "tangible activist" can be said to be untrue as the data developed indicates that councilmembers and mayors are not tied to easy issues but can develop its approaches to long term, intangible issues that improve the community. When

an elected official decides to deal with tangible issues such as constituency complaints, the indications are they would much rather deal with strategic plans and legislative issues. If we look at the concept of being the “intangible activist” we may see a truer picture of the activities and responsibilities of manager, councilmembers and elected officials. By appearance, elected officials do not greatly intrude into the realm of managerial and administrative activities. Instead, they are working cohesively as a group and sometimes working as a member of two groups depending upon situations.

Conclusion

As a result of these findings, it is observed that the restrictions of state laws and the limitations of city charters are keeping the elected officials of Tennessee’s smaller cities in their traditional roles with traditional responsibilities. There will be outliers, but the general directions of the majority of cities will be to follow the general roles of their positions. Despite the passage of over 30 years since the studies were conducted in North Carolina and Michigan, the roles of elected and appointed officials have not materially changed. They are conducting their roles with differing responsibilities, but basic dedication to the forms of government, defined roles by city charters and professional expertise and education added to the general governmental mix.

Mayors continue to have a strong presence and leadership role. Councilmembers continue to have oversight responsibilities that are taken seriously and budget adoption processes that are eagerly turned over by a professional city administrator. I have not seen evidence of encroaching role boundaries in Tennessee’s small cities studied in this report. It is perhaps better stated that the local governments of Tennessee are strongly committed to their forms of governments, elected official roles and their administrator expertise displayed in strong governmental policy actions. Elected officials follow their defined roles and responsibilities, while recognizing that strong relationships with each other, between the Mayor, Councilmembers and the City Manager are critical for local government success.

As our surveys and post hoc analysis identified in many instances, the mayors, managers and councilmembers participate in their required levels of work. Sometimes that work is shared and participation is extended as needed to accomplish the mission and develop the policies that will make the community a better place. The respectful relationship is duly noted in this report to identify that the elected officials and the city administrators are knowledgeable and dedicated about working together.

When this study was developed, there was an assumption that the roles of elected officials were quietly encroaching on the roles of the city managers. Likewise the city manager roles were changing to more strategic and political roles. It was perceived that this change was occurring due to changing work environments, changing laws, workforce generational change, active media coverage and forgotten history. It is safer to say that these changes may find a "purple zone" in which appointed and elected officials are both operating. (Alford, Hartley, Yates and Hughes, 2017) But, these encroaching roles are not the norm, and, instead, the municipal work that must go on continues to work in its present and traditional roles, but is flexible in a changing environment, changing demographics, and changing elected bodies.

Future Research Considerations

Future research may be considered as an outcome to this report. First, it must be admitted and recognized that there are limitations on the numerical participation in this report. The small sample size responding to the survey doesn't allow analysis of differences in attitudes to occur. The basic platform of a major survey encompassing more participants, multiple states and differing population scenarios will be more suitable. However, the use of Tennessee as a model has encompassed a good sample of varying municipalities that have produced strong, diverse and yet, interesting statistical data about the professions that we have examined. This type of survey may be more suitable for use in lesser populated states or concentration on specific sizes of cities throughout the country. Comparative analysis of this survey type can be utilized more readily and be more valid if used to compare state to state changes.

We also have to recognize in this report that many assumptions have been made. In examining the roles of mayors, councilmembers and city administrators, there have been no expectations set for differing forms of government. Our responses may contain a large or small number of cities with mayor-council form of government. The job titles are different in the responses from the city administrators. No comparisons of duties have been done, but only acceptance by invitation as the administrator or elected official of the city that was contacted. Similarities between administrators and city managers led to similar responses within the survey. As such, all administrators were merged as one group. No identification of legal changes have qualified these positions, which could affect the perspectives of the participants.

Due to time constraints for the report, it was unable to conduct individualized follow up interviews which were initially suggested to conduct as a validation of the survey findings. These interviews or focus groups might yield further modified results and verification which would help in the conclusions of this report. It is believed this can be an area of future research and deeper clarification.

In looking ahead, the future research of public administrators and the elected officials they serve needs to be examined more regularly. Other than the general “state of the Profession” survey of 2012, no detailed focus on local government elected officials roles have occurred over a very long period of time. The survey could be standardized and re-emerged for a new survey every ten years. This would provide regularity into the process and changing dynamics of duties and responsibilities would be more readily recognized as to their changes.

The completion of this study has elevated awareness of the actual details of work for the councilmembers, mayors and city managers of Tennessee cities. During our review, it is found that the foundations of local government are holding to the structures and roles as defined by charters, laws and traditions. City Councilmembers are upholding specific tasks that identify the development of budgets, managerial oversight and cooperation with fellow members of the governing body. Mayors are providing the significant actions

affiliated with community leadership, strategic planning and lobbying at state and national levels. City manager or city administrators are developing budgets, conducting economic development and supporting city employees. Of the many tasks and responsibilities reviewed, the blurring of the lines and activities did not occur as much as might have been predicted. Significance occurred with budgetary matters, financial policy, short term decision-making, facilitation of information, and development of policy by prioritizing change within the organization. All three groups have played and will play important roles in the vital work of small Tennessee cities.

In the instance of this study, Tennessee municipal officials have indicated a strong willingness to remain in a structured environment. Innovation is encouraged, but within reason. Planning is important to Tennessee officials, while implementation of strategic processes is a significant need identified within the report. As Tennesseans look ahead, they can be assured that the importance of structured local government is a critical value to communities and the initiative they take. Further research is encouraged to allow Tennessee local government to understand its idiosyncrasies and learn to thrive in a fast moving world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alford, J., Hartley, J., Yates, S., & Hughes, O. (2017). Into the Purple Zone: Deconstructing the Politics/Administration Distinction. *The American Review of Public Administration 47*(7): 752–763.

Alford, John, & O 'Flynn, Janine. (2009). Making Sense of Public Value: Concepts, Critiques and Emergent Meanings. *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(4): 171-191.

Ammons, D. N., & Newell, C. (1988). City Managers Don't Make Policy: "A Lie; Let's Face It." *National Civic Review 57*: 124-132.

Berman, E. M. (1997). Getting Support from City Council: City managers' Views. *Public Administration and Management: An Interactive Journal* [On-line], *2*(3).

Box, Richard C. (1993). "Searching for the Best Structure for American Local Government." *International Journal of Public Administration* 18: 711 -741.

Browne, W. (1985). Municipal Managers and Policy: A Partial Test of the Svara Dichotomy-Duality Model. *Public Administration Review, 45*(5); 620-622.

Dahl, Robert A, 1947 "The Science of Administration: Three Problems," *Public Administration Review*, 7, pp. 1-11 (Winter).

Demir, Tansu. 2009a. The Complementarity View: Exploring a Continuum in Political–Administrative Relations. *Public Administration Review* 69(5): 876–88.

Demir, Tansu, & Ronald C. Nyhan. 2008. The Politics–Administration Dichotomy: An Empirical Search for Correspondence between Theory and Practice. *Public Administration Review* 68(1): 81–96.

Demir, T., & Reddick, C. G. (2012). Understanding Shared Roles in Policy and Administration: An Empirical Study of Council-Manager Relations. *Public Administration Review:* 72(4), 526-535.

Denhardt, R. (2001). The Big Questions of Public Administration Education. *Public Administration Review: 61*(5), 526-534.

Doberstein, C. D. (2016). *Building a Collaborative Advantage*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Frederickson, G. (2007, March 26). *Bureaucrats without borders: Public management and the end of geography.* Donald Stone Lecture presented at the American Society for Public Administration Conference, Washington, DC.

Gargan, John J., (1997) *Handbook of Local Government Administration.* Kent State University, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, pp. 357-369.

Goodnow, Frank J. Politics and Administration (New York, 1900). See also the comments of V. 0. Key, Jr., "Politics and Administration," The Future of Government in the United States, ed. Leonard White (Chicago, 1942), pp. 145-163.

Hair, Joseph F. Hair, Jr., Black, William C., Babin, Barry J., & Anderson, Rolph E., (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis,* 7th edition. London: Pearson.

Hansen, Kasper M., & Niels Ejersbo. 2002. The Relationship between Politicians and Administrators—A Logic of Disharmony. *Public Administration* 80(4): 733–50.

Heilig, Peggy, & Robert J. Mundt (1984). *Your Voice at City Hall*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Herson, Lawrence J. R. (1957). The Lost World of Municipal Government Association, *The American Political Science Review*, 51, (2), 330-345.

Herzog, R., & Claunch, R. (1997). Stories Citizens Tell and How Administrators Use Types of Knowledge. *Public Administration Review: 57*(5), 374-379.

International City County Management Association, www.icma.org

Lee, Mordecai (2001). Looking at the Politics-Administration Dichotomy from the Other Direction: Participant Observation by a State Senator. *International Journal of Public Administration,* 24(4), 363-384.

Morgan, Douglas F., & Kass, Henry D. (1993). *"The American Odyssey of the Career Public Service: The Ethical Crisis of Role Reversal.*" In H. George Frederickson, ed. Ethics and Public Administration. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Ch. 9.

Meyer, Julie. (1951). "The Stranger and the City," *American Journal of Sociology*, 56 (March): 476-483.

Municipal Technical Advisory Service (MTAS). (1995). "Charters Change for Three Types of General Law Cities: Mayor-Aldermanic, Uniform City Manager-Commission and Modified City Manager-Council".

Nalbandian, J., (2006) Politics and Administration in Local Government, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(12): 1049-1063.

Nalbandian, J. (1991). *Professionalism in local government: Transformations in the Roles, Responsibilities, and Values of City Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nalbandian, J. (1989). The Contemporary Role of City Managers. *American Review of Public Administration 19*(4): 261-277.

National Civic League. (2003). 8th NCL Model City Charter. Denver, Colorado.

Nelson, Kimberly L. & Svara, James H. (2015) The Roles of Local Government in Theory and Practice: A Centennial Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 75(1): 49-61.

Nelson, Kimberly L. & Svara, James H. (2013). Upholding and Expanding the Roles of Local Government Managers: State of the Profession 2012; as presented to the International City/County Management Association membership.

O'Leary, R., Van Slyke, D., & Kim, S. (Eds.). (2010). *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Georgetown University Press.

O'Leary, Rosemary & Vij, Nidhi. (2012). Collaborative Public Management, *The American Review of Public Administration* 42 (5): 507 – 522.

Osbourne, David & Gaebler, Ted. (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Boston, MA, Addison Wesley Press.

Ospina**,** Sonia M. (2016). Collective Leadership and Context in Public Administration: Bridging Public Leadership Research and Leadership Studies, *Public Administration Review:* 77(2) 275–287.

Prewit, K. (1970). *The Recruitment of Political Leaders;* Indianapolis, IN, Bobbs-Merrill.

Salamon, L. (2002). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Selden, Sally, Brewer, Gene A. & Brudney, Jeffrey L. (1999). The Role of City Managers: Principals, Agents or Both. *The American Review of Public Administration,* 29 (2): 124-148.

Spicker, Paul 2012. Leadership: A Perniciously Vague Concept. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 25(1): 34–47.

Svara, James H. (1991). Council and administrator perspectives on the city manager's role: Conflict, divergence, or congruence? *Administration and Society*, *23*(2): 227-246.

Svara, James H. (1985). Dichotomy and Duality: Reconceptualizing the Relationship between Policy and Administration in Council-Manager Cities. *Public Administration Review* 45(January/February): 221-232.

Svara, James H. (2006). Introduction: Politicians and Administrators in the Political Process—A Review of Themes and Issues in the Literature. *International Journal of Public Administration* 29 (12): 953-976.

Svara, James H. (2006). The Search for Meaning in Political-Administrative Relations in Local Government. *International Journal of Public Administration* 29 (12): 1065-1090.

Svara, James H. (1999). The Shifting Boundary between Elected Officials and City Manager in Large Council-Manager Cities. *Public Administration Review* 59 (1): 44-53.

Svara, James H. (1998). The Politics-administration Dichotomy Model as Aberration. *Public Administration Review 58* (1): 51-58.

Vogel, Rick, and Doris Masal. 2015. Public Leadership: A Review of the Literature and Framework for Future Research. *Public Management Review* 17(8): 1165–89.

Wheeler, C. M. (1994). Identity and excellence: Role Models for City Managers *Administration & Society* 26 (3): 281.

APPENDIX

Survey on the Roles of Elected and Appointed Officials in Tennessee (attached).

VITA

Mark Watson is a second generation city management practitioner and originally a native of Columbia, Missouri. Watson grew up as the son of a public servant and lived in a variety of places including Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa and Kansas. In 1972, he graduated from Lawrence High School in Lawrence, Kansas. He promptly enrolled in the University of Kansas, where in 1976, he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. During that time, he was actively involved in a 2 year experimental integrated humanities program and was capped with a senior semester of study abroad at University of Galway in the Republic of Ireland.

Upon return, Mark Watson served an internship in the City of Overland Park, Kansas and was then accepted into the University of Kansas Public Administration School, where he graduated in 1978 with a Masters of Public Administration. In the Kansas curriculum, second year coursework entailed an internship for completion which he served in University Park, Texas. In the fall of 2011, Watson was accepted into the doctoral program at the University of Tennessee.

While attending the doctoral program, Watson concentrated in the field of public administration and public policy. During that period of study, his work involved research in public administration theory, environmental policy, national, state and local government and international conflict resolution.

Mark Watson's background is that of an active practicing city manager, and he currently serves as the City Manager of Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Prior to serving this city, Watson has served as City Manager in six other cities in Montana, Arizona and Texas. He has worked actively in cities that are characterized as rural, suburban, urban, agricultural, military, international borders, medical, aviation and scientific communities. Over the course of a 40 year career, Watson has been characterized as a change agent that seeks to contribute to the betterment of the communities he served.

Watson has actively served the profession of city management by serving as Vice President of the International City/County Management Association in 1999-2001. During his involvement with ICMA, Watson has served as the Chair of the Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee (1999-2002) and Chair of the International Committee (2009-2012). As Chair, he has actively participated in lobbying Washington D. C. on varied topics such as Internet sales taxation and U.S. municipal governance. Recently, in his official capacity, he has successfully supported the creation of the new Manhattan Project National Historical Park. Watson has led local government study groups to Japan, Slovakia, and New Zealand. In 2005, Watson participated in a management exchange with Maltese local government officials. In 2014, Watson represented ICMA and the United States State Department in Borneo, Indonesia as part of the YSEALI professional management fellows program. Additionally, in 2018, Watson taught U.S. Local Government Policy at the China University of Political Science and Law in Beijing, China. Watson has had an active career as a Credentialed Public Manager. He has attended advance education through attendance at the Public Executive Institute of the University of Texas, the Environmental Policy Institute of Virginia Tech University and the ICMA Inaugural Gettysburg Institute. Watson has served on numerous professional and community boards and commissions. In 1998, Watson served on the Governor's Task Force to Renew Montana Government. Watson has served in state officer capacity for his professional associations, and, in 2007 was recognized for the ICMA Program. Excellence Award for his "Cities that Think" program. Mark Watson has had many speaking engagements and written articles on international, statewide and local issues. Mark presently serves the city management profession in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.