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Abstract
At least since the late 1970s, the performance measurement literature has used different terminologies to describe agency- and citizen-generated performance measures. The first type of measures are placed into objective and the second type into subjective categories. This article argues that this terminology is outdated owing to evidence on the contextual subjectivity of all performance measures. The analysis also examines the potential impact of the dichotomization on the role accorded citizens in helping to develop public sector performance measures.
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This article analyzes the dichotomization of objective and subjective measures in the public sector performance measurement literature and the relationship of that dichotomy to the field’s perennial science wars. The past decade and a half has seen new energy in the epistemological debate over whether public administration is a science best pursued by quantitative positivist methods or an art best understood through interpretative narrative methodologies. This debate has a long history. As Raadschelders (2000) has noted, comparisons to the natural sciences have dominated successive attempts to define an identity for the

1 New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark

Corresponding Author:
Hindy Lauer Schachter, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 4019 Central Avenue Building, Newark, NJ 07102
Email: hindy.l.schachter@njit.edu
field. These attempts go back at least to William Bennett Munro’s 1928 plea for a natural science paradigm in public sector research rather than continued reliance on narratives promoting political reform. Such attempts undergirded Herbert Simon’s (1957) drive to create an administrative science.

In our own day, the debate over the field’s scientific status has continued through a number of Public Administration Review articles that questioned or embraced a natural science approach to education and research in the 1980s and early 1990s (White & Adams, 1994). Mel Dubnick’s (1999) call for greater conceptual rigor to increase the field’s scientific standing gave the issue enhanced visibility. This call was backed up by Gill and Meier’s (2000) argument that public administration needed to develop its own quantitative, scientific methods.

To these suggestions, proponents of qualitative, interpretative research replied that narrative inquiry or story telling represented an important alternative methodology. Its unique attributes—subjectivity versus objectivity and involvement versus detachment—were advantages in opening new inquiries outside of the small area amenable to positivist methods (e.g., Balfour & Mesaros, 1994; Dodge, Ospina, and Foldy, 2005; Hummel, 2008; Yanow, 2000). Postmodern theorists argued that science was only one among multiple equally relevant discourses on reality (De Zwart, 2002).

Although each side in this debate has its adherents along with its own dissemination networks, the two camps have never enjoyed equal status in the field. People are caught between the practical benefits of getting knowledge from common experience and the desire to seem scientific (Riccucci, 2007). Although it is not unusual for policy oriented writers to denigrate the worth of case study evidence in their articles (e.g., Candreva & Brook, 2008), few if any writers outside of the methodological imbroglios speak ill of science as a way of gaining useful knowledge. The science label has widespread cachet.

Although performance measurement is one of public administration’s hottest topics (e.g., Behn, 1995; Dalehite, 2008), for a long time the subfield seemed isolated from the controversy over method. Performance measurement as an activity was indisputably allied with the idea of public administration as a science and with the notion that quantitative data should take precedence over narratives in policy development. Proponents of measurement saw the activity as an attempt to rationalize government policy and move beyond decision making through political bargaining (Townley, Cooper, & Oakes, 2003). An oft iterated point of performance measurement was that it would “rationalize the budget process, replacing politics with facts and figures” (Ammons, 2008, p. 3). Indeed, the 1993 Government Performance and Results Act, which mandated performance measurement for federal agencies, required that each program’s activity have objective and quantifiable goals (Kravchuk & Schack, 1996).
Only recently have some analysts questioned whether such a rational process does or can exist. Radin (2006), for example, noted that all Congressional committees do not use the same measures to evaluate a given service because committee perspectives vary. Such differences suggest a strong political component to the measurement enterprise. As administration-as-science proponents have traditionally defined science to require objective observation (e.g., Meier, 2005), this declaration thrusts the interpretative viewpoint into the heart of performance measurement territory.

Those who posit performance measurement as a scientific process seem to require objective measures, that is to say measures developed and collected by people who are independent of the matter under observation (Adcroft & Willis, 2008). Indeed, proponents have conceived of performance measurement’s purpose as to “isolate decisions about allocation of resources from political pressures by providing objective and undisputed data” (Halachmi, 2004, p. 334). Most performance measurement specialists have assumed that agency data can meet these criteria if agency objectives are clear (e.g., Gooden & McCreary, 2001, or Nicholson-Crotty, Theobald, & Nicholson-Crotty, 2006). The majority of performance measurement scholars, therefore, have preferred measures generated by administrators or outside experts rather than through politics—however defined.

For new public management (NPM) advocates the problem with politically generated measures is that “politics focuses on perceptions and ideology, not performance” (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). NPM proponents believe that politicians want to use measurement to support their favorite programs and therefore are equally open to objective and subjective criteria. They crave particular results and do not much care about the objectivity of the measures that obtain them (Osborne & Hutchinson, 2004). This worldview accepts a politics–administration dichotomy where political figures have a lack of interest in objectivity whereas effective administrators focus on objective measures (Osborne & Plastrik, 2000). The effective administrative mindset mirrors a similar concentration on objectivity that NPM advocates discern in the private sector. Because NPM focuses on keeping politics out of measurement, Alkadry and Farazmand (2004, p. 297) argue that its proponents want to use performance measurement to minimize political accountability. (This argument does not mean that measurement does in fact limit political accountability but simply that its NPM proponents hoped it might.)

Apolitical measurement theorists assume that professional administrators have special knowledge that allows them to choose neutral measures (e.g., Williams, McShane, & Sechrest, 1994). Some theorists then privilege these measures over citizen evaluations of services that are seen as dependent on
the respondent’s sociodemographic background (e.g., Licari, McLean, & Rice, 2005; Stipak, 1979). The literature in general labels citizen-generated measures as subjective or context dependent.

The objective–subjective dichotomy has significant implications for the debate over whether public sector performance measurement is a science or art. For the endeavor to be a science, someone must be able to identify objective measures—and the expert has been chosen for the task. But as none of the articles contains an operational definition of objectivity, we can ask what are the differences between expert- (i.e., agency) and citizen-generated measures that lands one category—and one category only—in the objective column?

The objective–subjective distinction also has implications for the relative roles of professional administrators and lay citizens in choosing and recording performance measures. On one hand, some organizations such as the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation have funded grants to involve citizens in developing measures. But, as agencies are often free to choose which performance measures they collect, a literature dichotomizing agency- and citizen-generated measures on an objective–subjective dimension may be one reason that many cities survey citizens on performance issues but few localities use these surveys in developing performance measurement systems (Licari et al., 2005; Sanger, 2008).

The following analysis suggests that the differences implicitly posited to construct the objective–subjective dichotomy do not actually exist—or, at least no evidence we have shows they exist. The authors have simply made different assumptions about each data class and these assumptions result in differential classification. Categorization as objective or subjective is socially constructed and can be used to buttress particular theories about the policy development role citizens should play.

The paper consists of three sections. The first two sections identify and analyze the assumptions made to construct separate objective and subjective classes for agency and citizen generated data in the performance measurement literature. A final section then attempts to answer the question why researchers made variant assumptions for agency- and citizen-generated data. The analysis links these assumptions to their policy implications.

Objective and Subjective Measures

The worth of a performance measurement system hinges on the measures its administrators use and whether those measures help officials achieve their purpose(s) in implementing the system in the first place, for example, control or motivation (Behn, 2003). Effective measures are both valid in terms of
relating to the underlying conceptual goal and reliable, that is, internally consistent and stable over time unless change occurs in the underlying reality.

Valid measures of important program outputs and outcomes are a necessary—but not a sufficient—prerequisite to having the system actually spur performance improvement. First the agency has to identify goals for its programs (e.g., educate students or prevent crime). Because people can rarely measure such conceptual objectives directly, the agency must select outputs to measure, that is to say specific measurable results that the organization itself produces in a given time period (e.g., standardized test scores for a school or arrest rates for a police department). Next the agency must select desirable outcomes that it does not directly produce (e.g., crime rate decreases) and monitor relations between output and outcome (Behn, 2001). Fourth, the agency must conceptualize and implement some procedures to reorient outputs if they do not achieve outcome goals.

Most program administrators face a choice of seemingly logical measurement options at the output and outcome levels. Anyone with an interest in the social utility of performance measurement has an interest also in the specific measures chosen as programs may come out well with one set of measures and poorly with another. The particular criteria a given agency uses to measure performance influence its program evaluations and ratings. A training program, for example, might fare well on participant employment after 13 weeks but poorly on participant employment after 26 weeks or 6 months.

In addition, the measurement enterprise has multiple dimensions before and after employees count data points, including formulating the decision criteria that are used to select facts to measure and which will undergird administrator perception and interpretation of counts. These aspects of the selection process inevitably afford ample scope for politics—broadly defined—to enter decision making even if elected officials and citizens play no role in the choice.

Public program measures can come from many sources—governmental, commercial, academic, and civic, including public interest groups and foundations (e.g., Coe & Brunet, 2006). Data from different sources may yield different pictures of an agency’s performance; for example, Kelly’s (2003) multicity police and fire function comparison of agency data and citizen ratings found no relationship between the two measure types.

At least since the late 1970s, a number of public administration scholars have contrasted two methods to obtain performance measures. When measures are obtained from official public records, scholars speak of objective measurement or analyzing “actual service delivery” (Brown & Coulter, 1983, p. 51). When data are obtained from citizen surveys—whether from clients of
a particular program or a sample of area residents—the information is routinely labeled subjective (Park, 1984). A recent commentator labeled it “inevitable” that citizen-driven measures would be less objective and scientific than those created by professional managers (Ho, 2007, p. 117).

Objectivity is a concept based on the assumption that the structure of reality provides a basis for making correct judgments independent of the background characteristics of individual perceivers (Belliotti, 1992). A well-regarded textbook on behavioral research methods has defined objective tests as those “in which anyone following the prescribed rules will assign the same numerals to objects and sets of objects as anyone else” (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 479). All other tests are subjective. This definition focuses test objectivity on score enumeration rather than on deciding whether to give the exam in the first place.

Although the performance literature analyzed here does not explicitly define “objective,” two assumptions, close to the textbook understanding of objective and subjective terminology, have undergirded its labeling process. One that relates to measurement reporting is an implicit assumption that although some transmission errors may occur, most of the material held in public archives is true, that is, that the response time recorded in a police record was the actual response time or that the arresting officer recorded in the archives actually made the relevant arrests.

A second assumption relates to how measures are chosen. Here, the researchers’ assumptions are broader than in the Kerlinger definition. They assume that both the choice of public archive measures and the manner in which administrators collected them are demographically neutral—they do not relate to the personal characteristics of agency executives or workers. The relationship between administrator background and measure selection is not discussed. No mention of administrator demographic characteristics ever appears. The analysis proceeds as if administrators either have no demographic backgrounds or that when people become professional managers their demographic characteristics cease to influence their approach to measurement.

Similar assumptions are not made for citizens. Researchers investigate correlations between citizen characteristics such as age, gender, socioeconomic status and race, and individual service evaluations. A number of studies, for example, show that African American citizens in a given city rated the police lower than White residents (e.g., Fitzgerald & Durant, 1980) although DeHoog, Lowery, and Lyons (1990) found that this relationship did not hold in all localities they studied. From these analyses, researchers conclude that citizens base their evaluations on their own demographic characteristics rather than objective service.
These correlations between citizen evaluations and demographic characteristics have led some writers to question the usefulness citizen-generated information would have for giving an accurate picture of services in a given locale. Brown and Coulter (1983) go so far as to argue that increasing service quality to a given neighborhood would not improve citizen ratings for that function because citizen evaluations do not respond to objective quality indicators. Even Shingler, van Loon, Alter, and Bridger (2008, p. 1110), who favor using citizen surveys to evaluate agency performance say that because of the demography–ratings relationship, evaluators “must keep in mind that citizen perceptions and objective data are two different types of information.”

Researchers could have used the evidence that citizen ratings sometimes correlate with ascriptive characteristics to bolster an alternative conclusion; that is, different demographic groups have objective needs for different services because they have different life experiences. This view uses the correlations between ratings and demographic status as evidence on how the jurisdiction satisfies the objective needs of each group—needs that may differ group by group.

As valid performance measures evaluate services in relation to actual citizen needs, they must reflect gender, age, race, ethnicity, and religion to the extent that such characteristics affect the purposes for and manner in which people use public services. The definition of what comprises quality is not fixed; it varies depending on the needs of different communities. Sometimes measures that agency personnel assume affect quality are actually unimportant in the life experiences of some communities. Agencies, for example, may present data on quick response time to show high quality; some communities will agree that this measure is a suitable component of quality whereas other communities may care more for polite service once respondents arrive. For members of these latter communities, quick response time only means that the demeaning behavior occurs sooner. A full understanding of agency performance may require attention to both time and conduct indicators.

In addition, as the demographic profile of a given community changes, its citizens may want to use services for different purposes—for example, they want to use transit to access different destinations. Routes that meet one group of needs may be insufficient to meet others. Thus, people with one set of demographic characteristics legitimately rate service high whereas those with another set rate it low because they seek different outcomes from the service. The literature, however, does not predicate quality on meeting a community’s needs. It sees demographic–rating correlation as impeding objectivity.

Researchers, in addition, do not extend the same courtesy to citizens as they extend to agencies where they implicitly assume that archived data generally offers factual information. When citizen evaluations do not conform to agency
indicators, authors simply assume that survey ratings are wrong and cannot tell us anything about service provision (e.g., Stipak, 1979, or Brown & Coulter, 1983). In this literature, if citizens rate service quality low when agencies record that they have exceeded their performance targets, researchers view the problem as one of faulty lay perception and announce that government needs to educate the public (Kelly & Swindell, 2002). Citizens are seen as lacking knowledge about services or as confusing service measurement with providing an overall appraisal of local government (Brudney & England, 1982).

On the other hand, when citizen and agency ratings mesh, this concordance confirms that “citizens have some ability to perceive the efforts of service agencies” (Percy, 1986, p. 80). In this view, a concordance with expert ratings is a prerequisite for citizen knowledge to approximate an objective designation. Only to the extent that citizen surveys and expert ratings converge can citizen perceptions serve as a proxy for outcome measurements (Van Ryzin, Immerwahr, & Altman, 2008). As Rosentraub, Harlow, and Thompson (1979) wrote in a communication to Public Administration Review criticizing an early article on this subject (Stipak, 1979), this type of analysis implies that bureaucrats can substitute their sense of service appraisal for that of community members.

Pointing out this discrepancy in the treatment of citizen- and agency-generated measures should not be taken to imply that the former are always valid or that in every case, citizens even have sufficient information to judge agency operations. Sometimes citizens who do not have much contact with a particular service might base their ratings on media stories that have vested interest in boosting the negative and sensational aspects of agency performance. Sometimes citizen ratings may express unwarranted prejudices. Andrews, Boyne, Meier, O’Toole, and Walker (2005) suggest, for example, that racial unease might be one reason that citizens rated some local governments with diverse personnel lower than those with less diversity in a study of English authorities. The point here is not that citizens are always right and well informed but rather that a sweeping and indiscriminate difference in treatment occurs in the literature evaluating the two types of measures. Citizen-generated data are labeled as subjective a priori whereas agency-generated measures never receive this label. Is this differential expectation based on data source justified?

**Analysis**

As mentioned previously, in the performance measurement articles critiqued here, the term *objective* is never defined, but the objective nature of agency data
seems to rest primarily on two assertions: the truth of the reported measure, that is, its correspondence to what actually happened, and the lack of correlation between administrator choice of measures and an administrator’s own demographic characteristics. Each of these assertions is problematic, however, when applied to actual agency measures and the measurement process.

Although the argument here is not that administrators habitually falsify data, analysis of actual records supports the contention that public archives are not inevitably correct. Some discrepancies are simply the product of calculation errors. But mistakes occur not only because of random human weakness but also because of systemic agency prejudice. Every society has its communal or intersubjective agreement on how people should perceive reality and thus behave properly in certain situations (Belliotti, 1992). In any given era, stereotypes that cloud citizen survey data can also influence how agencies record information. Williams and Kellough (2006) give a particularly chilling account of how the Washington, D.C., police department historically falsified records on arresting officers to deny African American police a chance for promotions. The agency substituted the names of White officers for the African American policemen who actually made the arrests and then listed the Black officers as complainants. A look at the department’s log would reflect the prejudices dominating Washington, D.C., in the era—not objective reality.

Agency records are built and maintained by people who share the prejudices of their time. In addition, agency administrators have their own unique stance on measurement because they bear the brunt of legislative/citizen displeasure for low performance and may see budgetary increases and other benefits if indicators are high. This set of incentives gives agency employees a reason to manipulate performance data. As Downs (1967) has noted, administrators—like all people—tend to be utility maximizers. They favor actions that advance their own interests and try to minimize those that will reveal their own shortcoming. Some of them may, therefore, take action to record figures that make their performance better than facts would indicate. Bohte and Meier’s (2000) analysis of organizational cheating includes the example of the Austin Independent School District, which was caught manipulating test scores by eliminating grades from low-performing students. Hood (2006, p. 517) reports similar “creative compliance” in English agency data on hospital waiting times and ambulance response statistics.

Outright fraud is not the only relevant outcome of utility maximization. Once an agency selects a particular measure for its performance reports, administrators have a vested interest in getting good scores on this indicator. To this end, they will devote scarce unit resources to improve their tallies.
Such use of resources is only warranted, to the extent that the measure is actually a good way of learning whether a unit is meeting the agency’s underlying goal. If, however, the measure is a poor indicator for the underlying goal, the transfer of resources is not warranted. Standardized test scores, for example, are the dominant measure of output in the educational production literature (Smith, 2003). Yet such scores have only a modest relationship with individual or aggregate economic success. To the extent that administrators use these measures to identify their ability to transfer economically useful knowledge and skills, they exemplify Blau and Meyer’s (1971, p. 50) argument that there is a “tendency in large bureaucracies, for organizational ideologies to develop that take precedence over original goals.” Scarce resources are spent administering tests that do not relate well to the underlying goal while the agency could have spent those resources instead on improving indices that research shows do relate to economic return on schooling, for example, pupil–teacher ratio or term length (Card & Krueger, 1992).

Administrators at various levels of the hierarchy or with different functional responsibilities have different perceptions about what is key to agency success as well as how well the organization currently works to attain its goals. Brewer (2006) found, for example, that federal agency supervisors were more optimistic about performance in their organizations than entry-level workers. Such variations in outlook imply an internal politics of conflict among administrators over which measures to use and how to interpret them. Different actors are likely to back those measures that support their own sometimes conflicting management agendas or factions in policy disputes. Through interviews, Moynihan (2008) found that many state legislators were skeptical of agency-generated performance data because they saw it as reflecting the interests of the executive branch; federal legislators had similar reservations about the use of the Bush administration’s Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART).

Moynihan’s research as well as both the Williams and Kellough (2006) and Bohte and Meier (2000) articles underscore the subjective nature of agency data collection. In particular, these accounts underscore how ascriptive characteristics—race, place in the hierarchy, etc.—and organizational context influence administrative information collection choices and the trust various actors accord these choices. The relevance of administrator characteristics meshes with a basic premise of the representative bureaucracy literature: passive representation of groups (e.g., by race or gender) can influence active representation of group interests in some instances. Thus, Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) found that local police departments with a greater presence of women police officers showed greater responsiveness to crimes
against women. Another study found that an increase of female math teachers correlated with educational benefits for girls (Keiser, Wilkins, Meier, & Holland, 2002).

This evidence also fits with those interpretative theories that emphasize that all people are “caught in a web of social, personal, and familial relations, as well as embedded in particular historical contexts” (Burnier, 2003, p. 533). As Lindblom (1990) notes, every background socializes people to look at life and its discontents from one perspective rather than another. Each person rates services as a full human persona—that means a person with specific racial, gender, and time-dependent cultural attachments. As no ground for administrative choice exists where these attachments are absent, so no measure can be pristinely objective. Each is chosen because it has subjective importance to some arbiter owing to that person’s own needs and understanding. This relationship holds whether the person is a community member or an agency expert. In both cases, “no escape from feeling can be found” (Lindblom, 1990, p. 217).

Conclusions

Much of the most recent literature on objective and subjective measures centers on the appropriate role that citizen surveys should play in ascertaining agency performance. The conclusions often soften earlier analyses of the 1980s that wanted to exclude such evidence. Current authors are more likely to either find similarities between expert and citizen data that they say can validate the citizen material or they argue that the subjective surveys yield additional evidence that is important for understanding agency effectiveness. None of the analyses, however, asks the fundamental question whether the objective–subjective dichotomy itself should be retained or question why scholars created it in the first place.

A point of entry to answering such queries is trying to understand why much of the research community dichotomized agency and citizen responses on an objective–subjective frame. Why the use of these particular terms? Why the privileging of professional knowledge and minimizing of the problems associated with agency-generated data? Words matter. As vocabulary choices nudge policy in one or another direction, scholars need to study the practical consequences of research heuristics.

One answer to explain the dichotomy’s creation and persistence may lie in the need to affirm performance measurement’s scientific nature. Researchers believed that presentation of performance measurement as a scientific enterprise required objective data. Highlighting the subjective aspects of agency
information would not reinforce the politics–administration split with politics a subjective exercise and administration an objective enterprise above the fray of bargaining. If managerial—rather than political—entrepreneurship is the desired outcome, the agency’s own data needed to sport the coveted objective brand.

The objective and subjective literature that presents itself as immersed in methodology may actually be seen then as part of an attempt to map the respective roles of researchers, practitioners, and citizens in performance definition. As yet, no consensus exists in practice as to what role each of these groups should take (e.g., Coplin, Merget, & Bourdeaux, 2002; Heikkila & Isset, 2007). In fact, no consensus exists on what roles different practitioner levels should take, that is, whether measure development should be a top–down exercise or involve line workers at lower levels (Kamensky, 2009). But overreaching by professionals to differentiate their inquiry products from ordinary knowledge is not a new phenomenon for gaining professional prestige. Lindblom and Cohen (1979) already argued that researchers tended to distinguish too sharply between professional social inquiry and ordinary modes of knowledge—a tendency nursed at least partly by contempt for politics.

By proposing an objective–subjective dichotomy, the performance measurement literature elevates the role of researchers and administrators and diminishes the importance of involving citizens or even getting information from them. To a certain extent, this objective and subjective measures literature can be viewed as a counterweight to the citizen-generated performance measurement projects funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation or the National Center for Civic Innovation. If allowed to go unchallenged, its central dichotomized contrast of citizen and expert ratings could prove problematic to efforts to construct and institutionalize forums where citizens participate in developing public policies (e.g., Leib, 2004).

Tension between citizen and professional input is endemic in many areas of modern public administration. A set of comparative case studies on citizen coproduction found that administrator experts often feared citizen involvement and wanted to denigrate its importance (Bovaird, 2007). One way to limit citizen influence in identifying performance measures is to label such efforts as subjective because as Andrews, Boyne, and Walker (2006, p. 16) note, “Objective measures have been viewed as the gold standard in public management research.” Despite the importance of interpretive studies to public administration, many researchers and administrators will still view citizen ratings as a substandard, second-order category if they bear the subjective label.
Once classifications enter a field’s vocabulary, it is often difficult to extricate them even if subsequent analysis finds them wanting. Explicit calls to reformulate the objective–subjective dichotomy should, however, be part of the ongoing agenda for people who favor increased citizen involvement in performance measurement. Researchers should not use objective and subjective labels to dichotomize agency and citizen formulations. Because the primary criterion leading to subjective characterization—context specificity—is equally applicable to both types of data, this analysis urges eliminating the objective–subjective dichotomy that can separate the worth accorded citizen and administrator involvement in measuring public service quality. The distinction is not between objective and subjective measures but rather between measures developed by a relatively small group of experts and those produced by the individual judgments of large numbers of citizens. (See Weale, 2009, for the use of this distinction in a very different context.) For both types of measures, the creator’s ascriptive characteristics matter. For both types of measures, the key question is the same. How well does the indicator help the agency move toward attaining the underlying conceptual goal?
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