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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to discuss the ideal of public service, what it is and what it should be and how it has evolved in American history. I am concerned that the ideal of public service, a guiding principle for public administrators and government, has been diminished by the emphasis in American public administration on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. If public sector leaders, such as presidents, over time have changed their focus from discussions of the Constitution or republican principles to other ideas such as taxes and specific government programs, then has the ideal or vision of public service changed? The topic of service, aligned with duty and the responsibility of the citizen, while prevalent in the political theory literature, has been pushed to the back of the public administration literature shelves. Without the ideal of service as a vibrant element of the public administration discourse, the public administration community will have given way to those who see public administration as merely a modified business model.

The primary research question posed in this study was: Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service? The texts of presidential inaugural addresses were analyzed and reviewed for insights into the ideal of public service by the use of content analysis, using nine criteria that exemplify the ideals of public service. One of the secondary questions posed here was: Has the ideal or vision of public service changed? Discussion of the different criteria illustrated that there has been a change resulting in a different concept of the ideal of public service today. The final question of how and when the ideal of public service changed is answered in the dissertation also, as the results, criterion by criterion, are explained. This study shows that the inaugural addresses captured the ideal of public service dynamically and often eloquently over the course of American history. The changing nature of the role of government, issues of importance to government, and nature of the ideal of public service are on the historical record as set forth in these inaugural addresses.
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INTRODUCTION

In April 1995, I was on a business trip to one of my agency's field locations. While meeting with colleagues from several offices, we were interrupted with the news of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. Along with the rest of the country, my co-workers and I listened to the news and tried to find out details of what had happened, who was responsible, and how such a tragedy could have happened. The government facility where we were meeting was "made secure" as we waited for more news of this event, hoping that it was not one of several planned attacks. Initially, we speculated that foreign terrorists had done this. When we heard later that fellow citizens had attacked this building, the news reached to the core of my identity as a public servant. How could fellow citizens hate the government so much and hate those citizens who worked on their behalf? Had our nation lost its sense of the community that created our government in the first place? Had public servants become so anonymous and distant from others that we represented only the perceived evils of government and not fellow citizens serving the community?

Upon returning to school in 1996, I was surprised by the low opinion held of public service and public servants by several of my fellow students. I had come to expect these attitudes, and in some cases, hostility, from people outside the public service arena but I was puzzled to find these same attitudes and perceptions articulated by people studying public administration and public policy. Not only did these students react negatively to public service but also there was a strong sense of us (the private citizens) versus them (the bureaucrats or government workers). What had happened to the honor and ideal that I associated with being a public servant?

I became a passionate defender of the public service and its ideals that I had earlier learned about in school and experienced in the workplace. When others talked about the bureaucracy as some evil institution, I reminded them that we were all part of that “evil institution.” We were supporting these public institutions and ultimately, any of us could change things if we wanted to take action to do so. What had happened to discourse about what public
service was supposed to be? What had happened to the discussion of what public service could be? If such discussions were not taking place in a school of public administration and policy, were they occurring at all? Were we paying too much attention to the politics of the budgetary process and not enough to the questions of what a government should do? Had our preoccupation with process and procedure drowned the spirit and ideal of public service?

My passion for public service has always come from the sense that I contribute to American society through participating in it. I believe that some people have a calling to serve and have a calling to serve in particular societal roles. After many years of working for the Federal government and other experiences in local and state government, I believe that I am doing something useful for the community, as other professionals such as doctors, lawyers, and ministers contribute to their communities with their professional skills.

On the other hand, I know that many of my fellow citizens do not value what public servants do. Many seem to think that the government has become the employer of last resort. It does not take much effort to find politicians focusing on “red tape,” antiquated processes and equipment, or bad management in government institutions. Public servants perceive poor communication within their agencies, the lack of proper tools with which to do their jobs, and systemic lack of recognition for those who do their jobs well.

While researching a possible paper topic for an Ethics class, I came across a book by Robert Coles entitled *The Call of Service*¹ which reminded me once again of why I had chosen a career in public service. It was then that I became intrigued about what the ideal of public service is and why I thought it had deteriorated during my career. Coles, a child psychologist who has written extensively on the problems of disadvantaged children, discussed the concept of service in this book. He interviewed several people, “volunteers,” in the course of writing the book and drew upon interviews from previous research he had done over his extensive career. He discusses the idea that, in many cases he studied, the “volunteers” found themselves in circumstances they had not planned or prepared for, nor necessarily sought. As they

---

participated, these volunteers came to realize that their actions were significant at that time and
place in history, and, according to Coles, they were “called” to serve their community.

After reading Coles and reaffirming my passion for public service, I was moved to write
on the topic of public service. In an attempt to narrow the topic, I discussed my ideas with my
professional and academic colleagues, and frequently had to explain what I meant by the term
"public service". Most colleagues automatically assumed I was speaking of the term in the
context of customer service that had been popularized in the Osborne and Gaebler book,
*Reinventing Government*\(^2\) or the National Performance Review (NPR)\(^3\) initiatives of the Clinton
Administration. However, I was referring to public service as exemplified in John Kennedy’s
famous inaugural address quote: “Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can
do for your country.”\(^4\)

When I put public service in the context of the Kennedy quote, the discussion with my
professional colleagues shifted to why they had joined the public service and to some of their
experiences in public service. One colleague told me about how she had started her career in the
Food and Nutrition Service as it was developing the Food Stamp Program in the 1960s. She
reminisced about the strong sense of purpose and commitment shared among her colleagues as
they designed and implemented the program. Others spoke using similar terms, about earlier
times in the Peace Corps, and during other national crises such as the Vietnam War, Watergate,
or more particular crises such as the savings and loan crisis of the late 1980s, or the
Cuban/Haitian boat crises of the early 1980s and 1990s.

It is my contention that there is an ideal of public service just as there is a romantic
notion of being in love. While we all know that “being in love” is not always the same as the
storybook version of being in love, an ideal of what it is exists. There are other words such as
peace and freedom that signify a sense of something that is known and inexplicable at the same
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time. For example, freedom is a word that connotes value, one that has meaning in a personal sense to people. It is a word that is imbued with experience of the person defining and using it. Everyone has a concept of freedom but different people have different ideas and experiences that they associate with it. Also, the term may mean something different to people at different times of their lives. While freedom has different personal meanings, it is, at the same time, a term that all are familiar with and it is frequently used to describe an experience that all of us understand at some level.

The same could be said for a romantic or idealistic notion of public service. Though political scientists, historians, philosophers, politicians, bureaucrats, and students of government have tried to pin down the “ideal of public service,” everyone seems to have a different notional understanding of the phrase. However, I think we would all say we know it when we see it.

In this dissertation, I discuss this ideal of public service and show that it has been a viable and valuable part of the American government and culture. I think that the concept has changed over time, perhaps to the detriment of public service today. Regardless, public service should be a major topic of interest to the field of public administration as well as the spiritual, personal, and educational reasons people participate and contribute time, skills, and assistance to others in the community. Today’s emphasis, in the field of public administration, on discussing public service in terms of recruitment goals, pay disparity, and FTEs (full-time equivalent employees), detracts from the very goals these concrete actions are set up to accomplish: retention, recruitment, and sustainment of a committed, competent public service. Those who focus the discussion of public service in these terms fail to mention that without a committed and competent public service, this government cannot function.

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks public servants were praised and recognized for their outstanding efforts. Many of these public servants claimed that it was all in a day’s work. The news media and government leaders highlighted the actions and sacrifices of the fire, police, and rescue personnel as well as the armed forces and other citizens who volunteered time and expertise to the rescue and recovery effort. The military pilots in the sky, fire and police professionals performing their duties in the rescue operations, and public
servants planning and implementing emergency operations to make our skies, borders, and lives safe and secure again epitomized the sense of duty and purpose that I always associated with the ideal of public service. This is the ideal of service that seems to have been so elusive in recent years.

Now that the horror of the September 11 terrorist attacks has subsided and the glow of feelings about the public service has dimmed, surveys are showing once again that there is a declining trend in Americans’ trust of their government. Along with the trend in the trust of government, the thoughts people had of becoming public servants have also dropped back to pre-September 11 levels. Additionally, public servants have suffered a decline in morale since September 11 – with some feeling more despair about the ability to get the job done than before – due to insufficient resources or inadequate management.

I think a critical question for American governance is how to sustain this ideal of public service. If it has diminished, how can it be revitalized? Most importantly, how can we remind our fellow citizens of its usefulness to our society and institutions?

Some may say that the public servants are always there when we need them. After September 11, the public servants modestly deflected acclaims of heroism and continued to do their jobs. If there were people who were there for the September 11 crisis, surely they will be there the next time we need them. However, will they still be there? How can we be sure that the spirit and ideals that these public servants personified in 2001 will still be vibrant if the public service continues to be diminished by legislative actions and public opinion polls showing lukewarm or no support of the public service? How can we be sure that these public servants will be there in the future when public perceptions showing minimal respect and trust in the institutions that serve the public prevail? How can we be sure that the people we have attracted to public service will continue to serve and more will be recruited?

---

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to discuss the ideal of public service, what it is and what it should be. I discuss the ideal of public service and how it has evolved in American history. I am concerned that the ideal of public service, a guiding principle for public administrators and government, has been diminished by the emphasis in American public administration on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. When the ideal of public service has been discussed, it has moved people to pay taxes, fight wars, and fly to the moon. The topic of service, aligned with duty and the responsibility of the citizen, while prevalent in the political theory literature, has been pushed to the back of the public administration literature shelves. Without the ideal of service and in particular public service as a vibrant part of the public administration discourse, the public administration community will have given way to those who see public administration as merely a modified business model.

My primary research question is: Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service? If presidents over time have changed their focus from discussions of the Constitution or republican principles to other ideas such as taxes and specific government programs, then has the ideal or vision of public service changed? If this ideal of public service has changed and the rhetoric has emphasized different elements, is it possible to see how it changed and when it changed?

I considered many options to determine if there has been a change in the ideal of public service, if it has diminished over time, and how it might have changed over time. I considered who talks about public service in the ideal. Many people do talk about public service in idealistic terms – politicians, elected officials, public administrators, political scientists, historians, journalists, and citizens – and their opinions are valuable and necessary components of the discussion.
I decided to study the texts of presidential inaugural addresses for insights into the ideal of public service. The data used to illustrate this change are the Inaugural Addresses from George Washington to George W. Bush. The Inaugural Addresses are opportunities for presidents to elucidate their visions for the future of the country and the government that they will lead. The President, as the leader of the Executive branch and one of the most visible political actors, has a role that George Washington established during his first Administration. Washington realized he was setting an example for others to follow. He considered what image the President should project and what the role of the Presidency should be in the leadership of the executive branch.

Washington’s Inaugural Address, as with many other precedents he set as the first president, established the standard for future Inaugural Addresses. Originally, he prepared a set of recommendations to Congress as is set forth in the Constitution under Article II, Section 3. However, he decided instead to talk about the need for men of character and virtue in public life and the need for those in public life to be guided by the Constitution and “that Almighty Being who rules over the universe.” According to Tulis, “Washington did not regard the speech a success…Washington worried that its emphasis on virtue and, more particularly, the pomp attendant to the ceremony might too easily and wrongly be imitated by future presidents aspiring to monarchy.” History and succeeding presidents have decided that this occasion should be a forum to discuss lofty ideas and ideals and to celebrate their inaugural ceremonies as public occasions.

In this dissertation I shall examine the ideal of public service as defined and discussed by political theorists who have influenced American government. Additionally, I shall review public administration literature that focuses on public service from different perspectives including: (1) the commitment and motivation of public sector employees versus that of private sector employees; (2) advocacy of privatization and making government run more like a

---

7 This section of the U.S. Constitution concerns the duties and responsibilities of the President in relation to the legislative branch, including information on the State of the Union.
business; and (3) the differences between the public and private sectors. The criteria to be used for analysis of the Inaugural Addresses come from the political theory and public administration literature. Six of the criteria are readily found in the political theory literature and three of the criteria are no less readily found throughout public administration literature. Analysis of the Inaugural Addresses provides a window on the evolution of public service as advocated by presidents since the beginning of our constitutional Republic.

**Significance of the Study**

In 1989, the National Commission on the Public Service, more commonly known as the Volcker Commission, published a report entitled *Leadership for America: Rebuilding the Public Service*.10 The study was formed in response to a symposium in 198711 that concluded that there was a “quiet crisis”12 in government. This quiet crisis was that many senior executives were ready to leave government and not enough talented young people wanted to join the government.

Today, there are articles in the popular press and the public administration literature and hearings on Capitol Hill about the changing public service and the degradation of the quality of the public service. Many of these articles quote experts who echo the concerns and issues that the 1989 Volcker Commission highlighted. Within the next five years, 34 percent of the federal government workforce will be eligible to retire, and an additional 20 percent will be eligible for early retirement.13 Congress spent a considerable amount of time in the 2002 session on whether civilian employees should receive the same percentage raise as military personnel. Others participating in the public conversation said that public sector workers continue to be underpaid and that a 4.1 percent pay raise will not begin to close a large pay gap between the private and

12 The term “quiet crisis” was coined at the 1987 American Enterprise Institute- Brookings Symposium.
public sectors. Health care benefits changes, telecommuting options, executive exchange programs, special pay rates for information technology workers, and tuition and student loan repayment options have all been under consideration for legislative and regulatory actions designed to attract and retain a capable federal government workforce. At the same time, the Bush Administration has asked agencies for workforce analyses and planning models for the future. Bush Administration officials have testified that there is bloating in middle management ranks. They have claimed the workforce is not adequately sized and distributed for maximum service to the customer and have warned that they will take actions that will result in downsizing to resize the workforce for service and save money for taxpayers. Finally, the current Administration is advocating that outsourcing, contracting out of functions, or competing for jobs currently performed by public servants will make the government more efficient and effective and will save money.

Today's challenges have been a part of an ongoing tension in American government between the need for a competent and highly qualified public service and the skepticism of the citizenry to fund and support a permanent, well-paid civil service. Since the Roosevelt Administration in the mid-twentieth century, there have been efforts to contract out some functions of the government either due to staffing shortages or, in some cases, ideological preferences. Perhaps more pertinent is the similarity of the statements and ideas of today with the statements of the Civil Service Commission, as discussed by Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings, in 1964:

Agreement on the nature and urgency of the problem is fairly general, despite a scarcity of concrete information concerning the types, amounts, and locations of federal personnel shortages.…That the situation is comparable for the government’s management needs is indicated by…the Civil Service Commission: For all agencies, an average of 38 percent of top career executives will be eligible to retire in five years, and 66½ percent in ten years. This does not count the normal losses from death, disability, and resignation. In the face of the urgency of public issues before our administrative agencies, the Civil Service Commission is alarmed and needs help

in getting fuller recognition of the threat to effective government that the situation presents…if the federal government does no more than retain its present size…more than 300,000 people must be recruited to the federal public service every year. Progress, and perhaps even survival, demand that there be included…a proper share of the best in human resources that our society has to offer. Yet…the reputation of the public service…is not high enough so that it serves as a positive attraction to people. Any picture of civil service examining procedures as a means of choosing a few of the best from clamoring hordes of office-seekers is as old fashioned as the rolltop desk and the frock-coated dispenser of patronage. Our…employment system must compete in attractiveness with those of private employers.17

Another Volcker Commission18 was established in 2002 to revisit the state of the public service today. At a series of hearings in Washington, DC in July 2002, speaker after speaker picked apart some narrow aspect of the pay or benefits system. The Chief Justice of the United States and other judges within the federal judiciary appeared at the hearings to advocate a revised judicial pay system. While the Chief Justice, other justices and judges, and officials from the Executive and Legislative Branches, discussed other aspects of the public service and provided persuasive arguments and interesting data to support their positions, it was discouraging to see that these hearings were dominated by the minutiae of reforming pay and benefits systems rather than what was happening to the virtues and ideals of public service. However, Judge Deanna Tacha, Chief Judge Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, in her testimony about the inadequacy of the judicial pay levels, did speak eloquently about the nexus between the judicial pay problems and the public service when she said:

We know we cannot keep up with the private sector. We do not expect to do so. We came in because we believe in public service, we believe in giving our lives to public service. We know we make a sacrifice for that….We love our work. It is a wonderful job. We have great colleagues. The cases are interesting. We are constantly challenged. We would almost all stay and there would be far, far more who are interested in judicial office if it were not for the attendant financial sacrifice that goes with it and is becoming more and more pronounced.19

17 Ibid., 5-6.
18 This Commission is formally named the National Commission on the Public Service and is chaired by Paul A. Volcker. It was established by The Brookings Institution on February 13, 2002 to "restore and renew the public service."
Judge Tacha’s statement in the midst of her argument for a revised pay system may be illustrative of a basic struggle of the public service. While there is an understanding that those who serve will most likely sacrifice pay and material benefits, the question then becomes: how much of a sacrifice is too much and when does the amount of the sacrifice start diminishing the quality of the public service? More importantly, if those who join the public service are expected to make these sacrifices, what is it they expect in return or what is that “intangible something” in the public sector that they do not find or expect to find in the private sector?

It is not difficult to trace this public conversation in the current popular press and the academic literature back to the origins of our administrative state. Washington was concerned, even in 1789, with the quality of the public service and “…believed that the fate of the federal experiment hinged in part on the quality of the new federal service.” He wanted people to serve that were of “the first characters of the Union.” Leonard White, in *The Federalists* quotes Congressman Fisher Ames who stated:

> In other countries, where their Governments had been of long standing, persons were trained up with a view to public employments; but in this country this had not been the case, and therefore, the President found the circle from which to select proper characters for office was very confined.

The challenge then, as it appears to be now, was to convince people to leave their private lives and careers to join the public service.

Perhaps the reason the situation has never been resolved is that solutions are focused on the wrong problems. This may be a classic example of the “garbage can” theory espoused by Cohen, March, and Olsen. On every occasion where the public service or the effectiveness of government operations is discussed, certain solutions seem to bubble up to the surface. While the data to support the pay rates argument, or other problems mentioned are readily available, the data for the counter-argument that there are offsetting benefits of working in the public sector,

---

20 Kilpatrick, Cummings, Jennings, ibid., 28.
21 Ibid., 28.
such as generous benefits packages, and protection from the whims of the market are equally accessible.

There is little disagreement that many aspects of the recruitment, pay, and performance appraisal systems should be reviewed and revised because those systems have become dysfunctional and need to be fixed. There is little disagreement that reviewing government operations and how they function should be an ongoing process. Contracting out, privatization, or reorganization of certain functions are viable alternatives in some situations. However, at what cost are these ideas being embraced? If one of the costs is to throw the public service out with the “old” system, then something may be lost unintentionally. Further, there seems to be a sense that if one or more of these systems are fixed, or a better organization is designed or created, then public servants and prospective public servants will rush to join. However, none of these solutions come close to discussing or reaching to the core of why there should be a public service or why people should become public servants.

Perhaps if there is a crisis in public service, it is because of the uncertainty of the ideal of public service and the future public service as a place to pursue this ideal. Paul Light found that young people do want to serve and “…be somewhere where I can make a difference.” 24 If data25 compiled from surveys of public policy graduates and students from the past few years are accurate and these students do not see the government as a place to pursue the ideals of public policy and public service, then isn't there another problem? Shouldn’t the focus turn to what these potential employees see of public service through their idealistic lens when they begin their careers as public administration and public policy experts? Shouldn’t the emphasis shift to why public servants or prospective public servants feel as though they no longer make a difference when serving within the public sector? Shouldn’t the emphasis be on making the public service a place where “people can make a difference” and make a “contribution” to society?

I believe this is the time to shift the discourse from the technicalities and quick fixes for the public service and public servants to the reasons why public service needs to be part of our

25 Ibid., 95-97.
government. I think discussing the ideal of public service and bringing this discussion to the light of day once again is a direction that public administration should pursue. The discussion and review of the literature highlighted in the next chapter combined with the analysis of the inaugural addresses in Chapter 4 is a small step in this direction.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I discuss the literature reviewed for information on the public service. Included in this review are works by political philosophers who influenced the Founding Fathers and whose ideas influenced many of the principles of American government as it has evolved in the past two hundred years. Also discussed are different streams of literature from the field of public administration that have contributed to the discussion on public service. These include: (1) organizational commitment, professionalism, and motivation of public sector employees, and in some cases, as compared to private sector employees; (2) those who advocate privatization and making government run more like a business; and (3) the differences between the public and private sectors. Additionally, this chapter reviews some of the current discussion on the role of public service today.

Introduction

There is no shortage of data surrounding the public service. There have been commissions on the public service, and a multitude of studies on various aspects of public service, including differences between the public sector and the private sector, the image of the public service, public service motivation, public service ethics, and so on. Public servants have been surveyed on their attitudes, motivations, and racial, educational, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. There are statistics on how many people work in the public sector and where they work whether it is on the local, state, or federal level or in what city and state. Data have been compiled on pay gaps between public and private sector workers, and value components of public and private workers such as job security, pay, or tenure. The American people have been surveyed on their faith and trust in government and in their governmental leaders, both elected and career. Also, the people have been surveyed on their impressions on customer service and responsiveness of the government at a programmatic level.
Many of these studies reviewed leave the reader with the impression that the public service has changed and is in rapid decline. However, few studies have defined the ideal of public service and quantifying and qualifying this has not been done. The public administration community has avoided direct discussion of this ideal of public service and emphasized the measurable and factual aspects rather than the theoretical and the philosophical facets of public service. My research question: “Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service?” comes from the uncertainty about whether or not the public service is in decline and the certainty that public administration scholars are often concerned with what is, what has been, and what may be rather than what could and should be, namely the ideal of public service.

Green, Keller and Wamsley assert that public administration is a normative profession, that “the profession’s political foundations consist of normative and constitutive dimensions that help define distinctive roles, competencies, and structures.”¹ When public administration scholars ask the questions of what the role of government is, who should govern, and how shall we govern, then the core questions of the profession are exposed. Too often in contemporary public administration these normative questions are blanketed by process and procedural issues such as reforming the budgetary process or the strengths and weaknesses of contracting out or competitive sourcing. If budgetary process discussions were focused on how resource decisions should be made in the community, and who should be involved in those discussions, instead of whether the federal government should transition to a two-year budget cycle, then it would be fair to say that the normative aspects of the field were not being buried under process questions. Too often the normative issues are not even part of the discussion. Normative discussions are often relegated to Ethics classes or for doctoral seminars so that the practitioners of the field can focus on the “how to” information. Gawthrop reinforces this idea when he commented that much of the scholarship and teaching of the twentieth century of public administration scholars and practitioners has focused on the management aspects of the field rather than the ethical-

moral value aspects.² He asks: “Why are individuals being prepared to enter the public service without adequate training in ethical decision making?”³

Another exception to the shift away from normative thought in the field was the Blacksburg Manifesto published in the late 1980s. The Blacksburg Manifesto advocated an agential perspective to be based on a “concern for the public interest”⁴ and an acknowledgement of the value of “The Public Administration”⁵ defined as “an institution of government rather than of bureaucracy as an organizational form.”⁶ This work encompassed the assertion that:

The distinctive nature of public administration lies in the fact that it is part of the process of governance, that administration is accomplished in a political context, and that it is defined in large part as competence directed toward the public interest. This sets it apart from business management, and it provides the basis for a truly distinctive claim to status too long ignored.⁷

In this context of what “the public administration” is, it is “…based upon a solemn agreement between the public administrator and the citizens he or she serves.”⁸ Therefore, the public administrator is expected to fulfill a more substantial role than technical or administrative expert. In the reframing of “the public administration” in the context of governance rather than management, the perspective of how one views public administration shifts as well. Wamsley, et.al, point out that instead of debating “whether public administration,” the focus of the debate turns to “…the place of public administration and the public administrator in the governance of the republic.”⁹

Other writers in contemporary public administration have written on spirituality and the “soul” of public administration. These authors also take a normative approach and described their ideas from their spiritual perspective. They find the origins of public administration not in
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the realm of political theory and governance but reach back to religious and spiritual institutions and values to find the roots of the “spiritual public administration.” Of course, many of the great political and religious philosophers have also crossed paths. Much of St. Thomas Aquinas’ work is rooted in Aristotelian philosophy. Students of Aristotelian philosophy who ignore Aquinas miss one of the key interpreters of his thought and one of the key reasons Aristotle remains an influence on Western civilization today. According to Ernest L. Fortin, “Aquinas did more than anyone else to establish Aristotle as the leading philosophical authority in the Christian West.”

As Western politics has its roots in Judeo-Christian thought, it should not be surprising that much of the normative theory about the roots and origins of American public service stem from the same source.

Political theory provides much of the framework for understanding and describing the ideal of public service and the ingredients of this ideal. Some of the classical political philosophers, such as Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero discussed some of the fundamentals of the nature of man and the goodness or evil of man in their writings. From this grounding of political thought comes the ideal of public service that has predominated in American political thought.

Crucial to the understanding of political philosophy is the concept that these philosophers had of the nature of man. Is man good or evil? Is man to live together with others or apart? Is living with others to be a cooperative or competitive endeavor? Answers to these questions shaped the political philosophies of these writers. Whether man was innately good or evil, and how man was to live with others contributed to their ideas on the purpose of government and society and whether governments were set up to assist and serve, or control and restrict, men within society.

Once there is an understanding of how these philosophers thought of man, their descriptions of the political systems and their commentaries of what components a political system must have make more sense. These philosophic writings are a combination of what they experienced, as part of their governments or in living with fellow man, and how they think the

---


11 Man is used in the generic sense for men, women and mankind.
ideal society should be designed. As Carnes Lord states in his introduction to Aristotle’s *Politics*:

…the scope and range of the *Politics* represents more than a passive reflection of its historical moment. By exhibiting the complex unity of the elements of human life and the manner of their fulfillment in the polis and the way of life it makes possible, Aristotle provides at once an articulation of the phenomenon of politics in the fullness of its potential and a powerful defense of the dignity of politics and the political life.\(^{12}\)

In speaking of the ideal of a political society and one that must accommodate their view of man, elements of what is necessary to have an effective political system emerged from these philosophers’ writings. One of the necessary elements of the political system is the discussion of those who will participate in it. In the discussions in their works of who should govern that the details of the ideal of public service are found.

This chapter includes other supporting documentation of public administration literature focusing on public service from different perspectives. Included here are summaries of literature concerning (1) organizational commitment, professionalism, and motivation of public sector employees and, in some cases, as compared to private sector employees; (2) those who advocate privatization and making government run more like a business; and (3) the differences between the public and private sectors. In this discussion of these various groups of literature, the tension and balance between economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and the other ideals of public service become apparent.

The components of the ideal of public service are culled from review of political philosophy literature and public administration literature. Six of the nine criteria that are used for analysis of the inaugural addresses were so named and determined in the work of James Perry.\(^{13}\) After completing research on what public service should be, Perry’s naming and definitions seemed to encompass the criteria I thought were most descriptive of the ideal of public service. His criteria include self-sacrifice; civic duty; commitment to the public interest; compassion; social justice; and attraction to public policy-making. Perry’s criteria are modified


for this study by adding economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. These criteria are of equal importance to American public administration.

**Early Political Thought**

The ideal of public service, as an underpinning to modern American public administration, originates in the political philosophy that underlies Western civilization and subsequently, the American political system. This political theory, developed in Greek and Roman times, has been one of the anchors of Western civilization ever since.

In addition to the works of Plato and Aristotle are other writings of Cicero, Locke, Hobbes, and Montesquieu that heavily influenced the Founding Fathers. Many of the Founding Fathers counted themselves among the educated elite and studying Greek and Roman philosophy would have been part of their education. Various references to these classical philosophers are found in the writings of the Founders and in addition to their religious education, the philosophical works that they were exposed to emphasized duty, sacrifice and obligation as components for good men to serve the community. McCullough says of John Adams, “He read Cicero, Tacitus, and others of his Roman heroes in Latin, and Plato and Thucydides in the original Greek, which he considered the supreme language.”

Washington remarked in his Farewell Address that “…your suffrages have called me twice to the opinion of duty…” He saw the call to serve and the desire to retire back to his estate in keeping with the Greco-Roman ideal of the citizen-soldier and statesman serving the country when called and then returning to his life as a farmer when his service was complete. Contemporary political writers continue to influence American political thought and government and American public administration. Some of the contemporary political writers to be reviewed here include Bellah, Frederickson, Gawthrop, and Sandel.
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Among the authors of classical antiquity, Cicero enjoyed a privileged position.

According to Ebenstein:

Cicero’s influence has been particularly strong in the United States, above all at the time of the framing of the Constitution. Not only his concept of the mixed constitution appealed to the framers. More fundamentally, his view of the state as a “community of law” seemed to provide the answer for the dilemma the framers had to face: to create one nation out of people who had come to the New World from all parts of the old world…

He saw a need for philosophers to be concerned with the state and the political order. His works emphasized duty and the obligation to serve as a crucial element of the state or commonwealth. He states: “For in truth, our country has not given us birth and education without expecting to receive some sustenance, as it were, from us in return;…” Cicero claimed that the “…existence of virtue depends entirely upon its use; and its noblest use is the government of the state…”

Cicero’s definition of commonwealth as “property of the people” is another enduring feature of his philosophy. If the commonwealth was the property of the people then it must be nurtured and cared for by the people. Cicero’s argument that the rule of law was a necessary component of the nurturing of the state or commonwealth, along with the inherent obligation of individuals to participate in the governance of the state, influenced later political thinkers, including the Founding Fathers.

In addition to the authors of classical antiquities, the Founding Fathers were also influenced by authors closer to their own time – notably Hobbes, Locke, and Montesquieu. The Declaration of Independence makes references to the inalienable rights of man and the accounting of the perceived violations by the King of the social contract with the American colonists echoing some of Locke’s ideas and embraced many of Locke’s concepts including his views on tyranny, rights, definition of man’s place in nature, and the supremacy of property. The
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Constitution extended Cicero, Locke, and Montesquieu’s concepts of separation of powers among the different branches of government and the supremacy of the rule of law.

The religious traditions and mores of the eighteenth century were also critical in shaping the political thoughts of the Founding Fathers as were the stories of the challenges the original settlers of the American colonies faced when they arrived. Some of the Founding Fathers were mindful of the sacrifices and hardships overcome by these original settlers. Beginning with the landing of the Mayflower in Plymouth, and throughout the American Revolution, there was a strong sense that the American settlers were a “chosen people.”20 In that spirit and tradition, some of the Founding Fathers believed that they had a duty to serve each other and also, to create a government, unlike no other, that would serve as an example of the Christian tradition of cooperation and service.

The Mayflower Compact or covenant, signed before the Pilgrims disembarked in 1620, was an agreement that the settlers would work together for a common end, that of a civil society under the rule of law. This document was an agreement among the emigrants that they would live and work together “…for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith…”21 Even as the settlement grew and factions dispersed, the American settlement’s focus was primarily religious and governing was conducted in a communal manner with Christian principles as a common foundation. Those who left the settlement and formed new settlements, such as Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams, did so because of religious differences or to expand religious teachings to local Indian tribes.

Governor John Winthrop of Massachusetts, and leader of a group of emigrants to New England, wrote a sermon on board the ship, Arbella and read it to his fellow passengers on the crossing from England. This sermon expressed Winthrop’s intention to “…unite his people behind a single purpose, the creation of a due form of government, ecclesiastical as well as civil,
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20 This sense that Americans were a chosen people reverberates in many of the letters between, John Adams, Abigail Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and others that David McCullough refers to in his biography of John Adams.
so that their community would be a model for the Christian world to emulate.”

His exhortation to his fellow passengers that “…men shall say of succeeding plantations: the lord make it like that of New England; for we must consider that we shall be as a City upon a Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us…” conveyed the sense of purpose and idea that this group of settlers were chosen for a great mission and challenge to be faced in the New World.

It was this sense that the American people were chosen and had a duty to uphold and bring about a successful American Revolution and form a republic able to survive the tyranny and turmoil of the times that propelled some of the founders. During the deliberations of the Continental Congress in 1776, Adams wrote to a friend:

> Objects of the most stupendous magnitude, measures in which the lives and liberties of millions, born and unborn are most essentially interested, are now before us. We are in the very midst of revolution, the most complete, unexpected, and remarkable of any in the history of the world.

Jefferson, in writing of the coming of the French Revolution, believed that the American Revolution had been a major factor in the French Revolution. He commented that “…the American war seemed to have awakened the thinking part of this nation in general from the sleep of despotism in which they were sunk.”

Members of the Continental Congress included the educated elite, wealthy businessmen, and affluent farmers and landowners who still needed to tend to their fields or farms, businesses or law practices in order to maintain their financial solvency. The Congress was originally a part-time legislature and the members were often coming and going so that they could attend to their business at home. It was not unusual for members of Congress or the executive branch to take long, extended absences to tend to business at home even when Congress was in session.

Washington, Adams, and Jefferson tried to maintain their farms and estates while in the
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26 In McCullough’s book, he describes several journeys Adams took when he was traveling back and forth to Massachusetts to maintain his business and farming interests. However, the impression McCullough leaves the reader with is that other members of Congress did this more frequently than Adams often leaving few to govern.
presidency. As Jefferson stated: “There is a debt of service due from every man to his country, proportioned to the boundaries which his nature and fortune have measured to him.” In keeping personal and professional links to their lives at home, the notions of sacrifice, duty, and commitment to serve their fellow citizens and neighbors was continuously reinforced. For purposes of the ideal of public service, that was the foundation that was established for future generations.

**Organizational Commitment, Professionalism, and Public Service Motivation**

The concept of organizational commitment is closely aligned to the discussion of the ideal of public service. The literature on organizational commitment serves as a base for several other groups of literature prevalent in the public administration field over the past forty years. Among these related groups are the differences between private sector and public sector employees, public service motivation, and professionalism literature. From these areas of study come the questions:

- Are those in public service committed to the profession, the organization, the citizen, the policy, or the public good? Are they committed to a mix of these ideals, all of them, or to none of them?
- Are public servants more committed to the public sector than other groups of employees such as contract employees?
- Do the professional values of managers, accountants, physicians, or members of other professional groups override the obligation to public service that is essential to government?
- Are public sector employees more motivated by the public good or personal benefits that the public sector provides than aspects of the private sector such as pay?
- What motivates public sector employees?
- Are the motivations of public sector employees different from those of private sector employees?

The organizational commitment genre included articles debating commitment to profession and commitment to the organization. This debate has been relevant to public administration since the movement to professionalize the civil service occurred at the turn of the
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twenty-first century. When the Pendleton Act was passed in 1883 as a major reform to the civil service, its features included the principle of merit in the hiring and recruitment process, and political neutrality to be exercised by the civil servants. As Wilson wrote four years later, “…the administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.” The ongoing tension between politics and administration as well as ongoing debate about whether public servants should have qualities of loyalty to the administration, or technical competence and merit, continued from the Jacksonian era until the 1930s. It was not until the Roosevelt era of major government expansion of operations that the separation of professional neutrality and politics came to fruition and professional neutrality became the goal for public servants.

Some of the major questions that come from the professionalism issue include: are accountants or lawyers or physicians more committed to professions such as accounting, the law, or medicine than they are to the missions, goals, and objectives of the organization and if so, is that good or bad for the organization? Are policy specialists, such as migration or infectious disease scholars more committed to and interested in the ongoing policy research and perspectives of their fields at the expense of the political and implementation realities of their organizations? Are those professionals who serve in the public sector able to place their role as public servants above their professional commitments and interests? Should professional interests be of a higher value than public service values? Can professional values and interests be reconciled with public service values and interests? In other words, is an Army doctor’s primary allegiance to the medical profession or through the Army command structure to the Constitution he is sworn to uphold?

The generic organizational commitment literature has been cited frequently in public administration studies since the 1970s when this perspective of organizational research became popular in the field of organizational theory. Lodahl and Kejner defined job involvement and
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developed a measurement scale that “…was defined as the degree to which a person’s work performance affects his self-esteem. Elsewhere, it was hypothesized that its main determinant is a value-orientation toward work that is learned early in the socialization process.”

Mowday, Porter, and Steers developed an instrument, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, which was used to measure commitment in different work groups. Public administration scholars and other social scientists found this survey instrument useful to quantify the attitude differences between public and private sector workers, as well as commitment of the workers in the different sectors to their work.

Mowday, Steers, and Porter defined organizational commitment “…as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It can be characterized by at least three related factors: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.”

They emphasized the trend emerging from theory that commitment could be defined in terms of attitude. They defined attitudinal commitment as “…the identity of the person (is linked) to the organization or when the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly linked or congruent. Attitudinal commitment thus represents a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals.”

In addition to personal identification with the organization, another aspect of the concept of commitment was the notion of exchange, that is, that there was some relationship between the individual and the organization that was exchange-based. If the individual perceived that they were obtaining rewards from the organization, then his/her level of commitment to the organization would be greater. Hrebiniak and Alutto’s
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study found that “...commitment in utilitarian organizations is partially an exchange and partially a structural phenomenon. That is, commitment depends in part on perceptions of inducements-contributions balances or, similarly, the ratio of rewards received from the organization in relation to the costs incurred to receive those rewards.”

The importance of being committed to one’s job is reflected in the willingness to contribute “...something of themselves in order to contribute to the organization’s well-being.”

Mowday, Steers, and Porter explained the distinction between commitment and job satisfaction in terms of response to the organization and its goals and values (commitment) rather than response to an individual’s response to his/her own job or duties (job satisfaction). Buchanan claimed that:

Commitment is a critically important attitude for organizations of any kind. In addition to linking human imagination to organizational ends, it promotes a personal, proprietary concern for the health and well-being of the organization. It minimizes the necessity for external surveillance and control, of special moment in this age of concern for democratic control of an unwieldy bureaucracy. Commitment is, in sum, no less than a precondition for successful social organization.

Buchanan’s finding in this landmark study was that government managers, when surveyed on job satisfaction and organizational commitment attitudes, showed a greater level of dissatisfaction than managers in the private sector. The importance of this finding “...touches the core of organizational stability and managerial commitment. When the delicate balance between managerial contributions and rewards is disrupted, the willingness goes out of effort and effectiveness suffers.” Buchanan claimed that this occurs in government because of the changing nature of the political process and the instability that occurs with changing political priorities. In the private sector, he found more stability of goals and objectives, and managers that were able to identify with the mission of the organization more easily.

38 Ibid., 343.
Buchanan’s remedy for increasing the commitment and satisfaction of government managers included more effective ways of linking individual contributions to agency effectiveness. Also, he claimed that, in the recruiting process, prospective public servants were attracted by “…a sense of identification with program goals and an urge to contribute to society by working toward them.” He recommended sensitizing these recruits to the reality of the political process and the potential for politics to interfere in the attainment of the program’s goals and mission. He thought acceptance of this reality might mitigate some of the disappointment and disillusionment government managers and public servants experienced in the pursuit of the fulfillment of their agency’s mission.

Prior to Buchanan’s study, Guyot’s article in 1962, “Government Bureaucrats Are Different” first posed the question of differences between the business and government workers in the academic arena. There had been a sense for quite some time that commitment among public sector workers was different from that among private sector workers. Guyot was the first of many scholars to claim that images of the modern civil servant were “distorted.” In his study of middle managers from business and government, he was concerned with two major questions:

What motives propel a bureaucrat along his career in the federal government, and how are they different from those of his counterpart in a large business organization? What tells us more about the structure of a man’s motives: knowing whether he works in a public or a private bureaucracy or knowing whether he is an engineer, an accountant, or a public relations man?

Guyot administered personality tests, measuring motivation for achievement, affiliation, and power, to the 247 managers in his study. He found significant differences in achievement between the two sectors but when looking at similar occupations among the two sectors found less of a difference. He found sector differences in affiliation as well. However, he found that with power motivation, there was no difference between the private and public sectors but there were differences between occupations. He concluded “the government bureaucrat of this study emerges as more energetic, less dependent, and no more power-hungry than his opposite number
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on the business side.”

Understanding the components of that commitment was important to understanding the public sector workforce and the motivations of public sector workers.

Morrow, McElroy, and Blum conducted a study among Department of Transportation employees and found that commitment was important to public sector employees because rewards were not always linked to performance as much as to political or economic conditions. They found that long-tenured and supervisory employees exhibited the highest levels of organizational commitment, so early retirement options and flattening of organizational structures to eliminate organizational layers should consider that these actions may result in an agency losing its most committed employees.

Liou studied professional orientation and organizational commitment among detention workers finding that understanding of employees’ professional attitudes “…can be used to predict their levels of organizational commitment.” He stated that congruity between professional attitudes and organizational values must be considered and employee commitment would be enhanced where there was such congruity.

Additional antecedents of organizational commitment that have been studied include personal characteristics such as age, gender, family characteristics, family pressure, job satisfaction, need for achievement, personal importance, organizational dependability, tenure in the organization, position in the organization, education, task identity, and group attitudes toward the organization. Findings in these studies were mixed. Steers found that “a common theme that runs through many of these [need for achievement, group attitudes toward the organization, education, organizational dependability, personal importance to the organization, and task identity] variables is the notion of exchange. Individuals come to organizations with certain needs, desires, skills, and so forth, and expect to find a work environment where they can utilize...
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their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs.”
Morrow, McElroy, and Blum found that the position one holds in the organization, and tenure in the organization affected organizational commitment as did gender, with women being more committed than men. However, gender had less of an impact than these other variables. Also, they found that the greater number of tasks one performed the more committed the employee. Steers found that “…work experiences were found to be more closely related to commitment than personal or job characteristics…”

Balfour and Weschler studied the public-private dimension as an antecedent of organizational commitment and studied three organizations: a privately run bank, a public sector human services organization, and a public agency managing a public retirement fund. They found that:

Higher levels of internalization commitment among public employees suggest that they are more committed to their organizations on the basis of congruence between their values and the values served by the organization in general — and by their individual jobs, in particular — than is true of their private sector counterparts. Hence, there is some evidence in our results for the existence of a “public service ethic” that serves to bolster the attachment of public employees to their organization.

It is this public service ethic, this moral philosophy or moral practice that is the consequence of the ideal of public service. Commitment to the organization and the institutions of public service are one part of this ethic in practice. The link between principles and the duty to serve is one of the major components comprising this public service ethic. Pellegrino and Thomasma, in their discussion of virtues in medical practice, summarized the literature on virtue-based ethics and its relationship to the modern profession of medicine. Their remarks are generalizable to public service also. They claim that “[links] …must be made between principle, duty, and virtue-based ethics and that some link must be made between moral philosophy and moral psychology, that is, between cognition of the good and motivation to do the good.”
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In a study by Aranya, Pollock, and Amernic of professional accountants in public practice, they write:

According to the classical sociological theory of professions, society grants power and prestige to professions because professionals possess bodies of knowledge which are linked to the central needs and values of the social system. In return, society expects professionals to be committed to the service of the public, above and beyond material incentives. The extent to which the members of a profession have accepted such professional values is of particular interest to the community at large, as well as to the profession itself.\(^{50}\)

Their study did find a positive relationship between the organizational and the professional commitment of the accountants. The ideal of public service is strongly linked to the concept of professionalism. As Aranya, Pollock and Amernic state, there is an obligation expected from professionals having certain knowledge and skills and that they will “give something” of their expertise back to the community.

In the medical profession, prospective physicians make a significant investment of time and money in their training to become doctors. After obtaining a bachelor’s degree, medical students undergo a rigorous and competitive admissions process to get into medical school and then, once accepted, undergo years of training that is challenging and difficult physically, intellectually, emotionally, and financially. Medical school selection and retention is a highly competitive process – some may claim the origin of this is cost or economically-based, others say that it is the vestiges of the guild mentality that professions and professionals have, and some say that the competition is there because not just anyone should be allowed to “practice” medicine. Training for specialized fields extends this learning period even longer. When the training is complete and the individual starts practicing medicine, he or she has already made many sacrifices and overcome many obstacles and challenges. Most have incurred significant financial expenses and need to recoup these expenses during their practice.

Society acknowledges these sacrifices and willingly pays physicians for their expertise and specialization. However, society expects that physicians retain an ethic of compassion and
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concern and an attitude of helping others that should not be overtaken by the desire to recoup their educational expenses or the opportunity to earn a lot of money. No one who becomes ill wants to have his illness analyzed by a physician on cost-benefit criteria. Instead, people look for a physician who is technically competent to treat their illness and also has sufficient compassion and understanding of the personal and emotional needs of the patient.

How is it possible to find this combination of competence and compassion? Beyond the selection and training of people to be medical professionals, there are examinations at every phase of their training to ensure that they are technically competent and adequately trained. Compassion is less easily taught and more difficult to measure in quantitative terms than is knowledge of organic chemistry or anatomy. However, experiential training and evaluation in clinical settings expose the students to the idea of medicine as a community with certain values and morals. If the prospective professional does not pass muster during these phases of training, he does not become a physician. Once the training and exams are successfully completed, the physician must take an oath, the Hippocratic Oath, to become part of the medical community. This oath or covenant is an agreement by the physician to use his training and education in a manner that benefits the community of medicine and society as a whole. According to Pellegrino and Thomasma:

Moreover, this covenant is acknowledged publicly when the physician takes an oath at graduation. The oath – not the degree – symbolizes the graduate’s formal entry into the profession. The oath – whichever one is taken – is a public promise – a “profession” - that the new physician understands the gravity of his or her calling, promises to be competent, and promises to use that competence in the interests of the sick. Some effacement of self-interest is thus intrinsic to every medical oath. That is what makes medicine truly a profession.

Therefore, it is this profession to serve, this public promise to serve in a manner well-understood by the physician and accepted by the community that consummates the relationship between the physician and the community of medicine and to the community at large.
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The Hippocratic Oath finds its origins in the medical community of Ancient Greece. In this act of professing, the physician accepts and acknowledges his duty to serve, agrees to adhere to the standards of the profession, and agrees to join a community that has existed for more than two thousand years. Among these standards are codes of ethics that govern what is acceptable behavior and performance within the profession. It is this acceptance of the profession and its obligations, within the community at large, that provides the expectation that when medical treatments are discussed, patients’ needs are put first, and the costs of treatment are considered after the interests of the patient are considered. When this mix of priorities is upset, as many may argue it has been today by the heed paid to the balance sheet in hospitals and HMOs, then the integrity of the profession is called into question and the profession loses standing in the community.

Lawyers and accountants go through training and education processes similar to those of physicians. Rigorous selection processes and rigorous examination processes ensure that those who join the profession are technically competent. Those lawyers and accountants who meet the rigorous standards take an oath to “profess” allegiance to the tenets of the profession.

Public administration has rigorous acceptance standards for some, but not all, areas of the profession.53 In most cases an oath is taken, but it is not always treated as an initiation into the profession, sometimes it is treated more like one of the paperwork requirements to get started on the job.54 Rohr argues “…that the public servant’s oath of office is the strongest link between the Constitution and the profession of public administration. The oath to uphold the Constitution is presented as a measured statement of an appropriate professional autonomy for the career civil
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53 In earlier days most public servants took examinations and were ranked by examination scores in a merit-based application process. While merit is still a core value of hiring in most public organizations, alternative means of evaluating prospective candidates have come into play in many organizations.

54 Taking the oath is often one more task on a checklist that the personnel specialist completes when they sign in a new employee. However, in recalling that first day of government service, I recalled the thoughts I had as I recited the oath, that I was taking on obligations and responsibilities that exceeded my practical obligation to show up for work on time. As a result of these recollections, I informally surveyed those that I worked with and others who work for the public sector and all agreed that they remembered taking the oath and what it meant to them at the time. Although this survey of colleagues was not done scientifically, it supports Rohr’s contention of what the oath symbolizes. Perhaps personnel specialists should be trained to place a higher priority on this aspect of the initial orientation for new employees.
service in a democratic government.”

Because of the myriad places where public servants are found, whether in federal, state, or local government, public universities and schools, the military, or the police and fire departments, and the different jobs that they hold, the oaths may vary somewhat. However, the allegiances to the community, the core values and customs of the community, and the link to the rule of law that governs that community are at the heart of the oath. Consequently, the oath taken to uphold the standards of the profession and the rule of law - whether it be the oath of a police officer, a border inspector, or a city councilor - is a binding promise to uphold professional and community standards of public service and encompasses the specific expectations of the community for people in those positions. It is in the taking of this oath that the public servant acknowledges and accepts the duties and responsibilities that are associated with accepting a job in the public service.

The taking of the oath by public servants connects them to the Constitution and the greater community of public service. Despite the diverse environments in which the public servant may find employment, the understanding of his responsibility as a public official to fulfill his responsibility and obligation to the public good is articulated in his recitation of the oath of office. Ultimately, the oath is a verbal commitment on the part of the public servant to uphold the Constitution and, as with other oaths, it is more than a pledge to obey and is

…an initiation into a community of disciplined discourse aimed at discovering, renewing, adapting, and applying the fundamental principles that support our public order. The task is to see the oath as more an act of civility than submission. The word “civility” suggests both the independence and the self-restraint we look for in professionals.

Lane and Wolf state that the public servants’ acceptance of themselves in this constitutional community is key to how public servants see themselves and how they attempt to carry out their actions. They comment that:

…public servants accept these ideals and seek the public interest through constitutional processes. It is these processes and principles that provide the context

---

56 There is not a unique oath that all public servants take like medical doctors reciting the Hippocratic Oath. Communities expect their public servants to abide by and profess to the laws of their community and the oaths reflect the diversity of those communities. Also different professions within the community of public service expect those of their profession to adhere to oaths covering the unique aspects of their profession.
in which routine administrative actions are performed, assessed, and fine-tuned. A public servant committed to this community will use these processes to guide discussion and to select appropriate actions within the context of a specific situation.\textsuperscript{58}

Green, Keller, and Wamsley point out that often public servants are initially trained in other professions, such as law, medicine, engineering, or accounting. However, as they work their way up in the ranks of a government organization, they are faced with different challenges including operating in a political environment. Green, Keller, and Wamsley claim that “it is this political character that distinguishes public administration from other professions and forms of administration.”\textsuperscript{59} In many cases, the professional finds that there are disparate allegiances to his primary profession, such as medicine, and the public sector with which they are employed. However, this conflict is reconcilable given the similarities of the ultimate professional objectives of duty, service, and commitment found in both the standards of profession and the public sector environment.

Another area that is key to the discussion of the ideal of public service is public service motivation. This body of literature also derives many ideas from the organizational commitment literature and has been used by many as a starting point for discussions of the public service ethic. The basic premise of this literature is that public sector employees or public servants are different from those who choose to work in the private sector. Measurement and discussion of this topic have covered differences between private sector and public sector workers of the same professions such as engineers working for the government compared to engineers\textsuperscript{60} working for private companies. One of the major distinction of the private-public debate is whether one ultimately works for monetary rewards that are gained in a profit-seeking company, or whether one works for some reward or end goal other than, or in addition to, profit.

The public service motivation literature originates from the organizational theory literature of the twentieth century and is influenced by Chester Barnard and Elton Mayo to the present day. Mayo’s interpretation of Roethlisberger and Dickson’s study of the Hawthorne

\textsuperscript{58} Larry M. Lane and James F. Wolf, The Human Resource Crisis in the Public Sector: Rebuilding the Capacity to Govern (New York: Quorum Books, 1990), 133.
\textsuperscript{59} Green, Keller, and Wamsley, “Reconstituting a Profession for American Public Administration,” 517.
\textsuperscript{60} Philip E. Crewson, “The Public Service Ethic”, (Unpublished Ph.D. Diss., American University, 1995).
electrical plant in Illinois changed the focus of organizational theory from scientific management and physical changes in the environment to a greater focus on the psychological changes that could be made to a work environment. The researchers found that employees increased productivity because of the attention of the researchers rather than from the actual changes introduced by the researchers such as better lighting and other changing work conditions. 61

Barnard62 argued, based on his experience as president of New Jersey Bell, that individuals joined organizations for social reasons as well as economic reasons. He believed that people joined organizations voluntarily and that organizations are, by their very nature, cooperative systems. He thought that interactions with others resulted in contributions and inducements. He thought that man would make choices so that his inducements from being in the organization would outweigh the contributions he made. Similar to Locke, he believed that man had physical and biological limitations, so that cooperation with others and being in organizations outweighed acting alone. However, he did point out that man would not continue in cooperative systems unless he received more inducements and benefits than if he had acted alone.

From Mayo and Barnard’s works, the study of organizations began focusing on human behavior and looking to what the individual brings into the organization, physically, intellectually, and emotionally. Selznik63 thought that there was a distinction between formal and informal organizations and that formal organizations met only part of the individual’s needs within the organization. Other factors, such as the outside or external environment or an individual’s goals, might influence the organization in an informal way and in many instances, that influence may affect how the organization works.

From these early works came a variety of studies on work groups, leadership, and worker background and personality. How to integrate employees with the organization, how to motivate employees, and how to care for their needs grew into areas of study for organizational theorists.

Elements of motivation such as pay, profit-sharing, rewards, job security, recognition, time off, and other benefits and incentives became organizational inducements to encourage productivity, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. However, in some organizations these types of incentives were not possible or, if possible, were not sufficient incentives for motivating the workforce.

Maslow,\(^{64}\) Herzberg,\(^{65}\) and others proposed theories of motivation that still resonate within organizational theory today. Maslow proposed that people are motivated by a hierarchy of needs that covered physiological, social, and psychological aspects of the individual. Once the physiological and social needs were attended to, the employee would seek means to satisfy his psychological needs of satisfaction through work with the pinnacle of the hierarchy being self-actualization. Attention to these needs and integrating the needs of individuals with the needs of the organization became the basis of human resources management. The focus turned to the attitudes of employees and what would motivate them to contribute to the organization. Herzberg’s work on motivation distinguished between hygiene factors, those that the employee had to satisfy for basic living or biological requirements, and both illusory motivation techniques, such as pay raises or promotions, and the ultimate motivation techniques of internalized incentives. The internalized incentives that Herzberg considered to be motivating factors were related to “…unique human characteristics [such as] the ability to achieve and, through achievement, to experience psychological growth.”\(^{66}\) He argued for job enrichment as a way to enhance workers’ job satisfaction if the hygiene factors were stable.

Values of the workforce as well as organizational culture were important to motivating employees. Some organizational theorists thought that the design of the organization and the attitudes promoted within the organization contributed to the performance of the employees within the organization. More attention was paid to the values of individuals and organizations and the congruence between these two sets of values. Some argued that if an individual’s
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\(^{66}\) Ibid., 57.
attitudes conflicted with those of the organization, then the individual would not maximize his productivity or effectiveness within that organization.

Sikula offers his definition of values and value systems of government executives:
Values describe what individuals consider to be important. They represent wants, preferences, and likes and dislikes for particular things, conditions, or situations. A person’s values describe the things or ideas that matter the most to him -- things that he will make sacrifices for in order to obtain them. Values consist of opinions about what is right, fair, just, or desirable. Because values take the form of opinions, they are not subject to scientific or objective testing and validation. In addition, values represent broad guides to action.67

Sikula’s study of values incorporated the Rokeach68 value survey that had two series of values; terminal and instrumental. This values instrument was used in many studies to get a sense of the prioritization of values by individuals and different groups. By asking individuals to prioritize or rank the values, it can be determined what they find most important. Compilation of these individuals’ profiles by professional characteristics such as managers, GS-14s, or sales managers for a shoe company provide a window into the similarity or differences of value profiles among similar employees.

Sikula studied government executives in addition to eleven other occupation and career groups. He found that government executives and six managerial groups had similar value profiles, emphasizing “competency” and “initiative” values while having lower preferences for “security” values. Also, he found that government executives emphasized a unique subgrouping of “integrity”69 values that were ranked higher by these executives and not in the other groups he studied.

Much more research has been done in public administration about the values of public servants as well as what motivates them. There is a sense, as Guyot said, that government

69 From Sikula’s study, competency values include wise, logical, and intellectual. Initiative values include imagination, courage, and a sense of accomplishment. Security values include family security, national security, and a comfortable life. Integrity values include honest, responsible, and capable.
employees are different and the values and motives of public servants are different from those who choose the private sector as a work environment. The values and motivations of public servants lie at the heart of the commitment to the profession and organizations of public service. Nalbandian and Edwards compared professional values of lawyers, business administrators, social workers, and public administration students and alumni. They thought that public administrators would have a distinctive value pattern and they found that there were “…significant underlying differences in the decision premises of the professional groups surveyed.”70 Perry and Porter noted “…there is some indication that individuals entering the public sector value economic wealth to a lesser degree than do entrants to the profit sector.”71

Newstrom, Reif, and Moncza reviewed four common stereotypes in their study on motivating the public employee. For example, one stereotype was that public employees placed more value on job security than private sector employees. However, the data analyzed showed that “…security is perceived as less important for public employees.”72 The authors found that job security was not useful as a reward for public sector employees because they already had it. Another stereotype held that public servants have less need for self-actualization. However, the data showed that public employees have “…developed a large and unsatisfied need for opportunities to find fulfillment in their jobs.”73 The other stereotypes analyzed were concerned with employees’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction with fringe benefits and economic rewards. The authors found that public employees were more satisfied with indirect and direct economic benefits than their private sector counterparts although the authors did not provide definitive reasons for this higher level of satisfaction.

Perry and Porter identified four sets of variables that influence motivation. They are: “(1) individual characteristics, (2) job characteristics, (3) work environment characteristics, and (4) external environment.”74 Their study was focused on individual characteristics or attitudes
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73 Ibid., 71.
that people brought into the workplace and they discussed the efficacy of different motivational techniques, namely “monetary incentives, goal setting, job design, and participation.”

Perry and Wise did a study to “…clarify the nature of public service motivation and to identify and evaluate research related to its effects on public employee behavior.” Their definition of public service motivation is “…understood as an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations.” Crewson argued that this definition is too narrow for comparative analysis and too broad for empirical analysis. Crewson modified Perry and Wise’s definition to “…public service motivation is an individual’s propensity to value and be driven to act in a manner that promotes the general welfare of others relative to personal economic gain.” He argued “…public employees are more service oriented than private employees.”

Khojasteh’s study looked at differences in motivations between public and private sector managers using intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. He found that there were differences between the two sectors and recognition was one of the highest ranked intrinsic rewards of the public sector managers while the private sector managers ranked it among the lowest. However, on other intrinsic rewards, such as achievement and advancement, there were no differences between the groups.

Perry and Wise’s study framed the agenda for the work that continues to develop in the area of public service motivation. They claimed that the area of public service motivation and the public service ethic have “…significant behavioral implications.” Among the behavioral implications are that:

1. those with public service motivation will be attracted to public organizations,
2. individuals with high public service motivation will perform better in public organizations when they find their work meaningful, and

75 Ibid., 89.
77 Ibid., 368.
79 Ibid., 11.
80 Ibid., 19.
(3) public organizations that attract people with high public service motivation will not have to rely as much on utilitarian incentives, such as pay.

They sounded a cautionary warning that the persistence of the trend toward treating public service more like those in private enterprise might contribute to declines in advancing social goals and would fail “…to acknowledge unique motives underlying public employment and the critical linkage between the way a bureaucracy operates in an administrative state and the advancement of social and democratic values.”

Perry developed a public service motivation construct and measurement scale, with approximately forty survey questions, based on his earlier work with Wise. The construct consisted of six dimensions. The dimensions are attraction to public policy making, commitment to the public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion. Building on the work he did with Wise, he put these dimensions into three “analytically distinct categories” - rational, norm-based, and affective. According to Perry, “…rational motives involve actions grounded in individual utility maximization” and he put attraction to public policy making under this category. Perry said that “norm-based motives refer to actions generated by efforts to conform to norms” and he included commitment to the public interest, civic duty, and social justice. Finally, “affective motives refer to those triggers of behavior that are grounded in emotional responses to various social contexts” and included compassion and self-sacrifice under this category. After developing items to measure these dimensions and conducting confirmatory factor analysis, he collapsed the six dimensions into four dimensions. There was little discrimination between civic duty, social justice, and commitment to the public interest with the commonality among them being “public regardingness” or “concern for the public weal” so these were collapsed into one. In a later study, he looked at the relationship between the dimensions of public service motivation and antecedents of public service motivation such as professional identity and parental and religious socialization. The results did indicate some

82 Ibid., 371.
84 Ibid., 6 and 7.
85 Ibid., 20.
experiences with family, school, and profession contributed to later development of public service motivation.

When Gabris and Simo reviewed Perry’s work, they claimed that public service motivation may be inconsequential as a reason behind people’s choice to work for the public sector. They studied six organizations including two from government, two non-profits, and two private companies. Their survey looked at respondents’ extrinsic (money, fringes, security) and intrinsic (ethics, values, psychological satisfaction) needs. They concluded that all of the workers agreed on what they liked most, but they disagreed on what they liked least. What the public sector workers liked least were issues related to bureaucratic obstacles and structural design associated with their organizations. They concluded that “if public sector jobs are made more challenging, monetarily appealing, secure, loaded with responsibility, full of autonomy, and well supervised, then they will draw good recruits and produce public servants dedicated to their tasks.” However, they claimed that public sector motivation was too difficult a concept to see and isolate and questioned whether doing so would make any difference in finding new or different ways to motivate their workforce.

Naff and Crum analyzed data collected by the Merit Systems Protection Board as part of the 1996 Merit Principles Survey. This study, with nearly 10,000 Federal employee respondents included some of the questions that Perry had developed for his Public Service Motivation instrument. Additional information from the survey allowed the authors to “…examine the relationship between PSM [public service motivation] and performance, job satisfaction, retention, and support for government reinvention” They found significant relationships between public service motivation and all of these other factors. They conclude that their study provides construct validity for Perry’s public service motivation instrument and believe that this survey instrument is useful for more extensive research.
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88 Ibid., 49.
Brewer, Selden and Facer\textsuperscript{90} also built on the public service motivation work by Perry. In this work, they identified four distinct conceptions of public service motivation that individuals in public service hold: samaritans, communitarians, patriots, and humanitarians. The authors admit that these four conceptions overlap in many ways. However, they differ in their “scope of concern”\textsuperscript{91} whether it focused on other individuals, the community, the nation, or mankind.

Other scholars who have studied the public service have categorized the public service or public servants into a particular framework. For example, Mosher in \textit{Democracy and the Public Service}\textsuperscript{92} looked at the public or civil service throughout American public administration and categorized civil service history by presidential eras such as the era bounded by George Washington and John Quincy Adams which he labeled “Government by Gentlemen.” Given the focus of his study on issues of democratic governance and the history of the civil service, the categorization he developed was helpful in understanding how the civil service had developed and evolved.

Leonard White,\textsuperscript{93} on the other hand, was more interested in administrative institutions and traced the history of those institutions. One of the major topics in his studies was the public or civil service. White categorized administrative history into different eras such as the Federalists, Jeffersonians, and Jacksonians. He based his categorization on how the administrative institutions changed over time and linked the changes to eras of government associated with the politics and practices of distinct political parties or followers of particular presidents.

Selden, et.al have been interested in the roles of public servants and came up with five roles that administrators described. The roles were labeled: “stewards of the public interest,

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 260.
\textsuperscript{92} Frederick C. Mosher, \textit{Democracy and the Public Service}, Second Edition.
\textsuperscript{93} Leonard White wrote a series of books on different periods of administrative history in American public administration. He covered the Federalist, Jeffersonian and Jacksonian periods.
adapted realists, businesslike utilitarians, resigned custodians, and practical idealists.”\textsuperscript{94} The 69 public administrators, from whom they gathered their data, chose from statements encompassing five dimensions: managerial efficiency, political responsiveness, neutrality, proactive administration, and social equity.\textsuperscript{95} The authors were attempting to show how “…public administrators view administrative responsibility and how their perceptions shape their role conceptions.”\textsuperscript{96} This research indicates how public administrators perceive themselves and it may be inferred from those perceptions how strong a connection there is between the administrators and a public service ethic.

Nachmias and Rosenbloom,\textsuperscript{97} in their study of different public administration systems, categorized civil servants on a comparative basis and came up with a typology of bureaucratic types: politico, service, job, and statesman. St Germain, in her discussion of the differences between Mexican and United States public servants on the southwest border area between Mexico and the United States focused on background and recruitment patterns of the two groups. She found that Mexican public managers were recruited based on extrinsic qualifications, such as political party ties and personal connections and U.S. public managers were recruited based on intrinsic qualifications, such as education and experience.\textsuperscript{98} Correspondingly, Mexican managers have a more outer-oriented motivation while U.S. managers have a more inner-oriented motivation. St. Germain came to this conclusion after using Nachmias and Rosenbloom’s bureaucratic typology. Much of the differences among administrators that she found in her study appeared to be related to the type of systems the different managers were recruited to and the environment within which they work.

The research studies on organizational commitment, professionalism, and public service motivation mentioned here all draw from and contribute to the images and construction of public

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 179.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 176.
\textsuperscript{97} David Nachmias and David H. Rosenbloom \textit{Bureaucratic Culture: Citizens and Administrators in Israel} London, Croom Helm, 1978.
service that are shared in American public administration theory and practice. If it is possible to identify and recognize the ideal of public service in normative discussions or find it in surveys, then it is important to understand how varied and diverse the studies have been that attempted to capture one or more aspects of the ideal of public service. Values such as self-sacrifice, commitment, duty, and compassion are constant themes underlying discussions related to organizational commitment, professionalism, and public service motivation.

**Differences between the Private Sector and the Public Sector**

Empirical studies of the differences between private sector and public sector employees leave much to be desired. Despite the proliferation of such studies, many have significant flaws in the study design or in the data. Hardly any of the quantitative analyses used large enough samples, have been successfully replicated, or most importantly, have had enough impact to dispel or confirm the myths that have developed regarding differences between the two sectors. Rainey and Bozeman pointed out that most of the studies are based on questionnaire data that may have validity threats. Some of the studies done may have response biases, weak construct validity, and poor instrumentation.

There are several generalizations and myths concerning differences between public servants and public service and the private sector that are not supported by any quantitative analyses but persist in the public and political realm. When surveys of public attitudes toward government have been conducted in recent years, there are several areas that get a lot of attention. One is the level of trust people have in government. Another is the sense that public service has cumbersome and rule bound systems for everything that they do. Another popular attitude studied is the view that the public has of public servants and elected officials. Another area of study focused on the different motivations and expectations of public sector employees from private sector employees. Finally, there is a sense that the private sector way of doing things is more efficient, effective, and economical than the ways of the public sector.
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In the area of the level of trust, a study by NAPA in 1999\textsuperscript{101} found that from 1964 to 1994 the percentage of Americans expressing significant trust in the Federal government declined from 80\% to 20\%. Findings in a subsequent report with survey data from July 2001\textsuperscript{102} showed a slight increase, to 29\%, in the number of people who “trusted government to do what was right.” The survey was repeated in October 2001, after the tragedy of September 11, and the numbers showed a positive surge upward to 57\%. However, when the survey was repeated in May 2002, the same number declined to 40\%. Although the findings showed that trust of government has improved over the past few years, the numbers showed little variance for the feelings people had toward federal government workers. This number hovered at about 70\%. It was the numbers related to the elected officials that surged after September 11, from 57\% for the president and elected officials in July 2001 to 83\% for the president and 71\% for elected officials in October 2001. Therefore, it appears that people trusted civil servants to do the right thing most of the time but did not have the same opinion about their elected officials. However, when the media reports the survey results, they do not always distinguish between civil servants and politicians perhaps perpetuating this myth.

There have been surveys of the public on their view of public servants and elected officials. Studies making media headlines showing negative views of public officials fail to specify that it is the public’s views on the elected officials that are negative, not necessarily the public servants. As Goodsell\textsuperscript{103} pointed out in his studies the public is satisfied with their encounters with public servants, such as police officers; it is the elected officials they think are bad. However, all public officials are often grouped together and when this happens the general perception toward both public servants and politicians is negative. Given some of the corporate scandals uncovered in 2002, it is possible that future surveys may show that public servants (whether elected or career officials) are more highly trusted than private sector executives.

\textsuperscript{101} National Academy of Public Administration, “A Government to Trust and Respect: Rebuilding Citizen-Government Relations For the 21st Century,” (June 1999).
Another area that has received a lot of attention in the literature is in the area of red tape and rules. The myth is that the government bureaucracy is tied in knots because it is so rule-bound. During the Clinton-Gore Administration, the President and Vice-President commanded a lot of media attention when they brought the Federal Personnel Manual out to the lawn of the White House in a front loader and destroyed it. The myth of red tape and rules in government is not supported by studies that illustrate that public servants feel no more rule-bound than other sectors of the workforce. Rules and procedures are necessary in any large organization because they routinize and simplify complex processes. Additionally, in government, rules are the “…product of an agency’s legislative action”\(^ {104}\) and laws are the product of Congress’s legislative action. It is the rules and regulations that are promulgated by agencies that flesh out the laws made by Congress and inform the public of how the agency intends to implement the law.

Buchanan conducted a comparative study measuring job involvement and structure salience between public and business middle managers. The job involvement scale was that developed by Lodahl and Kejner.\(^ {105}\) The structure salience scale was developed to measure impressions of “formal bureaucratic routines.”\(^ {106}\) Buchanan found that business managers found more salience to formal structure and greater job involvement than did the government managers.\(^ {107}\) Buchanan concludes, “…the market environment may promote stricter attendance to operating procedures and deeper personal work involvement among managers inside economic organizations.”\(^ {108}\) Therefore, business managers may have more pressure to perform in ways that are consistent with their organizations and that are evaluated on a constant basis while public managers may have more confidence in the protections of job security, tenure and the nature of the work they have as public workers.


\(^{105}\) Thomas M. Lodahl and Mathilde Kejner, “The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement.”


\(^{107}\) Ibid., 433.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., 442.
Rainey, Pandey, and Bozeman’s survey\textsuperscript{109} found that public sector managers perceived external rules in areas such as procurement and personnel to be important sources of red tape in government. They found that the formalization of these processes contributed to the perception of red tape. Most of the previous studies, conducted by those studying organizations, that focused on red tape in government versus red tape in business “…tended to find no such difference.”\textsuperscript{110} Despite the lack of evidence that more red tape existed in government, “…economists and political scientists writing about the public bureaucracy have not been listening”\textsuperscript{111} and continued to claim that government has more red tape than the private sector. Public managers did have a higher tendency to report more rules constraining them in implementing personnel related matters such as rewards or implementation of personnel actions and also that more people were involved in personnel decisions. However, given some of the budget constraints that limit funding for rewards and some of the equity, ethics, and merit guidelines that are an integral part of the recruitment and retention process it is not surprising to hear that they perceive these areas to be more rule-bound.

Several studies have been conducted of the \textit{reward expectations} of public sector employees as compared to private sector employees. The popular notion and myth are that seniority and monetary rewards motivate public sector employees. Rather they are motivated by challenges, and monetary rewards and job security are low on the list of the factors that motivate them. This has implications on ways that public sector employees should be rewarded for their performance.

Rainey, Traut, and Blunt ’s\textsuperscript{112} compilation of the research done in the area of reward expectancies between private and public organizations illustrated that there are several problems with how the research has been designed including measurement of the expectancy items. For example, they mention that one of the features of the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act was to link pay more closely to performance. However, this aspect of the law was never fully implemented

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 568.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 568.
because of the lack of a budgetary commitment to fund the pay reward pools fully once the new performance system was put in place. Therefore, studies that searched for linkages to extrinsic rewards within the public sector to performance or expecting to find the public sector to be incentivized by performance rewards or additional pay based on performance was unrealistic given the low probability that this feature would be fully implemented. However, Rainey, et.al found that similar problems exist in the private sector as well. Often in the private sector, the personnel systems are highly bureaucratized, pay is highly secretive, and profit-sharing and performance bonus formulas are as confusing and complicated as in the government. While not discounting that issues of reward expectancies in the public sector exist, Rainey, et.al cautioned against oversimplifying the problems and overselling potential solutions.

If the motivations and expectations of the public employees are different from the private sector, then existing methods of motivation and incentives promoted by the private sector are not going to be effective in the public sector. As Light’s research\textsuperscript{113} has illustrated, those seeking to enter the public service are entering for the work not the money. According to Light, public servants are looking for challenge and an opportunity to contribute to their organizations.

Perhaps the greatest of all of the myths concerning the differences between the public sector and the private sector is that government can be run like a business and if and/or when that occurs the government will be more efficient, economical, and effective. The growth and sustenance of this myth has ebbed and flowed throughout American history as tensions between politics and administration, and efficiency and equity have arisen. There are certainly other aspects to this argument or ways to frame this discussion but for the purpose of the broader understanding of the ideal of public service these areas seem most appropriate for inclusion here.

The starting point or origin of this myth is often ascribed to Woodrow Wilson’s 1887 essay, “The Study of Administration.”\textsuperscript{114} This essay, considered by many to be one of the founding documents of modern American public administration, concerned the relationship

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
between politics and administration. The essay took on mythical status in the field and many interpretations of Wilson’s thoughts and his advocacy of the separation of politics from administration have been written. While it is true that Wilson advocated the separation of politics and administration so that administration would be efficient, effective, and economical, the understanding that Wilson saw this separation as possible or even as optimal is where the story becomes a myth and Wilson’s intent may have been transformed. Instead, Wilson pointed out that the study of the science of administration should not be marginalized by politics, nor should the importance of the political process be minimized at the expense of sound administration.

Wilson’s essay, coming four years after the Pendleton Act passed, was primarily a polemic for civil service reform. He argued that “it is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one.” His essay traces how the founding period of American history was concerned with developing the Constitution, understanding its utility, and assimilating it with the culture of American society. After tracing this evolution, he pointed out how the government had become more complex in his day and in its new complexity, administration had taken on a more significant role in implementing policy. He stated that:

…there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusineslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness.

Many students of political science and public administration go no further in their interpretation than here and assume that if government could only be run like a business then many of the government’s problems could be solved. However, it is as much a disservice to Wilson and his ideas as to the field of public administration and the profession of public service if one stopped there in the reading and interpretation of this essay. For Wilson continued to argue for a professional and capable public service, one that was based on service to the public and the ideal of democratic governance that the American system was built upon. Throughout this essay, Wilson argued for a professionalism of the civil service which was founded on moral principle, understanding of constitutional principle, respect for public opinion and public will, and
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administrative discretion grounded in the understanding of politics and administration. One of his final comments in the essay should be the starting point for those discussing his essay, yet often it has been overlooked and that is:

Our own politics must be the touchstone for all theories. The principles on which to base a science of administration for America must be principles which have democratic policy very much at heart.117

Fifty years after Wilson’s essay, the Brownlow Committee argued, in their section on personnel management, that, “the effective conduct of the work of the Government depends upon the men and women who serve it.”118 Some of the major recommendations of this committee included further professionalization of the career civil service and the depoliticization of civil service positions for any but the closest of advisors to the President. In addition to highlighting merit through procedures, such as examinations for the career civil service, the Committee recommended that the civil service be populated by “…personnel of the highest order—competent, highly trained, loyal, skilled in their duties by reason of long experience, and assured of continuity and freedom from the disrupting influences of personal or political patronage.”119 Luther Gulick, one of the major participants on the Brownlow Committee, “…envisaged a public administration of neutral expertise involved in the formulation of policy; the development and adoption of specific programs; administrative supervision, coordination, and control of activities; and the audit and review of results.”120

The Brownlow Committee presumed that the civil service would be value-neutral in its implementation of public policy and that this would be sufficient since the policy makers who were political appointees of the President would control the civil service and implement the policy goals of the President. Gulick believed that the political appointees would be similar to a board of directors, answerable to the President who would act similar to a business’ chief executive. With this type of system, government could be run like a business and management
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could emphasize economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of government programs.

It was at this point that two principles were minimized or lost to future discussions about democratic governance. First, management and administration overtook the concept of service as paramount principles of the public service. Secondly, there was a sea change from *what to do* in government to *how to do* in government. While Gulick, and his colleagues on the Brownlow Committee, were emphasizing the management principles of a government dominated by the executive branch and preaching the three values of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, they were, in effect, relegating the public service and civil servants to becoming cogs in the machinery of a corporate-like structure called government.

While economy, efficiency, and effectiveness were indisputably important values during the mid-twentieth century as the country recovered from the Great Depression, and the role of government was expanding, some of the other values important to the ideal of public service declined at this time. Restoration and expansion of the economy by implementation of government-sponsored jobs programs and credit restoration programs were primary areas of attention of the Roosevelt Administration in the 1930s. Legislation was passed that sponsored rural electrification, dam building, and established the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Works Progress Administration to name a few of the government agencies and programs. Once these programs were established, the intent of the Administration was to run them using sound and proven business management principles. Businessmen were brought in to provide expertise and they did so, in many cases, without drawing a salary or much of a salary. Throughout this period Roosevelt was able to offset discussion of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness values with values of duty, sacrifice, and commitment to the country and the greater good. These values coexisted and were compatible due to the circumstances of the day. Roosevelt’s leadership and the values he expounded in speeches and fireside chats, in addition to what the American people were comfortable with and accepted, made this coexistence possible. He preached the notions of sacrifice, duty, commitment, and unity to the American people that resonated with them because of the times and perhaps the culture and values present at that point of American history.
When the American people joined World War II after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt again appealed to the American people’s sense of duty, commitment, and sacrifice, and the people mobilized to fight the war whether by joining the military or participating in community programs. As manufacturing for war products accelerated and expanded, and materials for the war, such as rubber and gasoline, were appropriated for that purpose, the values of economy and efficiency coexisted with duty, sacrifice, and commitment.

The government continued to expand up until the 1970s as it assumed more responsibility for housing, health care, social security, and welfare, along with an expanded global military force that was sustained in order to counter the threat of the “Cold War.” The public sector was assigned this responsibility in many of these areas because of its past success in addressing urgent, complex, and critical problems. There was a sense that the public sector was capable of solving these problems, a sense that the government was able to solve “big” problems and should solve big problems as it had done during the Depression and World War II.

Eisenhower advocated that more governmental functions should be contracted out and the “A-76,” a government directive that defined what possible candidates for contracting out were and how the cost-benefit analyses should be conducted, was promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget\textsuperscript{121} in 1955. The policy supporting this document emphasized “…where private sources are available they should be looked to first to provide the commercial and industrial goods that the government needs.”\textsuperscript{122} In some areas of government, there were strong relationships between government and business. Business was working with government agencies, such as the Defense Department, to provide technology, equipment, and expertise in cooperative ways so that the industries grew as the government needs expanded.

During the 1960s and 1970s and up until the post-Watergate era beginning in and around 1974, the “contracting out” movement fit comfortably within the continuing government expansion. However, Watergate, the Vietnam War, and inflation seemed to put the brakes on

\textsuperscript{121} The Bureau of the Budget became the Office of Management and Budget in 1970.
both government expansion and the coexistence of the private sector with the public sector. Suspicion of the government and its intentions surfaced at this time. In 1974, a reform-minded Congress was elected. In 1976, President Carter, campaigning on an anti-Washington, anti-bureaucrat platform, was elected as an “outsider.” The public sector was no longer viewed as the place for policy solutions. Since that time period, the debate has shifted as well. It was no longer a question of what the government should do but how the government should do it and if the government should do it. In this new debate, the values of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness trumped other values. The public sector was now concerned primarily with the management values of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

On a parallel track with this post-World War II government expansion, economics was on the rise in the social science field and the political arena. As the United States became a player on the international stage due to economic aid initiatives such as the Marshall Plan in the 1950s and domestically as government aid programs became more predominant, economists became more involved in the policy arena. How to use government actions and government funds to influence the economy and how the economy influenced government actions became major areas of interest for economists and political scientists. Out of this cross-fertilization of ideas came public choice theory, which was at once a political science idea and an economic theory.123

Public choice theory claims that all actions and items have a price, whether in the private environment of the market or the public environment of government. Goods are classified as private, public, and common. Private goods are those that one person acquires to satisfy his individual need, such as a car. Choices exist between different products in the marketplace. Common goods, such as clean air, are those that benefit all and are understood by all to be necessary and desirable. Public goods, such as roads, are similar to common goods but can be locally beneficial or its value locally determined. Another component of this theory includes externalities, defined as those items or actions that impact the supply, demand, or value of the goods. For example the impact of climate on the “good” of water projects varies by location. In

123 Vincent Ostrom provides a thorough explanation of public choice theory from a political science and public administration perspective in his work, *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. However, Gordon Tullock and James Buchanan are responsible for establishing this theory in political science, public administration and economics.
California, water projects are more valuable than in Massachusetts because the differing climates make water a more scarce resource in California. Externalities affect the determination of what type of good it is and the value of the good.

By distinguishing goods and services by economic values economists claimed that public policy choices could be made based on rational decisions by using analytical methods such as cost-benefit techniques. However, what public choice economists did not consider is that many people did not look at some of these issues with only an analytical perspective. Rather, they wanted clean air, safe roads and cures for cancer no matter what the cost. And when issues were framed in those ways, the costs of solving those problems became inconsequential to the voter and the elected officials. In many cases, laws were passed that were not necessarily based on rational analysis and achievable objectives. Therefore, once these laws were in place, the best that could be done to change or adjust these policies and priorities was to tinker at the margins of the policy, reduce or increase budgets in incremental ways, and achieve incremental successes.

A cultural change related to individual rights and expansion and recognition of rights for disenfranchised people of color and women was going on during this post- World War II government expansion also. The Supreme Court handed down the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. This decision “…ordered public school desegregation with ‘all deliberate speed’.”  

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was another milestone in the recognition of equal rights for people of color. In the area of women’s rights, a constitutional amendment called the ERA (Equal Rights Amendment), stating that men and women should be treated equally by law, was passed by Congress in 1972 but never ratified by all of the 38 states needed for approval. Despite the failure of the ERA, women joined with the other disenfranchised groups in their struggle for equal rights, achieving by judicial interpretation many of the gains they had sought by Constitutional amendment.

---


As women and other minorities such as blacks and Hispanics acquired these individual rights, legislation and court decisions became much more specific in defining what those rights were and who was entitled to them. As public officials attempted to provide these rights they were working to achieve dual goals. On the one hand, there was pressure to accomplish their work efficiently, economically, and effectively and on the other hand, there was a need to accommodate and serve whoever was eligible for their services in an egalitarian manner. The people who needed these government services became “clients” or cases to the public servants.

Lipsky describes the “processing of people into clients.” When a person came into an agency to be served, he lost his uniqueness and was categorized into one of the different areas of service that the institution provided. For example, if a person went to a motor vehicles department, he was often seen by a “triage” specialist and given a number. The number was determined by the category of service he needed and an expert providing that service assisted him. Therefore, when the person needed to renew an automobile registration, the person who processed automobile registrations serviced him. If the person asked a question related to driver’s license renewal of the automobile registration expert, he would be told to get back in line, get a new number, and wait for the driver’s license expert. When agencies treated people as clients or cases, they were objectively counted and measured in terms of how many served, or as outputs. Instead of the client being treated and regarded as on equal footing, the public servant, in many cases, assumed an aura of superiority, based on their technical expertise, over the client or case. Unfortunately, this approach was unsatisfactory for most of the people involved because it ignored whether the person, the client, was truly served and left the public servant discouraged because their work lacked personal interaction and results were difficult to see or measure.

While the client approach worked for some businesses, such as law firms, who charged each client separately for time spent with the lawyers and the complexity of the work they performed, this approach was less successful for solving complex problems in the public sector such as finding housing for low-income people or helping drug addicts fight their addictions.

Law firms could link client statistics to its business’ costs and profits, but there was nothing on the public sector side that mirrored that measure of success or failure.

Over time, the term client fell into disuse and the public service, influenced by business and management theory of the day, started dealing with “customers.” Same people, different name, and different approach. The shift from clients to customers was a philosophical shift in public service as to who was being served and how that person should be served. Instead of just the “clients” being transformed into customers, others became customers as well. Included as customers, using this new definition, were Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, state and local governments, and interest groups and non-governmental agencies as well as those previously labeled clients. Now public servants viewed several groups as customers and public sector leaders urged their employees to be customer-oriented and outcome-focused rather than output focused.

The anti-Washington, anti-bureaucrat trend continued into the 1980s with much rhetoric about big government “being the problem” as the Federal government’s budget deficit climbed, local government services were constrained or reduced due to budget restrictions, and anti-tax initiatives implemented such as Proposition 13 in California. In the 1990s, a movement that dominated popular opinion called the “reinventing government” movement captured the attention of government managers and political leaders. This movement, popularized by Osborne and Gaebler, told of a government that had a “distinct ethos: slow, inefficient, impersonal.”127 Although the authors admitted that government couldn’t be run like a business, they articulated ten principles of “entrepreneurial government.” The ten principles were:

- competition between service providers
- empower citizens by pushing control to the community
- focus on outcomes
- driven by their goals and missions
- redefine clients as customers and offer choices
- prevent problems before they emerge
- earn money, not just spend it
- decentralize authority
- prefer market mechanisms to bureaucratic mechanisms

➢ catalyze all sectors to solve community’s problems.128

These ten principles were principles found in management theory, and sounded much like business principles. Although Osborne and Gaebler studied different local, state and federal government programs and cited many success stories from these different levels of government, the principles they endorsed were those found in and advocated by the private sector. Box states that:

it [reinventing government] is to some extent a repackaging of the old politics-administration question that has been in play since the late 19th century and was highlighted by the Friedrich-Finer argument in the early 1940s over the role of the administrator as relatively independent, expert actor, or tightly constrained agent of political officials.129

Vice President Al Gore assumed responsibility for the National Performance Review Project during the Clinton Administration. The goal of the project was to “create a government that works better and costs less”130 Gore and his team accepted Osborne and Gaebler’s ideas and argued that it was not the bureaucrats that were bad it was the systems. His expression that “the federal government is filled with good people trapped in bad systems”131 became their mandate to review and revise systems throughout the government. Additionally, in their attempt to make the government “cost less” they pledged to cut government positions by 252,000 public servants.

In this effort to reform government, Gore and his colleagues attempted to make government run more like a business. For example, the emphasis that they placed on persons served by government agencies being customers rather than clients was a means to bring in best practices of customer relations that successful businesses used to build and keep their customer base. However, this effort failed to consider that most people dealt with government agencies because they had to not because they wanted to deal with them. Of course the encounter was more positive for the “customer” if they were not treated rudely or inconsiderately but good

128 Ibid., 19-20.
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service was not going to entice them back to the agency as it would to a retail store such as Nordstrom’s.

Implementation of the principle to focus on outcome was another area that Gore’s team tried to implement. This idea was part of the Government Performance Results Act as well. In some cases this worked well and changing the emphasis from outputs to outcomes improved government operations. In other cases, it increased dissatisfaction of government operations by customers and public servants because the outcomes were vague, confusing, or conflicting. For example, if a government agency was letting a contract for some of its work what outcome was to be achieved? Was it the outcome of increasing minority participation in government contracting? Was it cost-based? Was it schedule-based? Who was going to make the decision of which outcome was most important?

The emphases on incorporating these business-like approaches into government continue to be debated in popular and academic literature to the present day. What does not seem debatable is the unintended consequence of these ideas on the public service. As Kearney and Hays argued, ”the reinventing government movement represents a pervasive and potentially pernicious attack on bureaucracy that may ultimately undermine the professional public service.”132 Certainly when the emphasis is placed upon managers signing performance contracts, based on efficiency goals, rather than managers working from a set of values incorporating commitment to the greater good and civic duty that had motivated them earlier then something is lost, unintended or not.

Many public administration scholars continue to turn to business practices and business ideas to solve public sector problems or improve government operations. Most recently, the Report of the National Commission on the Public Service, entitled “Urgent Business for America: Revitalizing the Federal Government for the 21st Century”133 made fourteen recommendations on reorganizing government, improving leadership for government, and

improving operational effectiveness in government. One of their recommendations was to reorganize government into mission-driven executive departments similar to the recent reorganization of several different agencies into the Department of Homeland Security. This recommendation is similar to the Brownlow recommendations of the 1930s. Reorganizing government based on business imperatives was not fully successful in the 1930s, and has met with mixed or limited success since then. Although the Department of Defense was organized from the military services and associated agencies in 1947, it has not always acted as a unified agency. Some might argue that it has yet to act as a unified government agency.

Another recommendation of the Commission is for Congress to allow agencies to set pay compensation based on market comparisons. This recommendation joins the ongoing debate about privatization of government functions and competitive sourcing of work done by government. These ideas continue to be on the forefront on management proposals that are continually recycled throughout the policy arena. With the expectation that market solutions will solve government problems and that government can be run like a business, similar solutions will continue to surface and be debated in the public arena. Unfortunately, none of these ideas encompasses all of the ideals of public service such as civic duty, commitment to the public interest, social justice, compassion, or self-sacrifice. They include only economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The probable result is a solution that does not accommodate the unique characteristics of the public sector and addresses only part of the problem.

**Contemporary Political Thought and the Public Service Today**

Some of the contemporary political thought that has affected American public administration includes the idea of revitalizing democracy through the strengthening of institutions. Another area of concern is the revitalization of civil society. The communitarian perspective and liberal perspectives compete for attention in the political debate. Other ideas such as representative bureaucracy, social capital, and social equity all vie to be part of the debate over how we should live. The same questions posed at the beginning of this chapter about how man is to live, whether he should live with others or apart, and whether living with others was to be a cooperative or competitive endeavor continue to be questions of debate within
contemporary political philosophy. What has changed is the addition of the democratic experiment to our body of knowledge and experience.

How the democratic experiment or American experience is viewed and interpreted differs among political theorists today. It has sparked the question of whether the emphasis on individualism and rights has compromised the sense of community and civil society necessary to have a coherent and cooperative society. Political theorists question whether we are losing individual rights to political correctness, or if we are losing our sense of civic responsibility at the expense of individual rights. These are just a sampling of the type of questions raised in today’s political philosophy discussions.

This debate has implications for American public administration as understanding about the role of government changes and the role of institutions change. The ideals of public service fit within an institutional concept of society. The public service is a part or component of society and its institutions. It is a critical component of the institution of government. If the emphasis in government institutions is more focused on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness rather than duty, self-sacrifice, compassion, and commitment to the public interest then it may be that the values and ideals underlying the public service have changed also.

Bellah and his colleagues are concerned with how we should live and they focus on the institutions of society as indicators of how we are living. They define institutions as:

- a pattern of expected action of individuals or groups enforced by societal sanctions, both positive and negative. …Institutions are normative patterns embedded in and enforced by laws and mores (informal customs and practices). In common usage the term is also used to apply to concrete organizations. Organizations certainly loom large in our lives, but if we think only of organizations and not of institutions we may greatly oversimplify our problems.\(^{134}\)

They believe that institutions must have a moral framework and where necessary, institutions must be reformed to reflect a moral framework that includes society’s ideals. Bellah and his colleagues believe that contemporary institutions are being viewed as “objective mechanisms

that are essentially separate from the lives of the individuals who inhabit them.” They observed that the supremacy of the individual’s needs over the needs of the common good are hindering the health of our institutions. They argue that the assumption that our institutions are there to serve the individual, and not the community, must be transformed. Bellah and his colleagues claimed that institutions are not objective and should not be objective. They should give shape to collective and individual experiences. Bellah sounds a warning to us not to make light of our institutions or what they are becoming.

Michael Sandel, in *Democracy’s Discontent* raises similar concerns as Bellah and his colleagues. Sandel argued that the emphasis on the individual over the common good has resulted in a value-neutral set of institutions including government. He argued that the United States is a child of liberalism and republicanism, and in an attempt to mix the two, a hybrid rooted in value neutrality called the procedural republic has been formed. He claimed that changing emphases from political concerns to economic concerns in the society have shifted the mix of political institutional frameworks. What is missing from the procedural republic, according to Sandel, is moral foundation rooted in community and discourse. This absence results in further erosion of community and the loss of a means for discussion. According to Sandel, restoration of values of civic and moral virtue must occur if the community is to be reestablished. The public service as an institution cannot be separated from the rest of the community. The idea that the government is a separate entity from the community because of its neutrality must be overcome and government as an institution must be reintegrated into the community.

Frederickson, in *The Spirit of Public Administration*, refers back to the Athenian Citizen’s Oath to explain the citizen’s responsibility within the community and for those in following generations. Public service and citizenship are not just contemporary institutions. They are based in the historical and political context of society. He claimed that:

The ideal of American democracy assumes that a special relationship should exist between public servants and citizens. To put it briefly, this belief is that all public

---
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administration must rest upon and be guided by the moral truths embodied in the enabling documents of our national foundation.  

Frederickson views the public service as an integrated institution within society and states that “public servants must genuinely care for their fellow citizens.” He views the public administrator as the bridge between citizens and the community. He considers the public administrator a representative citizen who should be “among the custodians of justice and equity.” He reinforces the idea that neither the public service nor government are, or can be, neutral in their theory or practice. He states:

The study and practice of public administration has never been regarded as only technical or managerial. Attempts to parse, on the one hand, the work of government into politics and policymaking as the expression of values, and on the other hand, administration as the mere technical and value-neutral carrying out of policy have not succeeded. That values inhabit every corner of government is a given.

Gawthrop argues that there must be a moral connection between democracy and the bureaucracy to keep democracy flourishing. He traces the origins of service and duty to its secular and religious roots, the secular found in the Athenian Oath of Citizenship and the religious roots found in biblical stories. He cautions against the separation of moral values and technical expertise. He states:

Democratic and moral values are indivisible; they are interwoven into a seamless garment. An ethics of moral consciousness insists on the fusion of ethical values and moral virtues. Democracy requires nothing more, but it certainly demands nothing less, and a life so lived in the service of democracy reveals the genuine worth of its noble calling.

The recent report on the National Commission on the Public Service avoids the contemporary debates on political philosophy so that it can provide concrete recommendations for action. However, the risk it takes in avoiding this debate is that there is no clear cut
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understanding of what the public service is and what makes up the ideal of public service and the ideal public service. It may be that the questions of who shall govern and how shall we govern are too abstract for a commission that is only in place for a year or so. However, these are questions that have to be confronted in theory and in practice.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I summarize the survey I made of several different literatures in my search for information on the ideal of public service. In my review of the literature, I found it possible to dig a very wide, but shallow hole. There is an ideal of the public service but it is a concept, and ideals of public service are value-based. Many scholars discuss the public service, refer to it, and use it as an underpinning of their discussions but it is not something that can be captured, photographed, or measured and public administration scholars rarely explain it.

Inclusion of the different literatures was a means to show in how many ways the public service is discussed and in what areas this discussion of the public service is most vibrant, diverse, and dynamic.

The literature reviewed encompassed a wide-ranging survey of articles and books in political science, political philosophy, sociology, public administration, and the management sciences. From the works of Aristotle and Cicero in political philosophy to articles on organizational commitment found in accounting journals, different aspects of commitment, professionalism, self-sacrifice, and civic duty were reviewed and have contributed to the discussion of the ideals of public service. The quantification of how motivated public servants are or have been, how they are motivated, and what motivates them has often been categorized with the public service literature in the fields of public administration and political science. The differences between public sector and private sector workers has been another area of the literature where the public service and its ideals have been discussed. It is assumed that if public servants have different attitudes, motivations, and ideals than persons in other professions, then it must be measurable and apparent if the two groups are compared, studied and surveyed. The final area of literature surveyed was that of contemporary political thought because it is in this
literature that the role and contribution of the public service is debated along with the role of government and the public sector in today’s society.

The political philosophy mentioned in this chapter includes the works of those who influenced the Founding Fathers thoughts as they designed and debated the formation of the American government. It is important to understand that the Founding Fathers were influenced by concepts of duty and sacrifice, commitment and justice that were rooted in their religious beliefs, academic training, and cultural background from the different regions where they lived. Their professional training as farmers and businessmen influenced their concepts of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. Some of the differences in the role that government should play in society and how governments should be formed that were explored in the early days of the nation’s development stemmed from the Founders’ different interpretations of political philosophy, their interpretation of the thoughts of these philosophers, or their personal and professional experiences that influenced many of their ideas on taxation, citizenship, and commerce as fundamental components of government. Many of these differences in thought about the role and scope of government still exist in the political debates of today.

The organizational commitment, professionalism, and public service motivation literature that was surveyed is important to the discussion of the ideals of public service because that is where the field has defined and debated these concepts that comprise many of the ideals. This area of the organizational commitment and professionalism literature includes thoughts, ideas and reasons why people join the public service, what keeps them in public service, or what motivates them in that profession. From the early works of Bernard and Mayo on organizational commitment and motivation, to the more contemporary works of Sikula, Selden, Perry and Wise, on motivation and worker values, there has been continuing discussion of what and why public servants come to the field, stay in the field, and the characteristics and values of those in this profession. James Perry’s articles on public service motivation have been the culmination of this stream of literature. Since the mid 1990s when he presented his public service motivation instrument until now, the discussion has revolved around his work and others have attempted to confirm or dispute it. He captured the idea that just as no one wishes that their doctors or lawyers are solely motivated by the profit motive, no one wishes that public servants are
motivated by thoughts of personal gain or profit-seeking behavior, and their attitudes are influenced and affected by thoughts of service to others instead.

Another predominant approach to studying the ideals of public service has been to compare and contrast the differences of the private sector to the public sector. Many of the articles assume that there are differences and these differences are rooted in the ideals and values of the two sectors. The authors who have studied this aspect of the field assert that there is a dichotomy or conflict between the business aspects of the field and the political aspects of the field. This assertion is rooted in the political-administration dichotomy first identified in the late nineteenth century by Goodnow, Wilson and others.\textsuperscript{143} Some of these authors assert that government can be more efficient, effective, and economical and should be run more like a business. They take this position without regard for facts or reality. The facts have never supported the idea that government can be run like a business and those who study this continually report this in their findings. Government has unique characteristics, not the least of which is the lack of a profit motive, its inability to choose its customers/clients/citizens, and its responsibility and obligations to fellow citizens that they serve. The inherent and delicate balancing act between the executive, legislative, and judicial processes and the importance of these processes to governance and the political system that many writers of the “run government more like a business” camp try to dismiss as ineffective or inefficient makes up the heart of the governance system developed by the Founders and expected from today’s citizens. While there is no harm in more effective, efficient, and economical programs and there is more than sufficient discussion of these concepts in American government over time, the idea that economy, efficiency, and effectiveness would trump the other ideals of public service was not the intended result of support for them, and the literature reflects this. For example, Gulick’s ideas of managing government more economically, effectively and efficiently has been taken beyond what he intended and has resulted in unintended consequences, namely reinventing government and other management initiatives of today.

\textsuperscript{143} In Frank J. Goodnow’s book, \textit{The Politics of Administration} and Woodrow Wilson’s essay “The Study of Administration” are among the first places where the politics-administration dichotomy is discussed. These thoughts are reflective of some of the thinking at the turn of the twentieth century in political science and public administration.
Contemporary political thinkers are concerned with the loss of civic involvement in communities and advocate the revitalization of civic responsibility, lament the deterioration of institutions as keepers of moral frameworks for people to live within, and criticize the dominance of individualism at the expense of community in terms of government action. The debate today is similar to the one of the earlier debates\textsuperscript{144} between the different Founders as to what the role of government should be and what the role of the individual should be in society. The overlay of the institutional and organizational behavior and theory and the composition of the moral and ethical frameworks within which institutions should operate are some of the contemporary influences that differ from those of the Founders.

The different literatures reviewed in this chapter are important to understand how the dimensions that James Perry used to build his public service motivation instrument have come to be accepted as some of the indisputable ideals of public service in the field of public administration. In the next chapters, there is discussion of the methodology and conduct of the study that was performed followed by the results and findings of the analysis. The research question for this study, “has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service,” seems to fulfill a gap in the literature as various authors mentioned in the previous pages touched upon the possibility of this having occurred.

\textsuperscript{144} This was one topic of debate but not the major topic of debate among the Founding Fathers. Federalism and the related issues were probably the most important topics debated at this time.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the research approach chosen and the methodologies used to conduct the research. The study includes: a quantitative and qualitative analysis of presidential inaugural addresses; a description of the information studied and why these data were chosen; criteria used to evaluate the data; the quantitative methodology used, including the means of data collection; and data analysis also. The methodology of analyzing the information qualitatively is described also. There is a discussion of the possible biases, and strengths and weaknesses of the methodological approach. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research question and the information used to answer the question.

In choosing to discuss the ideal of public service and how it has evolved, I was challenged as to how best to view the public service. A review of the literature found studies that contained surveys measuring public service motivation; studies analyzing existing data of public sector employee attitudes; and comparative studies of attitudes and values between those in public service and those in the private sector. Although the ideal of public service is essentially an attitude or feeling and in spite of the fact that many attitude surveys have been conducted over the years, none of these surveys addressed the essential questions necessary to understand the ideal of public service. Rather, published studies have focused on more narrow aspects of the public service. Therefore, replicating or reaffirming existing studies that did not focus on the research problem of interest here did not make sense. Despite these studies, there still seemed to be a gap in the literature on public service so then the challenge was how to find and draw out the ideal of public service.

I considered many ways to measure the premise that the ideal of public service has changed and diminished over time. To illustrate or determine if there has been a change, the question then became: who talks about public service in the ideal? Many people talk about
public service in idealistic terms – politicians, elected officials, public administrators, political scientists, historians, journalists, and citizens – and all of their opinions are valuable and necessary to the conversation.

Some ways considered to look at this discourse about public service included: a review of congressional speeches or congressional actions over time; a review of executive orders or proclamations concerning the public service; or a review of public opinion polls on citizens’ thoughts about public service. Another way to do this might have been to survey public administrators and the public servants themselves on this ideal. Some of these approaches have been done and many of these studies have already been discussed in this paper.

While many of these studies address one or more of the issues I wanted to study, none provided the means to assess how the ideal of public service has changed over time. To remedy this gap in the literature, I reviewed and analyzed the texts of all of the Presidential Inaugural Addresses and assessed how the discourse about the topic of public service has changed over the course of American history, as illustrated in these speeches. No other speeches, proclamations, executive orders, or other government documents were included in this review. Nine criteria indicative of different components of public service were selected and are illustrated in Table 1. Six of the nine criteria are dimensions of public service motivation as named and defined by James Perry. Perry found these criteria throughout the public administration and political theory literature. My review confirms Perry’s findings that these concepts or dimensions are prevalent in the literature. The other three criteria, concerning the economic or business aspects of public administration, are also prevalent in public administration literature.

3 Several studies were discussed in Chapter 2 such as the studies of Kilpatrick, Cummings and Jennings, Rainey’s many articles on reward expectancies and the differences between the public and private sectors, and Nalbandian and Edwards’ article on values.
### Table 1: Criteria Related to the Ideal of Public Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Related to the Ideal Of Public Service</th>
<th>Definition of Criteria Related to the Ideal Of Public Service</th>
<th>Examples and Frequency of Most Common Words Found in this Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>“The willingness to substitute service to others for tangible personal rewards”</td>
<td>Called (57), give (65), given (59), help (52), seek (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>“Duty derives from the state’s sovereign power and the role of public employees as nonelected trustees of this power”</td>
<td>Action (59), duties (88), duty (113), responsibility (62), service (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the Public Interest</td>
<td>“The desire to serve is essentially altruistic even when the public interest is conceived as an individual’s opinion”</td>
<td>Condition (41), conditions (33), oath (45), patriotism (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>“Combines the love of regime values with love of others”</td>
<td>Care (33), concern (18), cooperation (24), earnest (18), harmony (24), solemn (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>“Involves activities intended to enhance the well-being of minorities who lack political and economic resources”</td>
<td>Just (112), justice (129), principles (92), right (106), rights (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Public Policy-making</td>
<td>“Involves the interest and opportunity to participate in public policy-making.”</td>
<td>Administration (86), office (71), policy (97), rule (23), states (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>“The production and distribution of goods and services.”</td>
<td>Business (65), land (65), means (69), own (162), prosperity (66), work (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>“The use of resources in such a way as to minimize waste and to ensure resources are put to their most valuable use.”</td>
<td>Efficient (12), measure (22), measures (42), produce (31), waste (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>“The use of resources to accomplish what you set out to accomplish.”</td>
<td>Effect (36), effort (42), efforts (35), result (26), sufficient (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

I used content analysis, a common social science research method, to conduct this review and analysis of the inaugural addresses. According to Plano, et.al, content analysis is:

---

5 The definitions of these criteria are part of James Perry’s article, "Measuring Public Service Motivation," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (6:2 January 1996), 5-22.
…the systematic, objective analysis of written communications for the purpose of making judgments about the communications, their senders, and related political variables. Content analysis may be broken down into a number of related operations, including (1) determination of the kinds of messages to be sampled (such as all foreign policy speeches of United States Presidents from 1949 to 1972); (2) the selection of an adequate sample of the messages; (3) the designation of appropriate units of analysis (words, themes, whole message items, and so forth); (4) the construction of an unambiguous and exhaustive set of categories into which the units will be classified; (5) formulation of explicit coding rules for assigning units to categories; and (6) the coding process in which messages are examined and items assigned to categories.6

Content analysis has been a widely used research method in the social sciences, including political science and public administration. Krippendorf stated that:

content analysis has an important place in the methodology of investigative tools. It is capable, first, of accepting relatively unstructured symbolic communications as data and, second, of analyzing unobserved phenomena through the medium of data connected with the phenomena, regardless of whether language is involved. Since most social processes are transacted through symbols, the widest use of content analysis is found in the social sciences and humanities.7

Harold Lasswell, a significant influence in the field of political science in the latter half of the twentieth-century, did extensive research on political attitudes and propaganda studies using content analysis methodology. He coined the phrase that “politics is about who gets what.”8 He argued that:

…the language of politics is the language of power…the language of decision. It registers and modifies decisions. It is battle cry, verdict and sentence, statute, ordinance, and rule, oath of office, controversial news, comment and debate.9

Content analysis gained more prominence in the social sciences when Lasswell concentrated on the attitudes and language that conveyed these political attitudes. Berelson explained Lasswell’s use of content analysis as:

Viewing communication problems within the framework of a theory of politics, Lasswell introduced new problems, new procedures, and new categories into the

field (and thereby imparted a political complexion to it). His theoretical structure involved a set of political values (such as income, deference, safety), a list of key political symbols for the developmental analysis of world politics (such as freedom, democracy, fascism, communism), a group of methods used for the realization of political values (such as violence, bribery, negotiation, symbol manipulation), and measures of the extent to which the values are acquired (indulgence, deprivation).  

Since Lasswell’s work in the mid-twentieth century, many others in the field of political science and public administration have been concerned with symbols, ideals, and the effect of those symbols and ideals on public policy. Aaron Wildavsky stated that “values are embedded in policies”\(^\text{11}\) in his text on policy analysis. Edelman, a political scientist who studied language and symbols extensively, stated:

…rather than seeing political news as an account of events to which people react, I treat political developments as creations of the publics concerned with them. Whether events are noticed and what they mean depend upon observers’ situations and the language that reflects and interprets those situations. A social problem, a political enemy, or a leader is both an entity and a signifier with a range of meanings that vary in ways we can at least partly understand.  

More recently, Deborah Stone\(^\text{13}\) discussed symbols and storytelling in policy making and policy analysis. Stone claims that:

…the essence of policy making in political communities [is] the struggle over ideas. Ideas are a medium of exchange and a mode of influence even more powerful than money and votes and guns. Shared meanings motivate people to action and meld individual striving into collective action. Ideas are at the center of all political conflict. Policy making, in turn, is a constant struggle over the criteria for classification, the boundaries of categories, and the definition of ideals that guide the way people behave.  

Political speeches are full of symbols, stories, and metaphors. Stone states that “symbolic representation is a fundamental part of all discourse, political or other…”  

---


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., 11.

\(^\text{15}\) Ibid., 156.
Understanding the content of political speeches necessitates understanding the text and content within the speeches, the symbols and metaphors used in speeches, the stories that are conveyed, and the themes that the speaker wants to convey. Content analysis is one way to dissect speeches or texts to quantify and qualitatively evaluate their meanings. In Schaffner’s work on analyzing political speeches, she states: “The characterisation of a text as political can be based on functional and thematic criteria. Political texts are a part of and/or the result of politics, they are historically and culturally determined. They fulfill different functions due to different political activities.”

The meaning of inaugural addresses and the content of those speeches contributes to a greater understanding of the political process and public administration at the time the speeches were given, and from a historical perspective to see how the political landscape changed over time. The stories, symbols, and themes tell a story of American history and specifically, a story of American public administration and the public service.

Content analysis is an iterative, analytical process. There are several steps necessary to ensure that the analysis is reliable and valid. The steps taken in this study included:

1) determination of the kinds of messages to be sampled
2) selection of an adequate sample of the messages
3) designation of appropriate units of analysis
4) construction of an unambiguous and exhaustive set of categories into which the units are classified
5) formulation of explicit coding rules for assigning units to categories
6) coding process in which messages are examined and items assigned to categories.

These steps and how they are being used for this study are outlined in Table 2.

The texts of the addresses were analyzed by word and theme over time to determine if there were any trends or changes in the emphasis on different aspects of public service. The selection of the words for the quantitative analysis coding dictionary consisted of extracting words from the criterion definition first and then building on to the dictionary by adding

---

17 Appendix A is a listing of all of the inaugural addresses by president and year given.
Table 2: Steps of Content Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps of Content Analysis</th>
<th>Steps for this Research Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determination of Message</td>
<td>Inaugural Addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Comprehensive analysis of all 54 inaugural addresses\textsuperscript{18} is being conducted; therefore there is no sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units of Analysis</td>
<td>Words and themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of analysis</td>
<td>Nine criteria: self-sacrifice, civic duty, commitment, compassion, social justice, attraction to policy, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding rules</td>
<td>Three rules apply: (1) a dictionary of words that included the criteria or were synonymous with the criteria of public service as defined in this study; (2) a speech by speech search for the words contained in this dictionary; (3) a summary of the count of these words by address and criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding process</td>
<td>The coding process was completed in two steps: (1) word count and categorization by criteria; (2) thematic categorization and analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The listings of all of the terms, including those that were considered to be similar to the originating term, are listed by criteria in Appendix B. Appendix C lists the summation of those words by criteria, president, and inaugural address.

The thematic analysis was more subjective because the selection and categorization of themes reflects my understanding and interpretation of the texts. Although the thematic analysis was interpretive, the textual analysis was based on a qualitative review of all of the inaugural addresses using the same criteria as the quantitative analysis. When reading these addresses I searched for substantive comments about public service first and foremost. In some cases, the text transparently expressed thoughts, feelings, and ideas about the public service. For example, Washington talked of his country’s summons to serve during the American Revolution and then again to the presidency and his sense of duty to respond to that call. He stated that he had been “…summoned…from a retreat which I had chosen with the fondest predilection, and in my

\textsuperscript{18} The exception to this is that the addresses given when a vice-president assumed the office during his predecessors’ term (due to the predecessor’s death or resignation) were not included and were not considered as inaugural addresses.
flattering hopes, with an immutable decision, as the asylum of my declining years”¹⁹ to serve as president after he had retired. In other cases, the mention of public service ideas and concepts was part of a larger theme or themes and the public service themes needed to be drawn from the text as when William Henry Harrison talked of the principles and guidelines he would adhere to during his presidency to govern.²⁰ Second, the comments and references were categorized by criteria. In many cases, the same comments were categorized under more than one criterion because they captured several criteria at once. For example, several references to civic duty also encompassed the criteria for self-sacrifice and commitment to the public interest. In Chapter 4, the significant themes of these addresses are discussed category by category. In some cases, the same phrase or thought falls under more than one category. In many cases this is because the president was trying to tie more similar ideals together such as duty, sacrifice, and commitment, or economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

Some of the inaugural addresses made few references to public service or the terms related to it, but all of the inaugural addresses contained words pertaining to the criteria. It may be that the addresses containing few references to public service signaled a shift in the conversation and are relevant for that reason. In some cases, it may be that the events surrounding the inaugural event or time period were such that the ideal of public service was a subordinate theme or was not relevant in the context of the times. The subordination of this ideal of public service is also illustrative of its evolution.

Results of these analyses will be discussed in the next chapter. Trend analyses were ordered by criteria over time. The themes and words were categorized by criteria and in chronological order. If there was a change in the discussion of the ideal of public service, indications of change will be evident in historical and criteria trend analyses.

²⁰ William Henry Harrison’s Inaugural Address included many philosophical principles and ideas that he put forth during his speech. Harrison’s speech was the longest inaugural address ever given and he used this address to place himself in history, to delineate policy by policy what his administration intended to do during his term of office and discuss the principles of governance in which he believed. He died shortly after his term began so many of his ideas were left to subsequent administrations to implement.
The Data: Why Inaugural Addresses?

I chose to study the texts of presidential inaugural addresses for insights into the ideal of public service. I decided to look at presidential speeches because the presidents are the leaders of the executive branch and the government at the national level. While this study is not limited to the executive branch, the federal government, or government as the only places to find public service and public servants, looking at the public service from the perspective of this group of influential national leaders was the most appropriate to determine the historical evolution of the ideal of public service in American public administration.

Why inaugural addresses? Inaugural addresses are one of three possible visionary and comprehensive speeches that a president has the opportunity to make during his tenure. According to Tulis, presidents did not always use speeches as the means to transmit their message. He states that:

Prior to this century, presidents preferred written communications between the branches of government to oral addresses to “the people.” The relatively few popular speeches that were made differed in character from today’s addresses. Most were patriotic orations for ceremonial occasions, some raised constitutional issues, and several spoke to the conduct of war.21

He comments that “Jefferson’s practice of sending all messages to Congress in writing remained the rule until Woodrow Wilson dramatically broke precedent with his appearances before Congress.”22 Inaugural addresses were one of the rare occasions that presidents spoke to the people.

Perhaps the most visionary of speeches a president makes is his Nomination Acceptance speech. However, these speeches are partisan in origin, are meant to inspire the party to work for election of the candidate, and are primarily concerned with convincing the electorate to vote for the candidate. Additionally, the candidate is not always a sitting president, does not always win the election for which the speech was made, and then may quickly disappear from the political landscape after the election. Although some of the speeches have become part of the historical

---

22 Ibid., 56
and rhetorical landscape of American politics and government, many of them have not had a long shelf life.

The second possible opportunity to make a visionary speech is when presidents give a State of the Union address to Congress. The State of the Union address finds its origin in the Constitution: “He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient…” However, this device has been used in different ways during the course of our history. In contemporary times, it has become a tradition for the president to address both Houses of Congress and the citizenry to outline his plans for the coming year and talk about past accomplishments. However, in the early years of the country, presidents did not consider this a requirement of office, and the means of accomplishing this as well as the meaning of what this part of the Constitution required varied considerably. For example, there was some debate during Jackson’s presidency about whether the address had to be done annually or just when something of note changed. The breadth and scope of the messages has varied as well. In some cases, the President forwarded a letter to Congress and did not give a speech or present his findings to the public at large.

In contrast, every president has given an inaugural address when they have assumed the office in orderly fashion. The only exceptions have been when presidents assumed the office by means other than election: that is, when vice-presidents have assumed the office after a president has died or resigned, they have taken the Oath of Office but have not had an Inaugural event or given an Inaugural address. Those presidents who assumed office from the vice presidency in the twentieth century have spoken to the American people shortly after taking the oath of office. However, their speeches are not included in this analysis because the speeches appear to have served a different purpose. Those speeches are inaugural in the sense that they mark the beginning of the new President’s tenure; however, in many respects they have been more

---

23 *U.S. Constitution*, Article II, Section 3.
24 The presidents who did not give an inaugural address because they assumed the office when the previous president died are: John Tyler, Millard Fillmore, Andrew Johnson, Chester Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt (once), Calvin Coolidge (once), Harry Truman (once), and Lyndon Johnson (once). Ford did not give an inaugural address when he assumed the presidency after Nixon resigned.
retrospective than prospective because of the circumstances under which they assumed the Presidency.

The Inaugural addresses contain prospective information and are perhaps the best opportunity the president has for making a non-partisan, visionary speech during his tenure. The speeches are retrospective as well and many presidents have used this opportunity to place themselves, their actions, and their Administrations in historical and constitutional context. Tulis points out that Jefferson established a model for the inaugural address that was “…adhered to by all presidents until Lincoln. These speeches attempt to articulate the president’s understandings of republican principle.”25 After the Civil War, policy issues were enumerated first and then justified by “…vaguely articulated republican principles.”26 Further, Tulis comments that these presidents “…did devote special attention to proposed constitutional reforms, and these provided an avenue to serious discussion of constitutional principle.”27 For historical perspective, Tulis comments that:

Every president in the nineteenth century, except Zachary Taylor, mentioned the Constitution, and many of these addresses were at least partly structured by reflection upon its meaning. All of this was to change in the twentieth century. Symptomatic of the larger changes in form would be the fact that only half of the twentieth-century inaugural addresses even mention the word Constitution (or any of its provisions), and none of the twentieth-century addresses contain analyses of the meaning of the Constitution.28

Presidents can address the people whenever they want and on whatever subject they wish to speak. However, tradition and custom have limited presidential speeches to a narrow list of potential topics. Typical topics outside of the scope of the inaugural or state of the union addresses include crises of war or the economy, advocacy for a particular policy or legislative agenda, or an explanation of action or inaction with which the president has been engaged.

Most presidents choose their topics for speeches and the timing of those speeches very carefully. The Inaugural ceremony is one of those opportunities to speak that also encompasses the traditions and customs going back to Washington’s presidency and occurs every four years at

26 Ibid., 50.
27 Ibid., 51.
28 Ibid., 51.
a set time. The opportunity for a president to be visionary at this occasion of his Inauguration ceremony has been limited only by his ideas of what he wishes to speak of or his sense of what the occasion allowed him to do. For the most part, these speeches have been visionary, although the scope of the visions has varied.

Few presidents strayed far from a standard group of topics or changed the formula of the address which was essentially put in place by Washington. Controversy and partisanship is generally avoided, and while foreign policy has been discussed in some cases, it is usually not the focus of these speeches. Laundry lists of promises and legislative proposals are rarely a part of the inaugural addresses, although some presidents have done this. In general, these speeches have been visionary in that the president conveys a sense of where the country is and where he intends to lead or guide it. In that there is a visionary emphasis, it seemed that these speeches were likely places to find a sense or ideal of public service by these most visible of public servants.

**The Criteria for Analysis**

The nine criteria selected for this analysis are a combination of those identified by James Perry in the public administration literature plus economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. While Perry developed these criteria for his survey instrument on public service motivation, the criteria are based on his review and analysis of the literature and the themes he found. Perry asserts that public service motivation “…represents an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions. The construct is associated conceptually with six dimensions: attraction to public policy making, commitment to the public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion.” In my review of the public administration literature, I found similar themes to Perry. Although one can debate the efficacy of his labeling of the six dimensions, there is little doubt that he captured and described the dimensions and themes that are evident in the public administration literature.

29 Particularly, William Henry Harrison, William Howard Taft, and Herbert Hoover took this approach in their inaugural address.

Other scholars, who have studied public service and previously discussed in my literature review, including Mosher, White, Selden, St Germain, and Nachmias and Rosenbloom, have tried to categorize the public service or public servants into a particular framework. For example, Mosher in *Democracy and the Public Service* looked at the civil service throughout American public administration and categorized it by presidential eras such as the era bounded by George Washington and John Quincy Adams which he labeled “Government by Gentlemen.” Given its focus on the history of the civil service, Mosher’s categorization was helpful in understanding how the civil service developed and evolved. White, on the other hand, was more interested in administrative history and covered a wide variety of topics including the public or civil service. Selden has been most interested in roles of public servants and came up with five roles that administrators perceive. Nachmias and Rosenbloom, in their study of different public administration systems, categorized civil servants on a comparative basis and developed a typology of bureaucratic types: politico, service, job, and statesman. St Germain, in her discussion of the differences between Mexican and United States public servants on the southwest border area between Mexico and the United States focused on background and recruitment patterns of the two groups.

The reason for choosing the criteria Perry came up with as he developed his public service motivation survey instrument is agreement that he captured the prevalent themes in the literature. As he stated, “many practitioners and scholars of public administration have long claimed that public service is a special calling….The school of thought is epitomized by Elmer Staat’s reverential description: Public service is a concept, an attitude, a sense of duty – yes, even a sense of public morality.”

Perry’s dimensions measure attitudes of public servants about the different factors that “capture their motivations for pursuing public service careers.” Attraction to public policy-making describes a “rational motive” based on interest and opportunity to participate in public policy-making. The commitment to the public interest dimension captures the idea that the

---

31 Ibid., 5.
32 Ibid., 5-8.
“desire to serve is essentially altruistic.” Another dimension is that of civic duty. This
dimension “…derives from the state’s sovereign power and the role of public employees as
nonelected trustees of portions of this power.” The social justice dimension “…involves
activities intended to enhance the well-being of minorities who lack political and economic
resources.” Self-sacrifice is the dimension designed to capture the “willingness to substitute
service to others for tangible personal rewards.” Finally, the sixth dimension, compassion is
related to a concept developed by Frederickson and Hart that “…combines love of regime values
with love of others.”

In addition to Perry’s criteria, three other themes dominate the public administration
literature: economy, effectiveness, and efficiency. Economy is the production and distribution
of goods and services, and generally is concerned with how scarce resources are used. Efficiency
is the use of resources in such a way as to minimize waste and to ensure resources are put to their
most valuable use. Finally, effectiveness is concerned with making use of resources to
accomplish what you have set out to accomplish.

These three themes run throughout the founding documents of American public
administration including the Articles of Confederation, the Federalist Papers, and the U.S.
Constitution as well as much of the literature in the field. There has been an ongoing tension in
American public administration, dating back to the original English settlers who benefited from
land grants given by the crown or corporations, between the needs of people to be met by
governing bodies and the resources the governing bodies require to meet those needs. American
government has always experienced tensions between a government that values economy,
efficiency, and effectiveness, along with the principles of democratic governance including the
ideal that public service is comprised of citizens serving citizens. Balancing the needs of the
community with the funds collected from the community has been a major focus of public
administrators throughout history. Inclusion of these offsetting criteria of economy,
effectiveness, and efficiency, in addition to the other six criteria provides insight into the
evolution of the ideal of public service and the variation of that ideal from one end of the
spectrum to the opposite end over time.

33 Ibid., 5-8.
Steps in Quantitative Data Analysis

Fifty-four inaugural addresses were considered. The fifty-four addresses are all of the addresses given. There was no sample as the entire universe of inaugural addresses was considered. However, not all of the presidents gave inaugural addresses. The presidents who did not give inaugural addresses are those presidents who assumed the office because of the death or resignation of the previous president.

Nine criteria were considered as categories of analysis: self-sacrifice, civic duty, commitment to the public interest, compassion, social justice, attraction to public policymaking, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

The coding rules included development of a dictionary of words developed using the actual definitions of nine criteria, from the definitions established by Perry\textsuperscript{34} first, and then by consulting several dictionaries and thesauruses. From this core group of words synonyms were added, as were the plural versions and different tenses of the words. After compiling the core listing, the first review of the speeches was done. As this review was conducted, words were added to the “dictionary” listings.

A second review of the addresses was conducted using NoteTabLight,\textsuperscript{35} a software program that sorts text by character and word, and provides a count of all of the words. This software version that was accessed was available as freeware from the company via the Internet. The data were compiled in a spreadsheet by word, address, and criteria. If a particular word was referenced multiple times in an address, then the total number of times it was used was the number associated to it. In other words, if the word “service” was mentioned ten times in an address, then the count for the word “service” was ten under the appropriate category/criteria and that number was recorded for that particular address.

\textsuperscript{35}NoteTabLight 4.86 [Freeware Version] Copyright © 1996-2001 Fookes Software Web Site at \url{http://notetab.com}
A third and final review of the addresses was conducted using NoteTabLight again. This third review was done to ensure that none of the words in the dictionary were overlooked in previous reviews.

The word count compiled was 1,167 words. The 1,167 words were broken down by category/criteria as follows: Self-sacrifice (169 words, 14.48%), civic duty (92 words, 7.88%), commitment (112 words, 9.6%), compassion (51 words, 4.37%), social justice (145 words, 12.43%), attraction to public policy-making (79 words, 6.77%), economy (424 words, 36.33%), effectiveness (65 words, 5.57%), and efficiency (30 words, 2.57%)

The coding process consisted of three steps. First, the total words searched for were counted and categorized. The second step was determining the number of words counted by address and criteria. Then the words were summarized by address and criteria. Next, a percentage of these words was determined based on the total number of public service words found for that speech, and then by criteria for that speech. For example, if an address had 100 words counted for public service and ten were categorized under commitment, then the percentage for commitment would be ten percent. Once these percentages were determined, they were compared to the percent of the total words counted in each category as a percent of the 1,167 total words searched. Therefore, if an address had ten percent of its words counted toward commitment, and the overall percentage of words found under the category of commitment was nine percent, then that address exceeded the standard by one percent. These differences are the data points reflected on the charts displayed in Chapter 4.

The comparison of the percentage of public service words per category per speech can be made to the number of searched public service words per category, even though the percentages were calculated with different denominators. Although this method of subtracting percentages with different denominators is not mathematical, this procedure resulted in the best way to develop comparative numbers.

The calculations were:
1) By total number of public service words: Number of words by criteria (x) divided by total number of words searched (y) equaling the percentage of words by criteria of the total number of words searched (z). \( \frac{x}{y} = z \)

2) By total number of public service words by address: Number of words by criteria (a) divided by number of words searched for that address (b) equaling the percentage of words by criteria of the total number of words searched for that address (c). \( \frac{a}{b} = c \)

3) The difference between the number of words searched by criteria (z) and the number of words of that criterion in that address (c). \( z - c = \text{data point} \)

This procedure allowed for the words in the individual addresses by category to be compared across all categories. This method assumed two factors:

- Each word has the same probability of being selected. Therefore every word had a 1 in 1,167 chance of being selected.
- The second factor is as the length of the speeches varied, it was assumed that the chances of finding words dedicated to public service changed. Therefore, the data was contained to a comparison of public service words and eliminated the discrepancies associated with the length of the speeches.

While this approach is unusual, it did allow for the data to be compared over time among the different addresses without regard for length of speech, different values for different words, or the possibility of the same word being used in different ways. However, further manipulation of the data, as it is converted into percentages and percentage differences here, would not be recommended.

While the words chosen or how the words have been categorized may be debatable, it seems that whatever differences one might have on either count would be mitigated by the volume of the words in the dictionary. Additionally, the quantitative analysis coupled with the qualitative review mitigates any uncertainty about these word choices.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Methodology and the Data**

One of the major issues in all social science research studies that must be considered is the reliability and validity of the data studied and of the methodology chosen. In this study, the questions of importance are:

- Were the right words, phrases, and themes captured in the review?
- Were they measured correctly?
Was anything missed during the qualitative review?
Were the texts interpreted correctly?
Were there biases in the analyses?

As noted earlier, part of the study included a search for over one thousand words in the inaugural addresses when the addresses were analyzed and the quantitative data were compiled. The words searched are listed in Appendix B by criteria. It may be that someone else may not have chosen a particular word as one to include, or he would have placed a particular word or words under different criteria than was done here. However, that issue seems to be mitigated by the number of words that were considered. In the search for phrases and themes, the same issue applies. Although there were repetitive reviews of the inaugural addresses for the words, phrases, and themes I was the only person to conduct the reviews and had no assistance so there may be words or phrases that were not captured that someone else might have captured. Also, there was some judgment as to which words were captured and what definition of the word was used as the rationale to add the word to the list. For example, the word “just” may mean right or law but it means exactly or precisely also. There was no discrimination in the quantitative data gathering to distinguish between the two or more meanings of any word chosen for these lists once the word was added to the listings. However, discrimination and judgment were applied to the phrases and themes that were drawn from the texts in the qualitative review.

The measurement of how the words were counted and what was done to the summation of the word counts is described in the Steps in the Quantitative Data Analysis section of this chapter. While the calculation for the presentation of the trend data was somewhat innovative, the computation of the words was done in a replicable systematic method.

The most important questions related to the qualitative review concern what was chosen from the texts of the inaugural addresses to be analyzed and whether these phrases and themes were analyzed correctly. As mentioned earlier, this part of the analysis is admittedly subjective and may be biased by this writer’s understanding of the texts. Others such as historians, political scientists, communications experts, or public administrators may have found other phrases or themes more appropriate to a given category if they followed the same process I did. In many instances, it was difficult to determine into what category a particular phrase should be placed.
Therefore, in those cases, the phrase was counted against more than one of the categories. However, it was rarely difficult to determine when a particular phrase was focused on the public service.

There are possible weaknesses associated with the use of the inaugural addresses as a data set. One concern is that the speeches are not considered to be highly substantive. Another concern is that use of the speeches devoid of the historical context of the time and events taking place when the speeches were written and delivered might bias the analysis of the texts.

The inaugural addresses are not as rich in substance as other presidential speeches such as the state of the union address. When presidents make topical addresses on the economy or foreign policy they may define legislative priorities and state policies and actions that he wants to pursue. However, that is not the focus of this study. While ideals and concepts can certainly be teased out of topical speeches that the presidents have made, it seemed much more direct to go to the sources where ideals and concepts have found a home. By their very nature, inaugural addresses are prospective, visionary, idealistic, and in many cases inspirational. The only variable is whether or not they address the topic of public service that is of interest here.

The second concern is that these speeches are being studied absent the historical context in which they were given. While it is true that many inaugural addresses refer to issues of the day such as Lincoln’s inaugural addresses which focused on the Civil War and its implications for the country, many of the other inaugural addresses focused on the presidents’ view of the country, the political system (democracy and republican type of government); the importance of the Constitution; and the role of the president and the Executive Branch in relation to the other branches of government and to the people. These issues transcend the issues of the day. Certainly, presidents are influenced by their time and place within history, however, that is usually a secondary issue when studying inaugural addresses for when these speeches are given the orators are trying to reach beyond the present and place themselves in the entire context of American history and government. In that all of the inaugural addresses have been reviewed and not just a select few, current affairs and the context of the times take a secondary place in the analysis. Also, the emphasis of the study on the ideal allows current context to take a back seat.
Finally, because there is consistency in terms of the types of topics addressed in these speeches and consistency as to when, to whom and by whom they are given, the primacy of current events is minimized in most cases.36

On the other hand, there are several strengths associated with this approach. Presidents have given an inaugural address after each election cycle and after they take the oath of office every four years since George Washington’s first term in 1789. The address is open to the public who can listen to it or read it when it is published. Since printed text is being used in this study for the content and textual analysis any bias created by oratorical eloquence has been eliminated. Also, by studying all of the addresses and not using a selective process such as studying a sample of some other types of texts, it is possible to see trends as they have developed.

Finally, analysis of the inaugural addresses is not unusual. While there have not been many such studies in the political science and public administration fields, there have been several studies conducted in the journalism and speech communications fields.37 As a body of work to be analyzed, these addresses seem to have been underutilized for thematic and symbolic meanings and analysis in the fields of political science and public administration. Keeping in mind that the purpose of this study is to discuss the ideal of public service, content and textual

---

36 In those few cases where current events do dominate the addresses, it is important to understand that on some occasions current events were affecting the very survival of the country. One of the best examples of this situation was during the Lincoln presidency. It is evident in the reading of Lincoln’s inaugural addresses. He speaks of the perils of impending civil war in his first address and the job of putting the country back together in his second inaugural address.

analysis appears to be the best method of analysis compared to other possible methods such as survey research or interviews.

**Conclusion**

In attempting to trace the ideal of public service through American public administration history certain questions may be answered. These questions include what the ideal of public service is, what it has been, and what it should be. The research question posed earlier: “Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the idea of public service?” encompasses the broader questions of the ideals of public service and how it has changed. In the next chapter, the data derived from the analysis and the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis will be discussed.
CHAPTER 4
THE INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the results of the analysis conducted on the content of the inaugural addresses. As described in the previous chapter, I conducted a content analysis on the inaugural addresses to determine how the ideal of public service has changed over time and whether this change reflects an emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness to the detriment of other ideals of public service. A search of all of the inaugural addresses\(^1\) for words related to the nine public service criteria comprised the quantitative part of the analysis. The listings of the words, by criteria, that were considered are found in Appendix B and Appendix C. The qualitative review consisted of drawing out phrases, paragraphs, and sections from the inaugural addresses that related to one or more of the public service criteria considered. This chapter discusses the results and findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses first by criteria and then overall. Trends, when evident in either set of information, will be discussed. In some cases, trends are most evident when some of the criteria are collapsed and consolidated. Discussion of why certain criteria were consolidated and the rationale for this consolidation is included in this chapter also. Lastly, the findings are discussed in the context of the research questions.

There are fifty-four inaugural addresses. Included in the 54 are the two by George Washington and all the others up to George W. Bush’s most recent address in 2001. The speeches are, on average, not very long, averaging 2,360 words per speech. This average

\(^1\) Appendix A contains a listing of all of the inaugural addresses reviewed and the year that the speech was made. Note that all of the presidents did not give an inaugural address.
includes George Washington’s second inaugural address of only 136 words and William Henry Harrison’s inaugural address that was 8,442 words long. Figure 1 illustrates the number of words per inaugural address.

![Number of Words in Speeches](image)

The content of the addresses covered many topics including interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, foreign policy, policies of current interest, and comments about current events. Additionally, as illustrated in Figure 2, slightly over eight percent (8.13%) on average was dedicated to content concerning public service. I did not categorize every word of the addresses into topical areas such as religion or foreign policy so I do not know if the words dedicated to public service exceeded the words dedicated to other topics.

---

2 Please note that, because of space limitations, not all of the data points of the graph have corresponding label names listed here. Please refer to Appendix A to see the order of the specific inaugural addresses on the graph.
All of the speeches made references to an “Almighty Being” or the Christian God. Some presidents quoted biblical texts or made references to them. Many presidents used the inaugural addresses to “humbly accept” the responsibility or acknowledged the responsibility given them by the voting public. Almost all the presidents discussed, with some reverence, the oath that they had taken and the gravity of that action. This thirty-five-word oath to “faithfully execute the Office of the President…and preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States” is alluded to in many of the inaugural addresses. My impression, after reading all of the addresses, is that the oath and the recitation of it made these men aware of the job they were about to accept in a way that almost nothing else did.

Many discussed the role of the United States in the world. Many of the presidents discussed the challenges that the country faced and vowed to lead the country through these challenges. In some cases, the United States was promoted as a role model or responsible state, in other cases it was the role of the United States in relationship to other nation-states.

3 *U.S. Constitution*, Article II, Section 1.
Constitutional or political issues of interest were discussed in most of the inaugural addresses. Two of the major constitutional issues were states’ rights and the relationship of the different branches of government to each other. Specific topics changed over time or changed because of the issues of interest to the President or the public. In the early inaugural addresses (Washington through Jackson), much of the discussion focused on what the government should do and how it should be done. In the next phase, the issues of political parties and states’ rights were frequently cited (Van Buren through Buchanan). After the Civil War the inaugural addresses focused more on government reform, the type of person who should be in the government, how it should be run, and the role of government (Grant through Taft). The next phase reflected in the inaugural addresses occurred when the United States entered the global arena during World War I and the focus of these addresses was the role that the United States was going to play in the changing world (Wilson through Hoover). During the 1930s and 1940s Hoover and Roosevelt concentrated on the country’s internal problems, including the economy and later the Depression, in their inaugural addresses until Roosevelt shifted the emphasis in his inaugural addresses toward the country’s role in the world once America became involved in World War II.

The primary research question considered in this dissertation is: Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service? Additional research questions of interest are: Has the ideal or vision of public service changed? If this ideal of public service has changed and the rhetoric has emphasized different elements, is it possible to see how it changed and when it changed? The review of the speeches indicates that themes changed over time. It is difficult to determine whether all of the shifts in the discussion of these themes were deliberate attempts to set the debate or merely a reaction to the times and the issues of the day. These speeches were serious attempts by the presidents to put forth their ideas and philosophies, speak of topics that interested them, and set the agenda where possible. While many historians and public administrators may make light of these speeches as substantive, contributory documents to the field, it appears that the presidents thought of these speeches as important opportunities to express their ideas. Therefore when they expressed their concept of public service, it was with the purpose of expressing their opinion of what it should be, what people should think of it, or that it was an important element of American government.
Additionally, in some cases, the time dedicated to talking about public service meant time away from another topic.

**Self-Sacrifice**

The concept of self-sacrifice, according to Perry’s definition, is the “willingness to substitute service to others for tangible personal rewards.”\(^4\) Perry used a quote from Kennedy’s inaugural address regarding the call to service he made: “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country”\(^5\) as the “classic example of an appeal to this self-sacrifice motive.”\(^6\) This component of the ideal of public service permeates the discussion about public service and from this self-sacrifice component we associate the idea that the public service is a higher calling or a noble endeavor.

Wolf and Bacher differentiated between job, career, and vocation as the different worlds of public service employment. The concept of self-sacrifice is most closely linked to the world of vocation. Wolf and Bacher stated:

One popular notion of vocation builds on the German concept of *Beruf* or calling. During the sixteenth-century Reformation period, Martin Luther and others emphasized that vocation is played out in response to God’s call through one’s daily activities, especially occupational roles. A call implies a caller or a source of call, thereby introducing a transpersonal aspect to the idea of vocation.\(^7\)

Coles was concerned with why people give of themselves and cited several examples of how people participated, witnessed, or became part of movements or events because of a call of service. In some of the cases that Coles studied, the people willingly and enthusiastically volunteered to participate, such as the many who joined groups like the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in the 1960s. Others volunteered out of a sense of duty or obligation, such as college students volunteering to tutor inner city disadvantaged children or people

---


assisting at the Catholic Worker soup kitchens in New York City. Yet others he studied were thrust into situations and events such as six-year-old Tess who became one of the original children that desegregated the schools in New Orleans. This act, full of danger and uncertainty, was one of self-sacrifice performed for the good of others who would benefit from this action. She told Coles\(^8\) that she had been called to do this and he said that she drew strength from her religion and faith, believing God had called her to do this work. This act of service, originating from the call she heard and her faith, was one of historic importance for the desegregation efforts and civil rights movement that changed the perspective of justice and equal rights in this country in the second half of the twentieth century.

The concept of self-sacrifice envelops three aspects: one aspect is that of giving something up and sacrificing one thing for another, the second aspect is the calling that inspires that act of giving something up, and the third aspect is closely aligned with a sense of duty and obligation that one feels when deciding to take a particular course of action. Contemporary public administration scholars view the call to service as an opportunity for people to do meaningful work while giving up salary and other economic rewards in exchange for public service.

In some cases the presidents talked of how they were called to service. George Washington, in his first inaugural address, discussed being “summoned by my country”\(^9\) and called out of his retirement at Mount Vernon. In his second inaugural address, Grant talked about the obligation he had to “render to them [the citizens and countrymen] the best services within my power.”\(^10\) Also, Grant mentioned that he had been in service to his country since 1861, a period of twelve years, when he gave his second inaugural address in 1873. Cleveland, in his first inaugural address, talked about dedicating himself to the service of his fellow countrymen after being called to their service.

\(^8\) Robert Coles, *The Call of Service: A Witness to Idealism* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1993). The examples Coles cites in this work stem from his interviews and experiences over his career and are not all encompassing examples of all types of service or public service. For example, although he served in the armed forces he does not cite any examples from that period of his public service.


In other instances, the presidents called upon people to serve or talked of how people served the country. Jackson talked of the sacrifices that society asks of individuals to “give up a share of liberty to preserve [society]”11 and asked the people, in his second inaugural address, to make that sacrifice for the “preservation of a greater good.”12 Van Buren talked of “every burden cheerfully borne”13 and the “willingness of the people to contribute to these ends”14 when he discussed how taxes had been imposed upon the people for payment of war debts and other governmental needs. Also, he talked of those who had made sacrifices in other ways such as in defending the country and losing their lives to war.

Polk talked of the sacrifices that the people might have to make in case of war and increased taxes. Lincoln discussed the sacrifice of others in his second inaugural address when he mentioned the soldiers, widows, and orphans who needed to be cared for as the country moved to “strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds…”15 Grant asked “a determined effort on the part of every citizen to do his share toward cementing a happy union.”16 Benjamin Harrison reminded the people of the obligation owed to war veterans who had sacrificed by serving and suggested that part of that debt could be repaid by providing pensions to the military and their widows and orphans because “we owe everything to their valor and sacrifice.”17 Harding, in his inaugural address, recognized the “maimed and wounded soldiers who are present today, and through them to their comrades the gratitude of the Republic for their sacrifices in its defense.”18 He advocated universal service, either military or civic, for individuals and called upon business as well so that all might sacrifice for the country and its defense. He argued that from universal service “will come a new unity of spirit and purpose.”19

12 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
Hoover referred to the sacrifice of those who lost their lives in the First World War when he mentioned that “in thousand of homes in America, in millions of homes around the world, there are vacant chairs.”

McKinley discussed the high trust to which he had been called and willingly accepted his call to service. He continued his remarks by saying that he was inspired to serve by remembering that “no great emergency in the one hundred and eight years of our eventful national life has ever arisen that has not been met with wisdom and courage by the American people.” In his second inaugural address he asked again for people to dedicate themselves “to the task upon which we have rightly entered.” He stated:

The path of progress is seldom smooth. New things are often found hard to do. Our fathers found them so. We find them so. They are inconvenient. They cost us something. But are we not made better for the effort and sacrifice, and are not those we serve lifted up and blessed?

Others, such as Pierce, referenced the Founding Fathers and spoke of their “spirit of self-sacrificing patriotism” that should be drawn upon as an example of how to deal with future challenges.

Franklin Roosevelt, in his first inaugural address, talked of “these dark days” and stated that [they] will be worth all they cost us if they teach us that our true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow men.” Later on, in this same speech he commented that:

23 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
we cannot merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline because without such discipline no progress is made.\textsuperscript{27}

His first inaugural address was a precursor to many actions his Administration implemented to resolve the economic problems that the country was facing at that time. The proclamation of a three-day bank holiday two days after his inaugural address was the first of these actions.\textsuperscript{28}

The concept of sacrifice did not come up again until Eisenhower stated, in his first inaugural address, “no person, no home, no community can be beyond the reach of this call.”\textsuperscript{29} Earlier in his address he argued that: “We must be willing, individually and as a Nation, to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us.”\textsuperscript{30} Kennedy, in his inaugural address tied the concept of sacrifice to the struggle of the Cold War and freedom warning that “we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.”\textsuperscript{31} Lyndon Johnson, in discussing possible American involvement in conflicts, stated: “If American lives must end and American treasure be spilled, in countries we barely know, that is the price that change has demanded of conviction and of our enduring covenant.”\textsuperscript{32} Johnson also reminded people that “freedom asks more than it gives.”\textsuperscript{33} Echoing Johnson, Reagan, in his first inaugural address reminisced that “the price for this freedom at times has been high, but we have never been unwilling to pay that price.”\textsuperscript{34}

The trend of the self-sacrifice data, based on the quantitative analysis as illustrated in Figure 3 shows that self-sacrifice is moving upward during the twentieth century culminating in Kennedy’s speech and then returning to a level consistent with what it had held through most of

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{27} Ibid.
\bibitem{30} Ibid.
\bibitem{33} Ibid.
\end{thebibliography}
the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Some of the words searched for in the category of self-sacrifice such as “call” as used in “call to serve” or “call of service” or the words “burden” and “sacrifice” were powerful expressions to inspire people to deal with economic changes, war, or other hardships. In the total compilation of words searched, self-sacrifice words comprised 14.5 percent of the total words searched.

![Self Sacrifice](image)

Figure 3

The interesting aspect about the inaugural addresses that scored high on self-sacrifice quantitatively, is that more often they came after a time of challenge or as the country was getting through a time of challenge rather than before or during a challenging time. Examples of these addresses include Lincoln’s second inaugural address delivered as the Civil War was ending and Harding’s inaugural address delivered after World War I. Exceptions to this included Roosevelt’s first inaugural address during the Great Depression, Kennedy’s remarks that served

\[\text{Percent Change} \]

\[\text{Washington 1, Adams 1, Jefferson 2, Madison 2, Monroe 2, Jackson 1, Van Buren, Polk, Pierce, Lincoln 1, Grant 1, Hayes, Cleveland 1, Cleveland 2, McKinley 2, Taft, Wilson 2, Coolidge, Roosevelt 1, Roosevelt F 3, Truman, Eisenhower 2, Johnson, Nixon 2, Reagan 1, Bush, Clinton 2}\]

35 Figures 2 through 14 illustrate the quantitative compilation of the words from each address that were found for each of the nine criteria, and the collapsing of the criteria into consolidated criteria headings. The second and solid line, without data points, is the trend line of the data.
as a warning for what might lie ahead in the Cold War, and Johnson’s inaugural address during
the early stages of the American involvement in the Vietnam War.

There is a link between the quantitative and the qualitative results in the self-sacrifice
category. Whether the president was talking about his calling to serve or calling on others to
serve, there was an almost constant mention of what people should give up, what people had
given up, or what people needed to give up to contribute to the greater good and the community.
In addition, there was a strong link between duty, commitment to the public interest, and self-
sacrifice. In that these inaugural addresses were often inspirational speeches, it is not surprising
that the presidents used them as a means to ask people to give of themselves to the community or
the nation in some way. While the call to serve was made to the populace at large, it seems to
have reverberated to those who willingly joined in the service of the country. For example,
businessmen who were inspired by Roosevelt to assist in the recovery of the country during the
Great Depression by becoming “dollar a year” workers in the Federal government heard his call
and responded as did the many who volunteered to serve during World War II. Additionally,
many recently retired or current civil servants admit that they were inspired to join public service
by the call John Kennedy made to citizens during his inaugural address.

Civic Duty

The definition of civic duty that was used in this study was derived from Buchanan and
Mosher’s comments on public service and duty, especially that “…[duty] derives from the state’s
sovereign power and the role of public employees as nonelected trustees of this power.”36 Perry
expanded on this definition by referring to Mosher’s comment when he “argue(d) that the public
service ethic involves a unique sense of loyalty to duty and to the government as a whole.”37
Some of the words searched for under this category include obligation, responsibility, and
service.

All but three of the inaugural addresses mentioned civic duty and it was a recurring and dominant theme in many of the addresses. The three inaugural addresses that do not mention civic duty are Roosevelt’s fourth inaugural address, and both of Reagan’s inaugural addresses. Neither of Reagan’s inaugural addresses focused on civic duty. Rather, he stressed themes related to returning the government to the people and revitalizing the economy.

Theodore Roosevelt may have captured the sense of duty in his inaugural address better than most of the other presidents did in their speeches. The words that captured this inspiration: “Much has been given us, and much will rightfully be expected us.” Of course Kennedy’s famous expression “ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country” invoked a similar spirit of service, sacrifice, duty, responsibility, and obligation that Roosevelt had articulated. Kennedy’s call to serve appealed to the people’s sense of duty and their willingness to serve the greater good.

In the early inaugural addresses the presidents talked of their obligation to serve in the government or the duty that they had been called to fulfill as a fellow citizen. As time went on, the inaugural addresses became an opportunity for the president as chief executive to call upon others to fulfill their duty to participate in government, the public service and public life. Jackson spoke of his duty to choose men for public life “whose diligence and talents will insure in their respective stations able and faithful cooperation.” Van Buren spoke of the duty of the people to “submit to all needful restraints and exactions of municipal law.” Oftentimes the president’s sense of responsibility, his philosophy of his role in government, or as an instrument of the Constitution was cloaked in terms of his reference to his duties as chief executive. For example, William Henry Harrison stated that “the delicate duty of devising schemes of revenue

---

38 Franklin Roosevelt’s Fourth Inaugural Address, given in January 1945, was short (588 words) and focused on the challenges of the wartime situation. The elements of public service were trumped by the war as apparently happened when Lincoln gave his Second Inaugural Address eighty years before in 1865.
40 John F. Kennedy, “Inaugural Address.”
should be left where the Constitution has placed it – with the immediate representatives of the people.”

Polk, in 1845, was one of the first presidents to discuss the specific duty of public officers in his inaugural address. He pledged “a strict performance of duty will be exacted from all public officers.” This became a theme in the next several inaugural addresses through the nineteenth century of Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Harrison, and McKinley and set the tone of discussion about the public service and what the obligation of public service was for the public servant. Taylor talked of his duty as president to use the Constitution as his guide and his intent to call upon those in the executive branch “whose talents, integrity, and purity of character will furnish ample guaranties for the faithful and honorable performance of the trusts to be committed to their charge.” Pierce called for “a devoted integrity in the public service and a rigid economy in all departments” that would not have to be questioned or ever in doubt. He talked of the necessity of the qualities of “diligence, integrity, and capacity” for himself and all other public servants. Buchanan stressed the need for public virtue in government. Lincoln talked of his duty to serve and also for judges’ to accept their responsibility to decide cases without regard for the political purposes for which the decisions would be used after they were made.

Grant spoke of duty in three contexts: (1) the duty that he was going to assume as he became president, (2) the duty of the war veterans to “maintain the national honor,” and (3) the duty of all of the public servants, including himself, to “execute all laws in good faith, collect all revenues assessed, and to have them properly accounted for and economically disbursed.” In Grant’s second inaugural address, he pledged to “correct abuses that have grown up in the civil

46 Franklin Pierce, “Inaugural Address”
47 Ibid.
48 Ulysses S. Grant, “First Inaugural Address.”
service of the country”⁴⁹ and to continue the reform efforts that started under his first Administration.

Hayes discussed how his duty was to protect the rights of all. More importantly, Hayes addressed the issue of civil service reform in his speech. He stressed that the reform was needed and argued how the reform would result in a return to the ideals and practices of the Founding Fathers, particularly the ideals of duty and service when he stated:

I ask the attention of the public to the paramount necessity of reform in our civil service – a reform not merely as to certain abuses and practices of so-called official patronage which have come to have the sanction of usage in the several Departments of our Government, but a change in the system of appointment itself; a reform that shall be thorough, radical, and complete; a return to the principles and practices of the founders of the Government. They neither expected nor desired from public officers any partisan service. They meant that public officers should owe their whole service to the Government and to the people. They meant that the officer should be secure in his tenure as long as his personal character remained untarnished and the performance of his duties satisfactory. They held that appointments to office were not to be made nor expected merely as rewards for partisan services…⁵⁰

Garfield mentioned in his address that “it will be the purpose of my Administration to…require the honest and faithful service of all executive officers.”⁵¹ Cleveland, in his first inaugural address, discussed his obligation to serve and he discussed the obligation of public servants to “closely limit public expenditures”⁵² and asked the citizenry to “owe the country a vigilant watch and close scrutiny of its public servants and a fair and reasonable estimate of their fidelity and usefulness.”⁵³

Benjamin Harrison discussed the responsibility of citizens to understand the Constitution and their duties as citizens. Another concern Harrison discussed in this address was immigration

⁴⁹ Ulysses S. Grant, “Second Inaugural Address.”
⁵³ Ibid.
policy. He was concerned about immigrants understanding the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. He said:

> We accept the man as a citizen without any knowledge of his fitness and he assumes the duties of citizenship without any knowledge as to what they are. The privileges of American citizenship are so great and its duties so grave that we may well insist upon a good knowledge of every person applying for citizenship and a good knowledge by him of our institutions.\(^{54}\)

In addition he discussed the responsibility of nominating public officers and the burden of doing so without personally knowing them. He stated in his speech that he thought “a high sense of duty and an ambition to improve the service should characterize all public officers”\(^{55}\) and he expected that they would justify their appointment by a “conspicuous efficiency in the discharge of their duties.”\(^{56}\) He was not opposed to hiring people with partisan connections but stressed that those qualifications were insufficient to qualify them for public service positions. He stressed that the sooner the civil service was comprised of those selected on qualities of integrity in an impartial process the better the civil service laws would be enforced and implemented.

Wilson discussed duty in moral terms rather than in the specific particulars associated with the civil service reform discussions of the late 1800s. He linked duty with commitment and justice and argued that there was a moral purpose associated with public service and governance.

Eisenhower argued that the country’s needs and the care of freedom were duties that necessitated placing those responsibilities above individual comforts and needs. Kennedy reinforced this argument in stressing the need for Americans to defend freedom and the country if necessary. Nixon, in his first inaugural address argued that:

> Our greatest need is to reach beyond government, and to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed. What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all. The lesson of past agony is that without the people we can do nothing; with the people we can do everything.\(^{57}\)

\(^{54}\) Benjamin Harrison, “Inaugural Address.”

\(^{55}\) Ibid.

\(^{56}\) Ibid.

He saw that the call for service and the obligation and duty for people to serve had to come from within the individual and the community not from the government asking for the assistance of its citizens to serve.

There was a slight decreasing trend in the quantitative results regarding civic duty. Civic duty made up almost eight percent (7.88%) of the words searched in the speeches for public service relevance. Although there was a declining trend there was not much variance in this category over time. Some of the quantitative high and low points, as illustrated in Figure 4, were not repeated in the qualitative review of the speeches. For example, Roosevelt’s third inaugural address, given shortly before the country entered World War II, was a high point quantitatively for the civic duty category, but not qualitatively. Most of his speech was reflective and retrospective concerning the dedication of the people during crises. He discussed the spirit of America whose vitality was “written into our own Mayflower Compact, into the Declaration of Independence, into the Constitution of the United States, into the Gettysburg Address.”

![Figure 4](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/froos3.htm)
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George Bush, in 1989, said “the old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in.”59 George W. Bush said in his inaugural address “where there is suffering, there is duty.”60 In 1989 and 2001, the Presidents Bush urged individuals to become involved in their communities and assist those in need rather than attending to their individual comforts. In the past two hundred years, the concept of civic duty has been transformed from that of the president asking the citizenry to contribute as an obligation to the country and community to that of the urging of individuals to decide which duties to attend to, if any.

**Commitment to the Public Interest**

Commitment to the public interest, according to Perry, is “one of the most commonly identified normative foundations for public service.”61 Perry relied on the argument that Anthony Downs had made in *Inside Bureaucracy* that the “desire to serve is essentially altruistic even when the public interest is conceived as an individual’s opinion.”62 Perry and Wise asserted that while not all in public administration agreed with Downs’ description of the public interest, there was broad agreement that this desire to serve or commitment to the public interest was a major component of public service motivation.63 Commitment to the public interest has two components: commitment and public interest. Therefore, it is useful to look at the phrase broken down into its two components. The first aspect is commitment to the profession of the public service and the institutions of public service, with commitment being a binding pledge by the individual to others, an organization, or an institution because identification with or involvement in one of these communities is perceived as something good by the individual. Bailey said, “…the very call to serve a larger public often evokes a degree of selflessness and

62 Ibid.
nobility on the part of public servants beyond the capacity of cynics to recognize or believe.”

The second aspect is the public interest, which Wamsley, et.al described as a “…concern for broader public principles and values; in other words, a concern for the more inclusive principles we commonly call the public interest.” If the phrase is interpreted in its entirety, “commitment to the public interest,” it encompasses the responsibility of the individual to the rest of the political community as a participant in civic responsibility and social governance. Commitment is an action of assuming responsibilities and obligations, when one joins or becomes part of a community, to look beyond one’s self-interest. It is recognition by the individual that the “public interest” may overtake self-interest in order to create, maintain or improve the political community. It is acceptance by the individual of the values of the community.

Some of the words in this category included pledge, commit, compact, covenant, oath, owe, affirm, and ideal. These words comprised 9.6% of the total public service words searched. Commitment to the public interest shares many similarities with the categories of duty and self-sacrifice. In many of the inaugural addresses, these ideals overlapped and this is not surprising. When one commits to something, one has assumed a duty to complete this action of commitment. Also, in many cases, commitment involves a sacrifice – in the case of public service, it is common to hear of the financial sacrifice of salary.

Every inaugural address has contained a pledge of some type. One type of pledge that the presidents made included a pledge to act on behalf of the American people or for the American people. Garfield pledged to:

- maintain the authority of the nation in all places within its jurisdiction; to enforce the obedience to all the laws of the Union in the interests of the people; to demand rigid economy in all the expenditures of the Government, and to require the honest and faithful service of all executive officers, remembering that the offices were created, not for the benefit of incumbents or their supporters, but for the service of the Government.66

---


Another pledge was to further the American dream or spirit or restore the American spirit. When Wilson gave his first inaugural address, Democrats controlled both houses of Congress and the Administration. He mentioned this at the beginning of his address and then went on to discuss that the country had allowed the riches that it had acquired from industrial achievements to be squandered and the costs of the success not adequately considered. He claimed in this address that:

We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life again with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried at our hearts. Our work is a work of restoration.  

Still another pledge reflecting a commitment to some principle found in the addresses was to fulfill the obligations of the presidency as set forth in the Constitution. Cleveland stated “he who takes the oath today to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States only assumes the solemn obligation which every patriotic citizen…should share with him.”

Another vow was to act according to God’s will, in God’s name, or with assistance from God. Hoover said that the taking of the oath “is a dedication and consecration under God to the highest office in service of our people.”

Another pledge was to act in the best interest of the American people. Monroe declared:

conscious of my own deficiency, I cannot enter on these duties without great anxiety for the result. From a just responsibility I will never shrink, calculating with confidence that in my best efforts to promote the public welfare my motives will always be duly appreciated and my conduct viewed with that candor and indulgence which I have experienced in other stations.

---
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Another pledge was to protect the economic interests and act frugally with monies collected from the people. Cleveland argued that there needed to be a commitment by the people and for the people (by the public servant) to be frugal with the government’s work:

Every citizen owes to the country a vigilant watch and close scrutiny of its public servants and a fair and reasonable estimate of their fidelity and usefulness….It is the duty of those serving the people in public place to closely limit public expenditures to the actual needs of the Government economically administered.71

Another commitment was to respect the ideals of the Founding Fathers and act in a way befitting the traditions they established. McKinley spoke of the Founding Fathers in his second inaugural address:

The prophets of evil were not the builders of the Republic, nor in crises since have they saved or served it. The faith of the fathers was a mighty force in its creation, and the faith of their descendants has wrought its progress and furnished its defenders….The path of progress is seldom smooth. New things are often found hard to do. Our fathers found them so. We find them so. They are inconvenient. They cost us something. 72

In addition, presidents often asked in the inaugural addresses that the American people join in a pledge to act as good citizens of the country, good citizens of the world, act in the best interest of the community rather than in self-interest, or serve the country in some way. Roosevelt reminded Americans in his first inaugural address that “in every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory”73 and in these words asked for the people’s support. Kennedy said: “in your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.”74 Clinton urged that: “Each and every one of us, in our own way, must assume personal responsibility, not only for ourselves and our families, but for our neighbors and our nation. Our greatest responsibility is to embrace a new spirit of community for a new century.”75 George W. Bush stressed personal responsibility in his address too. He stated:
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Our public interest depends on private character, on civic duty and family bonds and basic fairness, on uncounted, unhonored acts of decency which gives direction to our freedom. Sometimes in life we are called to do great things….The most important tasks of a democracy are done by everyone.\textsuperscript{76}

Commitment shows a slightly increasing trend, in the quantitative data, illustrated in Figure 5, over time. However, the variance from the average percentage does not change significantly. Some of the words that were searched in this category are words used to encourage people by the president’s pledge to do something, and in some instances to ask for the people of the country to do something during his tenure. This action may have included sacrificing or acting in ways that the people had not done so before. It may be that there was less need to use such inspirational rhetoric in the early days of the Republic. Perhaps in the early days of the country presidents were more concerned with validating their personal commitment to the new country and governance structure rather than concerned with calling upon others to serve and participate in the government. Another reason may be that partisan politics was a more subtle issue in government and politics in the early days of the Republic.\textsuperscript{77} As the country grew and the government stabilized, there may have been a sense, on the part of these leaders, that the citizenry needed to rededicate themselves and be called upon to participate in the civic life of the country.

Along with self-sacrifice, the trend of the data in this category of commitment to the public interest are increasing but as with civic duty, it is interesting to see the differences in what the presidents are urging the citizenry to commit to when they give their inaugural addresses. It seems that Kennedy and Johnson’s inaugural addresses were the last of the speeches that included a pledge from the presidents that the government and the collective of American people could do more for the people and others in the world. In the past thirty-five years, it is hard to

\textsuperscript{76} George W. Bush, “Inaugural Address.”
\textsuperscript{77} The election of 1800 between Jefferson and Adams was a close election and had strong partisan tones but the candidates were not campaigning for office as candidates do today. Party identification was more subtle than is common today. Jefferson acknowledged this partisanship in his first inaugural address when he said: “We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists.” It may have been a conciliatory gesture on Jefferson’s part toward reconciliation to the Federalists who were part of the government and an acknowledgement that his chief rival for the presidency had been John Adams who was also a close friend. Both David McCullough’s book, \textit{John Adams} and Joseph Ellis’ book, \textit{American Sphinx: The Character of Thomas Jefferson} discuss this issue in depth.
find presidents making promises in their inaugural addresses regarding the ability of the
government to solve problems. Instead the presidents urged personal responsibility and
individual commitments to do better and called on people to undertake action because of their
personal beliefs and morality.

![Commitment Diagram](image)

**Social Justice**

Social justice “involves activities intended to enhance the well-being of minorities who lack
political and economic resources,” according to Perry’s definition. The social justice
category contained words such as honor, virtues, equality, fairness, and justice. Many of the
inaugural addresses included remarks about the importance of justice as a fundamental role of
the government. The information compiled from the qualitative review of the inaugural
addresses fit into four major themes. The themes are rights, equality, freedom, and justice. In

---

the subset of rights, topics discussed were the rights of individuals, the right to vote, states’ rights and the rights of nations. The theme of equality encompassed equality of individuals for groups of people including freed slaves, immigrants, and women. Freedom was another theme that was mentioned often. The freedoms mentioned included freedom from tyranny, freedom of speech and expression, and the freedom of religion and worship. Justice included economic justice, representative democracy, the rule of law, and the importance of law in society.

Washington discussed the tension of individual rights versus “public harmony” as a factor that the legislature would have to consider in public policy deliberations. Other presidents acknowledged that tension in their speeches also. William Henry Harrison noted that the people had certain rights and “…the only legitimate right to govern is an express grant of power from the governed. The Constitution of the United States is the instrument containing this grant of power to the several departments composing the Government.” In further explanation of this point, he said “there are certain rights possessed by each individual American citizen which in his compact with the others he has never surrendered. Some of them, indeed, he is unable to surrender, being, in the language of our system, unalienable.”

Adams reminded his audience of the nation’s origins in revolution when he said “representatives of this nation…not only broke to pieces the chains which were forging and the rod of iron that was lifted up, but frankly cut asunder the ties which had bound them…” Jefferson, a colleague of Adams in the Continental Congress during the American Revolution, was concerned that some of the ideas that the revolutionaries had fought for would be forgotten over time. He talked of the need for the minority to be heard and their rights protected. He said:

“All too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possesses their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.”

---
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Polk shared Jefferson’s concern about the rights of minorities and argued: “One great object of the Constitution was to restrain majorities from oppressing minorities or encroaching upon their just rights. Minorities have a right to appeal to the Constitution as a shield against such oppression.” Additionally, Polk said that it was the President’s responsibility to be the President to the “whole people of the United States [and] our fellow-citizens who have differed with him in opinion are entitled to the full and free exercise of their opinions and judgment, and … entitled to respect and regard.” Benjamin Harrison warned that: “The community that by concert, open or secret, among its citizens denies to a portion of its members their plain rights under the law has severed the only safe bond of social order and prosperity.”

One of the philosophical debates that had not been settled in the deliberations over the Constitution was the issue of states’ rights and national rights. This debate was not new and had been a source of constant tension throughout the American Revolution as states made unilateral decisions on policies such as determining when and where they would muster troops or contribute supplies to the war effort. John Quincy Adams recognized how much power the states contained and acknowledged their limited but individual sovereignty in his inaugural address. He signaled that the Federal government would not interfere with individual states’ rights when he said: “It holds out to us a perpetual admonition to preserve alike and with equal anxiety the rights of each individual State in its own government and the rights of the whole nation in that of the Union.”

As time went on, this debate concerning states’ rights did not diminish but was recast as other issues became intertwined in the debate. The most emotional of these issues was slavery and the different policies the states adopted with respect to the ownership of slaves. Van Buren, the first to discuss slavery in his inaugural address, recognized the compromise that had been

---

realized the power of the majority but asserted that the minority view should be considered and laws could be written to protect the rights of the minority.
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reached in the deliberations over the Constitution and suggested that the compromise should stand. Pierce pointed out that slavery had been part of the deliberations to create the Constitution and he claimed that it was a right granted in that document like other rights. Buchanan recognized the action of Congress that occurred previous to his inauguration that allowed for the majority of a territory to determine the question of domestic slavery. He added that the courts would settle any disputes so that the resolution of the problem did not rest with him.

Grant confronted the issue of voting rights for freed slaves in his speeches. He mentioned that: “The question of suffrage is one which is likely to agitate the public so long as a portion of the citizens of the nation are excluded from its privileges in any State.”\(^{88}\) He recognized that the freed slaves were citizens and they were being denied “the civil rights which citizenship should carry with it”\(^{89}\) and it was a wrong that needed to be corrected. Also, he voiced support for the recently ratified Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution. However, this issue was not resolved during his presidency. Hayes mentioned in his address “…it must be a government which guards the interests of both races carefully and equally. It must be a government which submits loyally and heartily to the Constitution and the laws…accepting and obeying faithfully the whole Constitution as it is.”\(^{90}\) Garfield continued the public debate saying:

…under our institutions there was no middle ground for the negro race between slavery and equal citizenship. There can be no permanent disenfranchised peasantry in the United States. Freedom can never yield its fullness of blessings so long as the law or its administration places the smallest obstacle in the pathway of any virtuous citizen.\(^{91}\)

Of course resolution of the right to vote for former slaves was only part of the solution of the suffrage issue. Hayes advocated universal education so voters would be informed of their choices. It was not until Harding’s address in 1921 that the issue of women’s voting rights was mentioned in the addresses. He said:

\(^{88}\) Ulysses S. Grant, “First Inaugural Address.”
\(^{89}\) Ulysses S. Grant, “Second Inaugural Address.”
\(^{90}\) Rutherford B. Hayes, “Inaugural Address.”
\(^{91}\) James A. Garfield, “Inaugural Address.”
With the nation-wide induction of womanhood into our political life, we may count upon her intuitions, her refinements, her intelligence, and her influence to exalt the social order. We count upon her exercise of the full privileges and the performance of the duties of citizenship to speed the attainment of the highest state.92

Harding’s remarks were a nod to the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment93 in 1920. This amendment provided women the right to vote and Harding was the first president elected after this amendment was ratified.

As the United States started to get more involved in relationships with other nations there were statements about what our responsibilities should be in those relationships. In the early days of the country there was a reluctance to get involved, as shown in the early inaugural addresses. Van Buren argued that we had reluctantly fought in war but when we did, “we saw that the energies of our country would not be wanting in ample season to vindicate its rights.”94 In other words, if we were to enter into war then we were going to fight to win, and when we fought, the reason would be to protect our rights.

Once involved in conflict with other countries or in relationships with foreign countries there was a sense that we needed to exert the moral principles of justice and freedom that we professed as a country. Wilson said in his second inaugural address that “…we have still been clear that we wished nothing for ourselves that we were not ready to demand for all mankind – fair dealing, justice, the freedom to live and to be at ease against organized wrong.”95 In this same inaugural address, given a month before the United States entered World War I, Wilson said: “We have been obliged to arm ourselves to make good our claim to a certain minimum of

---
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right and of freedom of action.”96 Eisenhower, in his second inaugural address, acknowledging the risks and struggles of Communism and the role that the United States was playing in countering this risk, stated “we look upon this shaken earth, and we declare our firm and fixed purpose--the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails.”97 He saw the struggle against Communism as a struggle for peace and justice on a global basis. Eisenhower asserted later in this speech that:

> We must use our skills and knowledge and, at times, our substance, to help others rise from misery, however far the scene of suffering may be from our shores. For wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope, the hope of progress--or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict.98

In this speech, Eisenhower asserted that the country was obligated to be a participant in the struggle against Communism and had a responsibility to support other countries and reinforce and strengthen the authority of the United Nations in this struggle. He said:

> There must be justice, sensed and shared by all peoples, for, without justice the world can know only a tense and unstable truce. There must be law, steadily invoked and respected by all nations, for without law, the world promises only such meager justice as the pity of the strong upon the weak. But the laws of which we speak, comprehending the values of freedom, affirms the equality of all nations, great and small.99

Freedom is another subtopic of social justice that some of the presidents discussed in their speeches. Van Buren discussed freedom of speech when he said: “our system, purified and enhanced in value by all it has encountered, still preserves its spirit of free and fearless discussion, blended with unimpaired fraternal feeling.”100 Polk pointed out that:

> All distinctions of birth or rank have been abolished. All citizens, whether native or adopted, are placed upon terms of precise equality. All are entitled to equal rights and equal protection. No union exists between church and state, and perfect freedom of opinion is guaranteed to all sects and creeds.101

---
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Eisenhower commented on the “virtues most cherished by free people – love of truth, pride of
work, devotion to country – all are treasures equally precious in the lives of the most humble and
most exalted.” Kennedy talked of the obligation that those in a free society had when he said
“if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.”

The final theme of the social justice category is justice. Benjamin Harrison stressed the
importance of the rule of law and linked the willing obedience to the law and civil and political
rights as part of a covenant of the people and the government. McKinley also connected rights
with the law when he said:

The great essential to our happiness and prosperity is that we adhere to the principles
upon which the Government was established and insist upon its faithful observance.
Equality of rights must prevail, and our laws be always and everywhere respected
and obeyed.

Other presidents talked about the different categories of justice and what justice meant to them
or to that time. Wilson said that the “firm basis of government is justice, not pity….The first
duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves.” Hoover emphasized the rule of law as a
tenet of government and emphasized more of a “law and order” approach to justice stressing that
citizens needed to support the laws and public servants must ensure that the laws were being
enforced and followed. Coolidge had said previously:

In a republic the first rule for the guidance of the citizen is obedience to law….Under
a free government the citizen makes his own laws, chooses his own administrators,
which do represent him. Those who want their rights respected under the
Constitution and the law ought to set the example themselves of observing the
Constitution and the law.

Lyndon Johnson appealed to the people’s trust and belief in liberty and justice as their guides.

---
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Figure 6, illustrating the quantitative data associated with social justice, shows a steadily downward trend over time. The qualitative data support this trend also but do not match up by address, only by time period. There is evidence in some of the earliest inaugural addresses that rights and equality were important issues to some of the presidents.

![Social Justice Chart]

It is not surprising to find Adams, Jefferson, and Madison concerned with these issue areas. Adams was a key figure in the Continental Congress and wrote the Massachusetts Constitution. Jefferson, as the author of the Declaration of Independence, and Madison, as one of the chief architects and defenders of the development and defense of the U.S. Constitution, are not surprising advocates for the rights and freedoms similar to those found in the documents they wrote and championed. John Quincy Adam’s confrontation of the issue of states’ rights in his address was probably more of a reaction to the issues of the day while his discussion of human rights seemed to be an explanation of his personal philosophy. Others such as William Henry Harrison, Franklin Pierce, and Abraham Lincoln had high quantitative levels of words found in this category but it was difficult to see any consistent themes related to social justice in their addresses when reviewed in total from the qualitative perspective. In contrast, neither of Grant’s
inaugural addresses scored high in this category quantitatively but his statements about the rights and need for equality of treatment of former slaves are among the most powerful statements in any of the inaugural addresses in support of equality and civil rights.

In the twentieth century, the addresses that scored the highest were Woodrow Wilson’s second address, Franklin Roosevelt’s fourth address, and Jimmy Carter’s address but there were only corresponding qualitative findings in Wilson’s address. However, it was surprising with all of the rights legislation and interest of the second half of the twentieth century that quantitative and qualitative findings in this category were lower than other periods of time. It may be that the actions by the courts and public opinion were racing far ahead of what could be said in these addresses. Perhaps some of the leaders were hoping that the actions of their government were sufficient in addressing this area of interest and discussing the issue in the speeches was unnecessary. Or, perhaps the presidents of the last half of the twentieth century have ceded control of social justice issues to the courts and have chosen to express their opinions through court filings and the less visible regulatory process thinking that is the safest approach to taking a stand and articulating their views.

Regardless of the quantitative trend, social justice as an essential component of public service is evident throughout the inaugural addresses. Over time, these inaugural addresses encompassed a number of essential themes that have shaped American history and its political life. The values of freedom, rights, equality and justice have come to define the American spirit throughout the world. When people are queried about why they came into the public service and say that they joined the public service to “make a difference,” they are often thinking of how their service and work contributes to the furtherance of social justice values such as freedom, equality, rights, and justice.

**Compassion**

Compassion combines the love of regime values with love of others according to
Perry.  

Frederickson and Hart stated that:

The ideal of American democracy assumes that a special relationship should exist between public servants and citizens. Stated briefly, it is the belief that all public administration must rest upon, and be guided by, the moral truths embodied in the enabling documents of our national foundation.

In this and subsequent work, Frederickson defined “the primary moral obligation of the public service as the patriotism of benevolence: an extensive love of all people within our political boundaries and the imperative that they must be protected in all basic rights granted to them by the enabling documents.” Regime values, according to Frederickson and Hart are “the absolute values which all elected officials and public servants are sworn to protect. They are the touchstone.”

All the presidents attempted in their inaugural addresses to establish a link between themselves and their time with the community of the Revolution and Founding Fathers. It was in the establishment of these links to the Founding Fathers and the earliest days of the government that they validated their vision of where the country had been or where it was going. Also, it is in the establishments of these links to the Founding Fathers that they expressed their agreement with and commitment to the regime values. They made these links in different ways – either by commenting on how well the government had evolved, how we should recall the founding principles, or how their ideas fit into the context of the founding principles.

Some of the words considered part of this criterion included care, charity, sympathy, and zeal. The compassion category comprised 4.37% of the total public service words searched. If the criteria were on a continuum, compassion would be closely aligned with attraction to public policy making but on the end of the continuum containing self-sacrifice, commitment, civic duty, and social justice.

---

The trend of the quantitative data illustrated in Figure 7, compiled for the compassion criteria show a slight, almost imperceptible downward trend. One reason for this trend may be the small number of words searched in this category. There may have been too few words to affect much change in any direction.

The sense of compassion related to the love of regime values is closely linked to the category of attraction to public policy-making and also linked to social justice. In some of the earliest inaugural speeches there was almost a self-congratulatory theme with the speeches sounding as if the presidents were reporting on an experiment that had been conducted with successful results. Washington and Adams set the stage in descriptive terms of what the government was to look like or what the experiment involved, and later, others reported on the
success of the experiment. Washington said “the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality, and the preeminence of free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world.” Adams said:

that to a benevolent human mind there can be no spectacle presented by any nation more pleasing, more noble, more majestic, or august, than an assembly like that which has so often been seen in this and the other Chamber of Congress, of a Government in which the Executive authority, as well as that of all the branches of the Legislature, are exercised by citizens selected at regular periods by their neighbors to make and execute laws for the general good.

Monroe, reporting on the success of this political experiment, claimed that there existed “a Government adequate to every purpose for which the social compact is formed; a Government elective in all its branches…a Government which protects every citizen in the full enjoyment of his rights…” Jackson commented that he would “look with reverence to the examples of public virtue left by my illustrious predecessors, and with veneration to the lights that flow from the mind that founded and … reformed our system.” Van Buren commented on “the success that has thus attended our great experiment” and Polk commented that “this most admirable and wisest system…has been tested by its successful operation for more than half a century”

During the Civil War there was more rhetoric about the dangers involved in allowing this experiment of American government to fail. Lincoln reminded his audience that “fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have in succession administered the executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils and generally with great success.” He made this statement as a reminder that it could be done once again but not without risk and not without adhering to the rule of law. He pledged to uphold all of the laws and the Constitution and suggested that if people disagreed with the laws that they should work
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to change them rather than disobey them. These statements reflected the love of regime values that Frederickson and Hart saw as essential to the linkage of public service to the enabling documents. In Lincoln’s second inaugural address, he addressed the risk to the survival of the nation again when he commented that “both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish.”

After the Civil War there was more focus on how the government was to evolve rather than what it was evolving from. In other words, there was an emphasis on where it was going rather than where it had been. However, in each of these cases, the presidents reached back to the past experiences of the country and the regime values to provide the context within which they were operating. McKinley reminded people of the success that the country had in the past when confronting opposition. He said that “the Republic has marched on and on, and its step has exalted freedom and humanity.” Wilson discussed that our government had “stood through a long age…that will endure against fortuitous change, against storm and accident.” Wilson argued that based on this history and tradition, the nation would be able to meet future challenges. Hoover claimed that one of the mandates from the election that brought him to the presidency was that “we would not neglect the support of the embedded ideals and aspirations of America.”

Franklin Roosevelt, in his third inaugural address, articulated a historical perspective rooted in the Founding period and also in the perspective of the people who came to the country. In this speech he was arguing for the American spirit and faith, a spirit that he said was generated from the desire for freedom. Kennedy took up where Roosevelt left off in this speech as he argued that:

We dare not forget that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans…

---
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Lyndon Johnson echoed Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt by invoking a historical link to the original settlers and Founding Fathers also. He said that: “They made a covenant with this land. Conceived in justice, written in liberty, bound in union, it was meant one day to inspire the hopes of all mankind; and it binds us still.”\(^{123}\) He continued, adding “in each generation with toil and tears, we have had to earn our heritage again.”\(^{124}\)

Reagan articulated another perspective on the legacy that the Founding Fathers left for the present day. He claimed that:

> We are a nation that has a government – not the other way around. And this makes us special among the nations of the Earth. Our Government has no power except that granted it by the people. It is time to check and reverse the government which shows signs of having grown beyond the consent of the governed.\(^{125}\)

In these words and other parts of both of his addresses, Reagan reached back to some of the debate articulated in the Federalist and Anti-Federalist papers about the size and scope of the government, centralization versus decentralization, and the role of the states in relation to the Federal Government. In so doing, he rekindled one of the most fundamental debates of American government and asserted that the source of sovereignty for the government was the people. It was the philosophical debate about the role of man in society and how society accommodates the individual. Reagan’s view was that the government must be subordinate to the individual and it should not interfere with the individual except to protect the rest of society.

Clinton acknowledged that the debate about the role of government had surfaced again. He acknowledged Reagan’s perspective by saying: “Government is not the problem, and government is not the solution. We – the American people, we are the solution.”\(^{126}\) However, he cast the debate a little differently in recognizing the value of community and the commonality of the journey that all Americans were taking together. In modifying the debate, he brought forth the other side of the debate that focused on republican tradition as well as the individual rights emphases that Reagan stressed.

\(^{123}\) Lyndon Baines Johnson, “Inaugural Address.”
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Therefore, the presidents often found that the best way to communicate their philosophy and ideas about the American governmental system was to ground themselves in the values and ideas of the Founding Fathers and that is the major focus of Perry’s compassion criteria. These values resonating with the American public and American political leaders are often best understood when the presidents used the words of the Founding Fathers when they wanted to inspire or energize the populace. What is interesting is that in the late twentieth century the use of the Anti-Federalist ideas seems to have overtaken the Federalist ideas.

Attraction to Public Policy-Making

Attraction to policy is the criterion that covers the “interest and opportunity to participate in public policy-making.” The importance of this category for James Perry’s public service motivation instrument differs from the importance one would expect from those who had already chosen public service as a career. Attraction to public policy-making is an inherent characteristic of political actors. As leaders of the government, the degree to which they spoke of policy, how they spoke of it, and what policies they focused on are of interest here. It is not possible to know, based on this analysis alone, whether the interest in these policies inspired the leaders to participate and craft the policies they discussed or if the times demanded their attention and approach to the issues contained within the speeches. Although these speeches are not considered to be substantial policy speeches by most historians and public administration scholars, policy issues were discussed and the presidents’ visions and understanding of policy issues were evident in each of the speeches. The inaugural addresses are insufficient to gain a comprehensive understanding of how an individual president felt about a particular policy or what actions he took on a particular policy but they certainly are contributory documents to a study of what the presidents thought of particular issues. The importance of identifying themes from the speeches that dominated the policy arena over the course of American history in these inaugural addresses is the attention paid to different aspects of public service over time as well as the connection to the other criteria of public service. For example, in a review of the foreign

policy information in these addresses, there are references to justice and duty, generally the duty of this country to promote justice in its relations with other nations.

There are four theme areas that were identified in this review. The thematic areas identified are most closely linked to the concept of public service and the fundamental purposes of the government as perceived by the presidents. The themes are:

- the support and sustenance of a national military force, including an army, navy, and militias. In addition to whether the nation should have a military and how big it should be, another part of this theme is the broader issue of neutrality or intervention in military actions. This issue crosses into the foreign policy area also.

- Foreign policy. This issue area includes the discussion about what the role of the United States should be in the world. Included under this topic is the discussion of when we will intervene in foreign issues, how we will treat our friends and neighbors militarily and for trade purposes, and whether our role in the affairs of others should expand or contract.

- Self-government and the sovereignty of the people. The discussion of where the power of the government is derived, states’ rights, and the role of the government in relation to its people fall under this theme.

- Domestic issues such as elections, election reform, and civil service reform, slavery, advocacy of public health and sanitation laws, and economic stimulus by the government are included here. This thematic area includes the debate about whether government should expand and provide more services or if it should contract and have its scope limited.

One of the first leaders to discuss the need for a militia or military force was James Madison. He advocated that a well-trained militia was necessary for a republic. Monroe supported this idea as well and said, “our land and naval forces should be moderate, but adequate to the necessary purposes.”¹²⁸ Jackson, as a former military officer, supported a military force also.

Foreign policy was not as dominant a topic in the early inaugural speeches. The country’s friends and foes were well known and there were no attempts to assert any dominance over any other country. The major interest in foreign affairs was to increase trade partnerships

¹²⁸ James Monroe, “First Inaugural Address.”
and avoid war. With the exception of the acquisition of territory in the Louisiana Purchase and the expansion westward on the American continent, there are no indications from the speeches that this policy changed until the days of McKinley at the end of the nineteenth century. This inward focus was partly a reaction to the need to pay attention to internal domestic issues, partly a reaction to the distance from other foreign countries, and partly the need to attend to westward expansion and its related issues.

In McKinley’s speeches, there is more discussion of the policy of neutrality that the country had tried to maintain, and the promotion of favorable trade policies. However, it was during McKinley’s tenure that the United States became more involved in military actions that were more aggressive than defensive such as the actions in the Philippines and Cuba. Taft said that the country’s “international policy is always to promote peace.”129 He saw the involvement in foreign affairs connected to increasing trade opportunities.

During Wilson’s tenure in office, the purposes of foreign policy changed due to the war in Europe. Wilson’s second inaugural address is a descriptive microcosm of the political conflict that was underway in the United States between involvement and entry into the war and maintenance of careful and cautious neutrality. He said:

We are a composite and cosmopolitan people. We are of the blood of all the nations that are at war. The currents of our thoughts as well as the currents of our trade run quick at all seasons back and forth between us and them. The war inevitably sets its mark from the first alike upon our minds, our industries, our commerce, our politics and our social action. To be indifferent to it, or independent of it, was out of the question.130

A month after Wilson’s second inauguration, the United States entered the war. It seemed that Wilson knew that the United States’ entrance into the war was inevitable, and he hinted at this later in the address when he said:

130 Woodrow Wilson, “First Inaugural Address.”
We are provincials no longer. The tragic events of the thirty months of vital turmoil through which we have just passed have made us citizens of the world. There can be no turning back.\(^{131}\)

Wilson’s words were prophetic and despite some other attempts to pull the United States back to “[withdraw] to our own shores”\(^{132}\) as Coolidge tried, the United States had become a citizen of the world. Roosevelt reiterated Wilson’s words in 1945 as he said that: “We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace, that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of the other nations far away….We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.”\(^{133}\) Every president since Roosevelt has acknowledged this responsibility in his inaugural address.

The issue of self-government and creation of the United States governmental system was a topic often discussed in these speeches. In the earliest inaugural speeches, the topic was discussed by those Founding Fathers who had helped create the Constitution. In addition to using the inaugural speech as an opportunity to give their views on the Constitution and the ways in which the country was developing, there is almost a sense that they were in awe of what they had created and shaped. Adams said:

> Can authority be more amiable and respectable when it descends from accidents or institutions established in remote antiquity than when it springs fresh from the hearts and judgments of an honest and enlightened people? For it is the people only that are represented. It is their power and majesty that is reflected, and only for their good, in every legitimate government, under whatever form it may appear. The existence of such a government as ours for any length of time is a full proof of a general dissemination of knowledge and virtue throughout the whole body of the people.\(^{134}\)

Other presidents commented about “how near our Government has approached to perfection” and the “high destiny which seems to await us.”\(^{135}\)

---

\(^{131}\) Woodrow Wilson, “Second Inaugural Address.”

\(^{132}\) Calvin Coolidge, “Inaugural Address.”


\(^{134}\) John Adams, “Inaugural Address.”

\(^{135}\) James Monroe, “First Inaugural Address.”
Another part of the self-government theme was the importance of the Constitution and the rule of law. There were differences among the presidents as to how strictly they interpreted the Constitution and the powers conferred in it. The perspective and interpretation influenced the debate about states’ rights and the federal government’s relationship to the state governments. John Quincy Adams remarked that “the General Government of the Union and the separate governments of the States are all sovereignties of limited powers”\(^{136}\) Polk said “each state is a complete sovereignty within the sphere of its reserved powers.”\(^{137}\) Pierce argued that if the Federal government only exercised powers granted by the Constitution, then the States would be able to manage their affairs according to the people’s will.

Domestic issues such as elections and election reform and the right to vote were mentioned often in the addresses right before and after the Civil War. Buchanan, Hayes, and Garfield commented on how the election process had been passionate and controversial but once the election had been decided, the process of transition from one administration to another was calm and orderly. Among the post-war issues Grant and Hayes brought up for resolution were the suffrage questions of voting rights for former slaves. The Fifteenth Amendment was ratified in 1870 but had not been uniformly implemented in all of the states. Both Grant and Hayes used their inaugural addresses as a forum to urge states and localities to allow these rights to former slaves. Later, Benjamin Harrison reflected on some of the challenges and achievements that the country had endured, including his reference to the abolition of slavery when he said that “mill fires were lighted at the funeral pile of slavery,…men were made free, and material things became our better servants.”\(^{138}\)

Civil service reform and the limits of public servants was also a domestic issue that originated with Buchanan’s comment about it not being necessary for the public service to “strain the language of the Constitution.”\(^{139}\) He continued by saying that “…long experience and observation have convinced me that a strict construction of the powers of the Government is the

\(^{136}\) John Quincy Adams, “Inaugural Address.”
\(^{137}\) James Knox Polk, “Inaugural Address.”
\(^{138}\) Benjamin Harrison, “Inaugural Address.”
only true, as well as the only safe, theory of the Constitution.” Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, and McKinley made prominent mention of civil service reform efforts that were under discussion during this time and indicated their strong support for the measures under consideration. In his second inaugural address, Grant discussed his “…earnest desire to correct abuses that have grown up in the civil service of the country.” He continued by stating that:

To secure this reformation rules regulating methods of appointment and promotions were established and have been tried. My efforts for such reformation shall be continued to the best of my judgment. This spirit of the rules adopted will be maintained.

Hayes also supported civil service reform and recognized the bipartisan support the issue had when he said in his inaugural address:

The fact that both the great political parties of the country, in declaring their principles prior to the election, gave a prominent place to the subject of reform of our civil service, recognizing and strongly urging its necessity, in terms almost identical in their specific import with those I have here employed, must be accepted as a conclusive argument in behalf of these measures. It must be regarded as the expression of the united voice and will of the whole country upon this subject, and both political parties are virtually pledged to give it their unreserved support.

Earlier in his address he discussed what needed to be reformed and why reforms were necessary. In particular, he was concerned with the means of appointments and wanted appointments to be based on merit rather than as a reward for partisanship. He wanted “a return to the principles and practices of the founders of the government…[who]…neither expected nor desired from public officers any partisan service.”

James Garfield urged civil service reform in his address also. He stated:

The civil service can never be placed on a satisfactory basis until it is regulated by law. For the good of the service itself, for the protection of those who are intrusted with the appointing power against the waste of time and obstruction to the public business caused by the inordinate pressure for place, and for the protection of

---
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incumbents against intrigue and wrong, I shall at the proper time ask Congress to fix the tenure of the minor offices of the several Executive Departments and prescribe the grounds upon which removals shall be made during the terms for which incumbents have been appointed.\textsuperscript{145}

The irony of Garfield’s advocacy for civil service reform in his inaugural address was that he was assassinated later that year by a disappointed office seeker. The Pendleton Act, originally introduced in 1880, became law in 1883 when President Arthur signed it.

Cleveland expressed the hope of what the results of civil service reform would foster. He urged citizens to keep careful watch over those in public service to ensure that they remained trustful and useful in their jobs. He urged public servants to be aware of the trust that had been given to them to watch over public expenditures. He reminded people in his first inaugural address that:

\begin{quote}
The people demand reform in the administration of the Government and the application of business principles to public affairs. As a means to this end, civil service reform should be in good faith enforced. Our citizens have the right to protection from the incompetency of public employees solely as the reward of partisan service, and from the corrupting influence of those who promise and the vicious methods of those who expect such rewards; and those who worthily seek public employment have the right to insist that merit and competency shall be recognized instead of party subserviency or the surrender of honest political belief.\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}

In his second inaugural address, eight years later, he commented that civil service reform had “…found a place in our public policy and laws.”\textsuperscript{147} He stressed the need once again for strong vigilance over public servants, the public monies, and the need for frugality and economy in public expenditures.

McKinley referred to the civil service reform and his commitment to its implementation. He wanted the changes in the civil service to be “real and genuine”\textsuperscript{148} and pledged to enforce it in the “spirit in which it was enacted.”\textsuperscript{149} He reiterated the purpose of the reform which was:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{145} James Garfield, “Inaugural Address.”
\textsuperscript{146} Grover Cleveland, “First Inaugural Address.”
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…to secure the most efficient service of the best men who would accept appointment under the Government, retaining faithful and devoted public servants in office, but shielding none, under the authority of any rule or custom, who are inefficient, incompetent, or unworthy. The best interests of the country demand this, and the people heartily approve the law wherever and whenever it has been thus administered.  

McKinley was the last of the presidents to discuss the civil service reform efforts related to the Pendleton Act in his inaugural address. However, it remained a topic of interest to successive presidents such as Theodore Roosevelt who had chaired the Civil Service Commission and William Howard Taft, under whom reorganization legislation related to budget reforms took place. It may be that by the end of the McKinley presidency, civil service reform was well-established in the institution of government and no longer necessitated a mention in the inaugural address or it may be that it no longer merited mention because of the relatively small number of federal employees covered by provisions of the Pendleton Act which was the major civil service reform of the nineteenth century.

Other policy issues of concern included immigration and naturalization policy with their assimilation and education of paramount concern so that immigrants could exercise their duties of citizenship. Universal education was another topic of interest in the late nineteenth century that Hayes and others supported. Wilson advocated government involvement in areas of public health, food safety, and sanitation services in urban areas because of the need to safeguard the health of its citizens. Wilson termed these types of efforts that of restoration of “every process of our national life with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning.” Franklin Roosevelt referred to Wilson’s addresses as he argued for government efforts to stimulate government growth through relief efforts and government employment programs that would “accomplish greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.”

Limiting the scope of government was not discussed until Nixon said, “we are approaching the limits of what government alone can do.” He argued that individuals
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controlled their destiny and the government could not solve all problems. Reagan reiterated Nixon’s argument and indicated he would take action when he said:

It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal government and those reserved to the States or the people. All of us need to be reminded that the Federal government did not create the States; the States created the Federal government.\textsuperscript{154}

The debate over how to limit the scope of government and if to limit the scope of government is open and future speeches may continue this debate.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{attraction_to_policy.png}
\caption{Attraction to Policy}
\end{figure}

In the quantitative portion of the review illustrated in Figure 8, 79 words (6.77\%) were assigned to this category of the total public service words. Some of the words searched for under this category include initiatives, priorities, policy, institutions, issues, administer, and administration. The quantitative data show a declining trend of the words in this category over

\textsuperscript{154} Ronald Reagan, “First Inaugural Address.” Reagan’s comment that “the States created the Federal government” was quite controversial. His critics appealed to the preamble of the Constitution where it states, “We the people of the United States… do ordain and establish this constitution.”
time. This trend reflects a shift in the discussions from constitutional and specific policy issue areas to less specific policy pronouncements and more general visionary statements. While the data indicate a declining trend in the inaugural addresses, it may be that there has been a separation of the discussion of specific policy issues in the inaugural addresses and an increasing trend in these issues in state of the union addresses or targeted, one-issue policy speeches. Also, this trend may reverse if the debate about limiting or expanding government continues in this forum of the inaugural addresses.

**Economy**

Economy is the production and distribution of goods and services. It is concerned with how scarce resources are used. In the quantitative review, this category far exceeded any other category in the number of words searched. This category was over thirty-six percent (36.33%) of the total words searched and had 424 words in the category. One of the reasons there were so many words in this category was because of the number of different resources mentioned such as mountains, railways, factories, farms, and rivers. Another reason for the large number of terms was the variety of terms associated with money such as cash, budget, and currency. However, this category did not overwhelm other categories in the qualitative review.

Monroe was among the first of the presidents to discuss the collection of revenue and the responsibility that the president had in disbursing the funds collected for the purposes “for which it is raised.”\(^{155}\) The general sense of the duty of the executive with respect to the economy was to collect only such revenue as was necessary for conducting the public’s business, and ensure that the expenditure of the funds was done in a frugal manner and with the public’s interest in mind. Several presidents expressed the sentiments that Buchanan put into words when he said, “no more revenue ought to be collected from the people than the amount necessary to defray the expense of a wise, economical, and efficient administration of the Government.”\(^{156}\)

\(^{155}\) James Monroe, “First Inaugural Address.”

\(^{156}\) James Buchanan, “Inaugural Address.”
One of the reasons for the necessity of civil service reform was to make public servants impartial and accountable in the management of public funds. It was expected that impartial, professional public servants would be able to manage public monies more efficiently and without prejudice toward political patrons. Grant, in his second inaugural address, was the first to discuss the link between civil service reform and economy when he argued for implementation of a merit system of appointment and promotion. He said:

It has been, and is, my earnest desire to correct abuses that have grown up in the civil service of the country. To secure this reformation rules regulating methods of appointment and promotions were established and have been tried. My efforts for such reformation shall be continued to the best of my judgment. The spirit of the rules adopted will be maintained.¹⁵⁷

This pledge was made in the address after he had mentioned some of his accomplishments from his first term, including restoration of “…harmony, public credit, commerce, and all the arts of peace and progress.”¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ Ulysses S. Grant, “Second Inaugural Address.”
¹⁵⁸ Ibid.
Harding was the first to propose solving economic problems such as unemployment with government assistance. Hoover suggested assisting those in need by cooperating with private organizations that already provided assistance to those in need. Roosevelt called for action through coordination of relief activities and government involvement in job creation. He argued that “in our seeking for economic and political progress as a nation, we all go up, or else we all go down, as one people.”

Nixon, in his pursuit to limit the scope of government, suggested in his second inaugural address that “government must learn to take less from people so that people can do more for themselves.” Reagan warned that increasing deficits and public spending would lead to social, cultural, political, and economic upheaval. The elder Bush tried to change the focus of people away from their possessions to more altruistic pursuits.

There has been little mention of economy in the inaugural addresses since Reagan. However, this topic is important to the debate over the limits of government. Interestingly, the focus on the limits of government has shifted away from the influences of economy to individual’s responsibilities and contributions to the community and society.

The trend for this category illustrated in Figure 9, shows it steadily increasing over time. However, this trend starts out negative and it does not show a positive relationship to the average percentage the addresses are being compared against until well into the mid-twentieth century. It is difficult to know whether the data from earlier addresses showing the negative values is a function of the calculation done between the number of words in this category and the number of words found in the address or some other factor.

**Efficiency**


Efficiency is the use of resources in such a way as to minimize waste and to ensure resources are put to their most valuable use. Efficiency was the category with the fewest number of words searched (30) and made up 2.57% of the total public service words searched. Some of the words in this category included frugality, industrious, thrift, and wasteful. The trend of the data, illustrated in Figure 10, was slightly downward with little variance. There were twelve inaugural addresses that had no words for this category.

Efficiency was usually discussed in the context of three situations: the collection and expenditure of revenue, the abolishment of wasteful practices in the government, and the traits and characteristics of public servants or the public service. In Jefferson’s second inaugural address he took credit for “The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses, enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes.”\(^{161}\) Jackson was concerned with the management of public revenue and pledged to give it his attention during his Administration. He pledged attention to reform of the abuses of the patronage system “which have disturbed the rightful course of appointment and have placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands.”\(^{162}\)

Cleveland advocated “reform in the administration” and the application of business principles to public affairs.”\(^{163}\) He mentioned in his first inaugural address that:

> those who are selected for a limited time to manage public affairs are still of the people, and may do much by their example to encourage, consistently with the dignity of their official functions, that plain way of life which among their fellow-citizens aids integrity and promotes thrift and prosperity.\(^{164}\)

His words came two years after the Pendleton Act had become law and after several of his predecessors had advocated the reform of the civil service system. In his second inaugural

---


\(^{162}\) Andrew Jackson, “First Inaugural Address.”

\(^{163}\) Ibid.

\(^{164}\) Grover Cleveland, “First Inaugural Address.”
address eight years later, he was still concerned with the management aspects of government and asserted “the waste of public money is a crime against the citizen.”

McKinley spoke in favor of the civil service reforms in his first inaugural address and pledged that he would enforce it and support the spirit of it. He said the purpose “was to secure the most efficient service of the best men…retaining devoted and faithful public servants in office, but shielding none…who are inefficient, incompetent, or unworthy.” Later, in his second inaugural address he stated, “honesty, capacity, and industry are nowhere more indispensable than in public employment.”

![Efficiency Graph](image)

Figure 10
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Additional discussions of efficiency were made in the context of discussions on economy and effectiveness. It is difficult in many of the addresses to separate or distinguish between economy and efficiency, efficiency and effectiveness, or all three of the categories.

**Effectiveness**

Effectiveness concerns making use of resources to accomplish what you have set out to accomplish. Included in this category were the words capable, capacity, competence, accomplishment, accountability, and productivity. The effectiveness category comprised 5.57% of the total public service words searched. The quantitative data, illustrated in Figure 11, shows a slight, consistently downward trend. However, as is the case with the efficiency category, there is little variance between the addresses so the downward trend may not be important.

There are no clear, unambiguous statements in the inaugural address that would fit solely under this category. When references to effectiveness were made, they were coupled with statements about efficiency or economy. One exception to this was a statement by Franklin Roosevelt in his second inaugural address when he said:

> Government is competent when all who compose it work as trustees for the whole people. It can make constant progress when it keeps abreast of all the facts. It can obtain justified support and legitimate criticism when the people receive true information of all that government does.¹⁶⁸

It may be that discussions of effectiveness of government operations involve more specificity of goals, objectives, and results than the presidents thought appropriate for speeches that are primarily visionary. The state of the union addresses may contain more information that would fall under this category. This finding is consistent with Tulis’ remark that:

> The inaugural address…developed along lines that emphasized popular instruction in constitutional principle and the articulation of the general tenor and direction of presidential policy, while tending to avoid discussion of particular policy proposals.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Second Inaugural Address.”
Business or the Three E’s

The combination of the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness criteria is worth reviewing also. Since there was rarely a mention of efficiency and effectiveness without a corresponding reference to economy in the text of the speeches, efficiency and effectiveness do not really have much influence on the trend of the combined category making up this category labeled “business.” In sum, as economy goes, so goes this combined category of the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

William Howard Taft’s inaugural address is the high point of the quantitative results for this “business” category. His speech concerned many elements of the economy including the issues of monopolies, tariffs, unlawful business methods, banking, labor relations, and trade policies. He advocated a reorganization of several government agencies including the Department of Justice and some components of the Departments of Labor and Commerce. He wanted to minimize the deficit but realized that people should not be overly taxed. He echoed previous presidents when he said:
The obligation on the part of those responsible for the expenditures made to carry on the Government, to be as economical as possible, and to make the burden of taxation as light as possible, is plain, and should be affirmed in every declaration of government policy.\(^{170}\)

Therefore, despite the popular impression that economy, efficiency, and effectiveness have come to dominate discussions of public policy, neither the quantitative nor qualitative analyses of the inaugural addresses support that impression.

\[\text{Figure 12}\]

\textbf{Public Regardingness}

Public regardingness is a term coined by Perry in his public service motivation study. It resulted from combining civic duty, social justice, and commitment to the public interest. He termed this combination public regardingness or “concern for the public weal.” As part of his

\(^{170}\) William Howard Taft, “Inaugural Address.”
research on his original six dimensions or criteria of public service motivation, he conducted confirmatory factor analysis, after which he collapsed and combined three of the criteria into one, leaving a total of four criteria. If the quantitative data from these criteria are combined, there is a declining trend similar to that found with the individual criteria of social justice and civic duty. The upward trend of the commitment data did not influence this downward trend of social justice and civic duty. The result of combining these data into one summarized set of data is illustrated in Figure 13.
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While this combination of criteria resulting from Perry’s work is interesting, it does not reflect the similarities and overlap I found among the criteria in either the quantitative or qualitative analyses of the inaugural addresses. Instead, I thought combining the data from the self-sacrifice, civic duty, and commitment criteria were more illustrative of the overlap and confluence of the criteria. In many cases, it was difficult to determine in which of the categories a word or phrase should be included when distinguishing between these three categories. Concepts such as desire to serve, sacrifice, duty, and commitment were interspersed in the texts.
of these speeches and there was much overlap in the texts identified for these criteria. Figure 13 shows the compilation of these categories and the upward trend of these data. The difference between these two charts is the influence of social justice, which slopes downward in Figure 13 and self-sacrifice and commitment that had positive, upward trends as reflected in Figure 14.

In my review of the inaugural addresses social justice, and the words and phrases I found for that category seemed to be independent of the other criteria. This was not the case for self-sacrifice, civic duty, and commitment to the public interest. It was very difficult to distinguish between these three categories. Combining these categories seemed consistent with the literature also. Organizational commitment was earlier defined as “…the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization.”\(^{171}\) When people commit to an organization, they are making one choice over another and in that “exchange” they are sacrificing something. Additionally when a professional commits to his or her profession,

they are taking on well-established responsibilities and duties that are associated with that career field, including the obligation to serve others by the use of their professional knowledge and skills. The combination of the quantitative data related to the categories of self-sacrifice, civic duty, and commitment to the public interest is illustrated in Figure 14 and has been named “Obligation to Serve.”

**Summary of Research Results**

The primary research question posed in this study was: Has the emphasis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness diminished the ideal of public service? The results of both the qualitative and quantitative analysis do not indicate any substantial diminishment of the ideal of public service rhetoric at the expense of the “three E’s,” economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. However, it does appear that discussion of the different criteria has varied over time and has resulted in a different concept of the ideal of public service today than in past times. Therefore, a positive answer seems to be in order for one of the secondary questions posed here: “Has the ideal or vision of public service changed?” The final question of how and when the ideal of public service changed is answered in the earlier pages of this chapter, as the results, category by category, were explained and is answered in the discussion of the second research question.

The quantitative data in Figure 12 showing the combination of the “three E’s,” economy, efficiency, and effectiveness do show an increasing trend. However, the qualitative analysis associated with these criteria did not show a similar trend. Additionally, how the other categories of quantitative data are combined or viewed may indicate an increasing trend as well. For example, Perry’s collapsing of certain criteria into “public regardingness” shows a decreasing trend, while the collapsing of other criteria into “obligation to serve” that I thought was more indicative of the criteria illustrating the obligation to serve shows a positive trend. Therefore, based on this quantitative and qualitative analysis, the answer to the first question is no, discussions of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the inaugural addresses have not diminished the ideal of public service.
The answer to the second question, has the ideal or vision of public service changed, is yes. The ideal or vision of public service has changed as the different presidents from George Washington to George W. Bush addressed different aspects of this ideal over time. There are seven distinct periods or trends, from the earliest of the inaugural addresses of George Washington until the address given by Bush in 2001 that are illuminated after the application of the nine criteria of public service to the inaugural addresses. These seven periods are loosely bracketed in the following way:

- Washington to Monroe
- John Quincy Adams to Abraham Lincoln
- Ulysses Grant to William McKinley
- William McKinley to Woodrow Wilson
- Warren Harding to Herbert Hoover
- Franklin Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson
- Richard Nixon to George W. Bush.

In the early days of this country, from Washington through Monroe, the emphasis was on the personal obligation that the presidents believed that they had to serve the country and fulfill a duty and responsibility. They saw this responsibility, in the earliest days, to continue the work begun during the American Revolution. It was a work of building and refining a vision of civic republicanism and self-government. All of these presidents had been involved in the deliberations of the founding period and there is a sense after reading their inaugural addresses that they were proud of what had been accomplished and expressed their visions of what had yet to be done.

In the spirit of the first five presidents, John Quincy Adams emphasized constitutional principles also. Adams was a bridge between the “old,” the Founding Fathers, and the “new,” post-Founding era. Jackson was the first of the post-Founding presidents and his addresses reflected a more partisan and populist perspective of the Constitutional teachings. From his presidency until Lincoln’s Administration, the Constitutional teachings were melded with partisan interpretations of the role of government as political parties and specific issues became a
greater factor in the political life of the country. Lincoln’s focus was inward, primarily directed toward reassuring the country that the challenge of the Civil War would not destroy the country.

The next phase begins with Grant’s addresses as he tried to frame how the country should be restored and rebuilt. The major features of his addresses included discussion of rights for former slaves, and reform of the civil service system. Reform of the civil service system encompassed a vision of an impartial, professional service that focused on the work of the government rather than the work of the political party in power at any particular time. This era encompassed the Progressive ideas and the application of business management techniques to government.

The focus of public service shifts again in the time period bridging McKinley’s Administration through Wilson’s Administration. In addition to the pursuit of professionalism of the public service, the country’s attention turned outward toward its role in the global community. The new obligations of this focus appeared to permanently eliminate constitutional debate from these addresses through the present day.

From Wilson’s inaugural addresses through the inaugural addresses of Herbert Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt, discussions of the global role that the country should pursue dominated the addresses. Hoover refocused the discussion somewhat as he talked of the many internal responsibilities and limits of government. Also, Roosevelt talked of the responsibilities of government and, countering Hoover, encouraged expansion of government to assist in solving “big” problems that the country faced during the Great Depression.

There is another shift in the last Roosevelt address that shifted the focus again toward the country’s obligations as a part of the global community. In this case, it appears that World War II and the beginnings of the Cold War are other bellwethers of this shift.

Another shift does not occur until the Nixon presidency when he warned of the dangers of the growth of “big” government in domestic policy and advocated that government should be limited in its scope. The debate over the limits and role of government in all areas of domestic
policy is where the debate stands today. While it seems reasonable to assume that this debate concerns economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, and there is no doubt that it does, these are just parts of the debate about the limits of government. Narrowing the focus to these criteria alone leads to a distorted vision of the debate. The debate not only includes how these criteria are viewed but it reaches into how the rest of the criteria are discussed as well. For example, the concepts of duty and sacrifice took on a different perspective in this last era. Duty and self-sacrifice, in the debate today, are now individual responsibilities that should be pursued outside of the government realm and in the local community if anywhere in government. Commitment to the public interest should be exercised in terms of personal values and determined individually, not communally. Commitment to the public interest does not necessarily have to be pursued through public sector venues. The elder Bush suggested that individuals volunteer in the community and do some activities that were formerly sponsored by the government. The role of social justice is not as clear but appears to have taken on a more limited perspective, focusing more on whether government needs to be involved in particular issue rather than that government should be involved in those issues or when government should be involved.

Therefore, review of the texts of the inaugural addresses illustrates that the concept of public service has changed over time. The emphasis on public service has changed as the view of government has changed. The answer to whether it has changed for better or for worse will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In the first chapter, I talked of the ideal of public service being an inexplicable notion and that different people have different concepts of it, and that the meanings associated with it change over time. The notion of public service is referred to in many different situations and as an expression or descriptive term commands much power and attention similar to words such as freedom or peace. Public servants are often described in vague terms. Sometimes they are referred to in positive terms, as they were after the tragedy of the September 11 terrorist attacks. At other times, they are described as the cause of many of the government’s ills.¹

In my review of the literature, I discussed many of the different perspectives people have of the public service and how they have studied the public service. I described the ideas behind the obligation to serve and the links to duty, sacrifice, and commitment to the public interest. I described how economy, efficiency, and effectiveness as important concepts of American public administration came to have more influence in public debate. I described some of the influences that contributed to the attitudes that have permeated the notions of public service in American public administration. Additionally, I discussed some of the myths that have evolved about public service over time.

Some people view the public service as a noble calling and some people view the public service as a place where people go to get a safe and secure job. Some people view public servants or bureaucrats positively and some people view them negatively. Thad Hall’s² recent study of how Congress used the term “public servants,” when making positive references, and “bureaucrats,” when making negative references, comes to mind when reflecting on how the

public service is referenced and viewed in today’s society. Public servants have become the personification of the good and the bad of government. The public service and public servants continue to suffer from derogatory comments and disparate treatment from many of today’s political leaders.

This study harnessed many ideas from the literature about what the ideals of public service are, what the definitions of these ideals are, and how they have been studied. The inaugural addresses provided a set of data that illustrated how the presidents, commonly seen as the leader of the government, talked about public service at the beginning of their term of office. This information from the speeches combined with a summary of the academic literature has implications for the public service of today and tomorrow and for the field of public administration. In this chapter, these implications and possibilities for future research will be discussed.

**Summary of Results and Findings**

In this study, the use of the texts of the inaugural addresses for discussions of the ideal of public service yielded an interesting historical perspective. My findings show that the inaugural addresses captured the ideal of public service dynamically and often eloquently over the course of American history. The changing nature of the role of government, the changing issues of importance to government, and the changing nature of the ideal of public service are on the historical record as set forth in these inaugural addresses. Some of the most famous of quotes from our presidents are found in their inaugural addresses: Franklin Roosevelt’s expression, “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself,”3 Kennedy’s quote, “ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country,”4 and Lincoln’s appeal to end the Civil War:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow

---

and orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.⁵

These addresses provide a window into American history and also to the important issues taken on by the executive branch of the government in the two hundred years since its founding.

When I began this study and initially read these addresses, I thought that they were a rich source of material for studying the ideal of public service. In the last chapter the findings show that the speeches provided material on the ideal of public service as the presidents described their sense of duty and service to the country. The speeches provided insights into the presidents’ philosophies about government and its role in society, and the role of its citizens to contribute and participate in government. It was possible to see in the speeches how the ideal of public service changed from an emphasis on personal duty, self-sacrifice, and commitment, to a collective call for others to give of themselves to society as public servants and citizens, and then to a concern and caution about how expansive government should be in today’s society. Also, the speeches illustrated the inherent concern of the political leaders about a public service that needed to be dedicated, of the highest caliber and, at the same time, reminded of their fiduciary responsibility to the American people.

In the early days of American government the inaugural addresses were a means for the presidents to explain the role of government, the duties of its officers, and their political philosophy. They argued their views on the party system and partisan politics, Constitutional principles, and their ideas on the principles of self-government and states’ rights. As time progressed, they stressed some of the finer points of the governmental system that was evolving such as civil service reform and election reform.

The inaugural addresses of the nineteenth century encompass three different periods of thought related to the ideal of public service. The initial period, beginning with Washington’s inaugural addresses given at the turn of the century and extending to Monroe’s second inaugural address in 1821, included a group of leaders who had been founders of the American republic.

---

Washington, Adams, Jefferson and Madison had been delegates to the Continental Congress, Madison was a member of the Constitutional Convention, and Monroe had fought in the Continental Army during the American Revolution. This was a period in history where personal sacrifice, duty and commitment were essential characteristics of the leaders of the day. Many of these leaders had lost part of their fortunes, experienced hardship during the American Revolution, and severed friendships with those who supported the British. The ideal of public service that they believed in and discussed in their inaugural addresses was rooted in personal beliefs that they has a duty to fulfill and a responsibility to complete what they had started.

Although John Quincy Adams had served in the government in its Founding years, he was not of the generation of the earliest of the presidents. He became president after some of the basic issues had been worked out such as where the government should be located, how the vice-president should preside over the Senate, and what the role of the country would be in foreign affairs.\(^6\) While resolution of some of these initial issues may have been complete, there were still many issues that had been left undone for the presidents of his time to resolve. Among them were the role of political parties, the degree of partisanship and political reward for those in power, and the role of the states and its relationship to the federal government. These critical constitutional issues were debated vigorously in the inaugural addresses until the Civil War broke out in the 1860s.

After the Civil War ended, Grant’s inaugural addresses indicated another change in the trends about public service. While the period of Adams to Lincoln focused on constitutional issues and who should make up the public service, the period from Grant to McKinley focuses on the role of the public service as impartial professionals that should contribute their expertise in fulfilling the job of government. Additionally, it was in this period that the inaugural addresses indicate a greater awareness of the influence of the rest of the world on American policy and the role that America had to play in world affairs.

\(^6\) By the time John Quincy Adams became president, the seat of government was Washington, D.C., the White House was constructed and was home to the presidents, the Congress and the Supreme Court had processes, procedures, and traditions in place, and the Monroe Doctrine had been promulgated.
William McKinley was the first president of the twentieth century and his second inaugural address in 1901 was partially a reflection on the role of the country as a leader of the world. The emphasis in the addresses for most of the twentieth century was for the government to take a positive, active, and expansive role in the global community as advocated by Wilson at the beginning of the century when he said:

We are provincials no longer. The tragic events of the thirty months of vital turmoil through which we have just passed have made us citizens of the world.  

Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, in the next significant historical period, suggested an inward focus that came about after the devastation of World War I, the changing American role of the world, and the increasing importance of domestic issues such as immigration and the economy. It was Franklin Roosevelt, in his address near mid-century that echoed Wilson’s words when he said: “We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.” The presidents following Roosevelt - Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson - continued the trend toward a government that assumed more responsibilities in domestic and foreign affairs.

It was Richard Nixon who argued for a shift that “we are approaching the limits of what government alone can do” and led the change in philosophy that has been reflected in the inaugural addresses since 1969. This changing attitude about government over the past thirty-five years is one of the limited capability of government, and a desire for government to be smaller and less intrusive in people’s lives. It has been an attitude characterized by property tax caps, deregulation of industries such as airlines and railroads, and distrust of how and why the government waged war, raises taxes, and fulfills its functions. One of the byproducts of this changing attitude has been the diminishment of the ideal of public service.

With this shift in the philosophy toward limited government that has been in place for the past thirty-five years has come the perception that government is bad and the people who work

---

for the government are lazy, incompetent, and concerned primarily with their security and benefits rather than the work that they do. However, as mentioned earlier, most of these perceptions are not supported by fact. The studies conducted by Buchanan and Rainey, Pandey, and Bozeman on red tape, Rainey and Bozeman on the empirical soundness of some of the differences between public and private sector workers, and Goodsell on the perception of public servants mentioned earlier in this study confirm that perceptions have not been indicative of reality. Despite the lack of evidence, it has not stopped political leaders from disparaging public servants and exploiting the myths of laziness and incompetence of public servants in order for them to get elected and reelected by claiming that they will reform and restore the government to the people. The political leadership rarely assumes the challenge of encouraging people to participate in government or join the public service. It is ironic that many of the public servants and political leaders who are in leadership positions today joined the public service because of the call to service that Kennedy made in his 1961 inaugural address but have not become advocates for others to follow in their path.

**Implications for the Public Service**

In the world of the twenty-first century, the year 2004, the role of government is unknown and uncertain. Should the government do more for the people, and if so, what should it do for the people? After the tragedy of September 11, there were several actions taken by the

---

10 Some of the literature discussed in Chapter 2 regarding red tape by Buchanan and Rainey, Pandey, and Bozeman, the work on people’s perceptions of front-line public servants by Goodsell, and the concern that Rainey and Bozeman highlight concerning empirical soundness of some of the studies conducted are indicative that the perception that bureaucrats are lazy or incompetent may not be based in fact but instead in political rhetoric. Chapter 2 discusses these studies in greater detail.

11 In the past year or so, I have attended a few events where long-time public servants have been recognized for their outstanding careers and contributions to government service. Most of these people refer to Kennedy’s inaugural address as their inspiration to join public service. Yet, in their remarks they often advocate making government more like business and express pride in what they did as public servants to encourage privatization and outsourcing, not what they did or did not do in the areas of duty, obligation, social justice and commitment to the public interest. It seems to me that it would be on these occasions that these public servants would want to talk about the fundamental reasons they joined the public service so that they would serve as examples to future public servants. However, they seem much more focused on the nuts and bolts of what they did rather than what inspired them to do it.
government to enhance the sense of security throughout the country. For example, the duties and functions of airport screeners, screening people and luggage, now became a function of the federal government with the employees hired and trained as government workers. However, their salaries were funded with additional fees collected on airline tickets as a security surcharge that the airlines turned over to the government rather than with appropriated funds so the funding would not count against the budget and leaving open the possibility for the function to be privatized again. Additional border patrol agents and immigration and customs inspectors have been recruited to increase security at our borders and ports. The USA Patriot Act, enacted in late 2001, allowed the government more surveillance power and enhanced police powers. At the same time, one of the major elements of the President’s Management Agenda is increased competitive sourcing of federal jobs so that more jobs can be contracted to the private sector. There is still much uncertainty about what jobs will fall into this category and what the rationale is going to be for what jobs get contracted out and what jobs stay in the public sector. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior are writing environmental rules that encourage voluntary compliance with environmental standards leaving compliance experts and oversight inspectors with a reduced role in the public sector.

Many functions performed by the government are now being designated under the umbrella of national security responsibilities. Physicians at the Center for Disease Control are now designated as national security experts and their attention has shifted to analysis of the potential for certain diseases to be used as weapons. As their focus changes and their research and analysis is being used for different purposes, there remains an undercurrent and perception by some political leaders that these experts are “bureaucrats” unable to struggle with the myriad of red tape and rules, susceptible to fraud and abuse, and unable to cope with the changing requirements and the dedication necessary to meet the new requirements.

The shifting of public sector resources from one policy area to another is not an unusual occurrence from one president to another. It is an accepted reality that as the government changes from one administration to another; the policy emphases and the direction of the resources shift as well. However, what seems to be unusual today is the conflicting perceptions about who can do the job right: government employees, or private sector employees.
These mixed signals emanating from the political establishment are confusing to the public service and to the public. On the one hand, the CDC physicians are praised for their dedication and efforts in the war on terror that they fight with their professional knowledge and skills. On the other hand, this Administration of the younger President Bush has proposed that they are not on par with the military in waging this war and are not deserving of the same pay raise increase as the military.\(^\text{12}\) It is the same mixed signals at the Defense Department, the Pentagon in particular. While all employees are provided with gas masks and other survival gear, it is the military personnel who are recognized for their heroic service while other government workers are disparaged as being “bureaucrats” and not important participants in the war on terrorism. While the employees of the newly established Transportation Security Administration are being hired for government positions to screen and check baggage, there are proposals to privatize the air traffic controller positions of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Discussions of the ideals of public service with the practical nitty gritty and detail of what government positions should be privatized, what should remain in the public realm, or how much public sector workers should be paid may seem to be impractical. However, without knowing what the ideal of public service is, what it should be, and what society wants it to be, decisions on what to privatize, how to treat public sector employees, and what value to place on them becomes a matter for the budget analysts rather than the political leadership. When these discussions are framed in monetary and procedural terms, the public service and the community lose.

The National Performance Review (NPR) is one of the most recent examples of the minimizing of the public service via cost analysis. The National Performance Review claimed that public servants were good people working in bad systems and that the systems needed to be fixed. The NPR claimed that fixing these bad systems would result in government working better and costing less. One of the most measurable outcomes was cost savings in dollars and people. Soon the emphasis shifted from “government working better” to government costing  

\(^{12}\) Although President Bush has proposed differing pay raises for civilian and military workers of the Federal Government in every budget submitted, Congress has chosen to continue pay parity between these two workforces.
less and having fewer people do the jobs was the means to that end. Eventually the staff reductions were one of the uncontroversial achievements that the Clinton Administration claimed. Debates about whether government works better today than it did prior to the NPR are still underway.

The reality of the actions and implementation of the National Performance Review during the Clinton Administration illustrates how empty the rhetoric about public service has become. While Clinton challenged “a new generation of young Americans to a season of service,” his means to support it and sustain it through government action was counteracted by the downsizing of government programs and the elimination of government jobs. Although Clinton established the Corporation for National and Community Service, which included Americorps, a domestic program, and an updated and revitalized version of the Peace Corps, the new program now includes incentives to participate which were never included in the past. The program includes a student loan payback provision as well as the small stipend the participants receive while working in these programs. The original program established by the Kennedy Administration recruited volunteers on the strength of Kennedy’s call to service and was fully funded by the government. It did not provide additional incentives such as student loan repayments either. Today’s program includes partnerships with religious organizations and includes corporate funding, and administrators believe that they need to provide incentives, such as student loan repayments or education credits, to get the volunteers to join the program.

No longer is a call from the president sufficient for people to join organizations like Americorps. Despite the younger President Bush’s summons to volunteer with Americorps or for others to volunteer in their communities, the Administration has not fully funded these programs to support the Americorps volunteers or many of the community programs that people would join if they wished to fulfill the President’s call. Again, the public is receiving a mixed message; hearing that the government is going to be the leader in the area of public service to

---

14 The Americorps program has had funding problems throughout Fiscal Year 2003 and will need a supplemental appropriation from Congress or will have to drastically reduce the number of volunteers.
others but seeing that they are not willing to commit the resources and expertise necessary to make any of these programs work.

**Implications for Public Administration**

It is not just the political leadership that sends out mixed messages on the ideals and values of public service. The academic community of political scientists and public administrators must share some of the responsibility for these mixed messages too. Those claiming that they know how to “fix” government by reducing layers in the organization, “reinventing government,” and making government run like a business do so in the name of good government and government reform which is a noble effort. However, with each of those approaches there is an underlying implication that the public service is not capable of managing themselves and that they have created all of the problems existing in the public service today. It is rare when the academic acknowledges that the failure of a government program may have been the result of bad legislation, flawed policy, or bad choices by the political leaders of the public service.

In the review of the literature, I discussed how the public administration academic community spent much of its time focusing on some of the technical problems of the field such as the number of political appointees throughout the Federal government and the length of their tenure. Issues such as representative democracy, the importance of merit principles as a fundamental tenet of public service, and the responsibilities of the legislative and executive branches in the budget process seemed to be overcome by other trendy issues such as whether the budget cycle should be annual or biennial or senior executives should have to sign performance contracts with their agency directors.

There is interest in all of these areas and there is a need for public administration academics to be responsive to what is happening in the field and responsive to the needs of the practitioner community. However, one of the more interesting dilemmas of the field is almost ignored by the academic community creating peril for today’s practitioners. This dilemma, one
that was born during the Progressive era of good government reform at the turn of the twentieth century, is that of the effort to professionalize and legitimize the practitioners of the field by training them in the science of management while minimizing the values that inspired these professionals to join the field in the first place. Wamsley, et.al mentioned that Dwight Waldo once said, “…only in America did we create such rhetorical and symbolic disjuncture between the concepts of ‘good government’ and ‘good management’…”15

This symbolic disjuncture of good government and good management also finds roots in Luther Gulick’s vision of the “managerial presidency” envisioned in the Brownlow Committee report of 1937. Lane and Wamsley commented that:

…Gulick and his colleagues saw the need for a new kind of public executive, one modeled after the corporate chief executive and the urban city manager. This managerial executive concept shaped Gulick’s vision of the presidency and became central to the daunting process of overcoming not only the difficulties faced by the Roosevelt administration in implementing the New Deal, but also the challenges that American democracy faced.16

This idea that the presidents were the chief executives and that those in the executive branch were beholden to the president, rather than fellow citizens, has resulted in the politicization of the bureaucracy and the decline of standards and values of the professional public service.17

Previously, in the discussion about the commitment of professionals to their field, there were indicators that professionals took an oath to uphold the standards of the community of professionals that they had joined and yet there has been an expectation by the political leadership over the past half-century that the professional public servants have taken an oath to be responsive to them.

The public administration academic community must acknowledge and advocate that the public service is its own community of professionals that needs to uphold its independence and

professional standards. As the world changes, due to political, economic, and security needs of the nation, there needs to be a cadre of professionals who can be responsive to these changes. The political process already allows for the citizenry to decide on a routine basis whether they approve of the direction the country is going. The citizenry exercises this decision making through voting for its political leaders. However, there is an assumption that no matter who is put in office, at whatever level of government, that there will be a professional public service that continues to make the institutions of government function. It is the cadre of public servants that needs to be better understood and acknowledged for what they add to the functioning of the republic. The public administration academic community must ensure that this community of practitioners continues to exist.

Avenues for Future Research

Although there is a substantial literature related to the ideals of public service, surprisingly little attention has been paid to the relationship between the public service and its ideals. The work that James Perry and his associates initiated and others have adapted is the most substantial contribution in this area to date. It was for this reason that I turned to it for my research here. However, adapting the criteria that Perry identified and using Perry’s definitions exposed some of the weaknesses of the definitions for universal applicability. For example, Perry’s definition of social justice is a very modern concept developed during the second half of the twentieth century. It is a concept that acknowledges the role of government in securing rights for everyone in society. However, in the earlier days of the American republic, the ideas and ideals of social justice were quite different. When Perry’s definition of social justice was applied to all the inaugural addresses, some of the critical features of this definition such as equity and minority rights seem to have been missing for much of the country’s history. For example, in reading the inaugural addresses it appears that granting of voting rights for people regardless of race and sex were relatively new concepts supported by the presidents only after
being ratified as Constitutional amendments. Yet voting rights for all has been a political issue since the government was formed.18

Social justice, civic duty, and compassion are all concepts and values that we all “know when we see” and most readily agree that they are among the ideals of public service. However, are the definitions that Perry presented adequate to describe these concepts or ideals that we are thinking of when we think of social justice, civic duty, or compassion? There are flaws and weaknesses in all of the criteria definitions used here which makes them questionable markers of the ideals of public service. Admittedly, the dimensions that Perry put forth for his public service motivation instrument were exploited in this research study in a way probably not envisioned by Perry in his earlier work. However, it is common in the social sciences to build on the well-regarded work of others and in the area of public service, Perry’s work is among the most commonly referenced. Therefore, it did not seem inappropriate to rely on Perry’s work as a means to investigate how the ideals of public service have changed, or to use the definitions as applied here.

Some of the weaknesses of the criteria definitions might be resolved if the criteria were collapsed in the ways proposed in the previous chapter. The categories of “public regardness” and “obligation to serve” should be analyzed further to determine which consolidation of the criteria is most appropriate. The consolidation of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness criteria into one dimension or category called business seemed to be uncontroversial. Another avenue for future public administration research should be to refine these criteria and more precisely refine and modify the definitions for the universal applicability that they appear to support. This research could start with a thorough review of the literature on which public administration has been constructed. Definitions of commitment, duty, sacrifice, and justice are not uncommon in the literature and their meanings should be better understood throughout the field.

18 Most of the recordings of the Continental Congress, discussions of the Declaration of Independence and later the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution by the Constitutional Convention mention the issues of voting rights, especially for the slave population.
Despite the weaknesses of these criteria and Perry’s definitions, it was possible to recognize trends and themes on the public service in the inaugural addresses. The use of the inaugural addresses as a data set for public administration is another avenue to pursue for future research in public administration. There are several themes and ideas that are contained within the addresses that trace the political history of the United States. In addition to the more general overview of the ideals of public service, the careful reader of these inaugural addresses could trace the specific ebb and flow of the ideas of representative bureaucracy, religion, states’ rights, and foreign policy to name a few of the ideas and themes found in the addresses. Some of those themes have been mentioned as they related to the ideals of public service discussed here.

Additionally, the inaugural addresses, coupled with court decisions and approved legislation, could trace the evolution of a policy such as civil service reform throughout American history in a new way. Another use of detailed content analysis of the inaugural addresses could be to focus on one particular theme, such as economic messages, and compare those to a corresponding analysis of changes in key economic indicators such as the gross national product to assess whether the president’s messages affect the economy or result from the movement of the economy. In other words, did the president discuss an issue because it was emerging and they wanted to discuss it so they could lead the resolution of the issue or did they discuss it because it was an existing issue for which they needed to take a position?

There are many comparative studies that could be done using inaugural addresses and other methods of communication such as state of the union speeches, speeches by other leaders such as leaders of Congress or governors to put these addresses in the context of the times. There are certainly other ways to tease out the ideals of public service as well. Surveys of future, current, and former government employees have been one method to determine the ideals of those who pursue public service. The impressions of the public toward public service and government have been another way to determine the expectations that they have of the public service.

Summary
Along with the many avenues of potential research directions that the public administration community could pursue in this area, it is time for public administration professionals and academicians to discuss the ideals of public service in a serious and analytical way. Too many are talking of the day to day realities of public service and not the underlying reasons for being in the public service. Must our society be reminded of the ideals of public service when we have an event such as the accident of the Columbia shuttle and loss of its crew? This accident in February 2003 was another reminder of the sacrifices and commitments of our public servants. The astronauts accepted the mission, knew the risks, dangers, and the rewards for the country if successful. In addition to the seven astronauts who perished, the public saw there was a supportive and dedicated NASA community that made the flight possible. It will be the community of public servants, the engineers, program managers, technicians, repairmen, and multitude of others who planned the mission, prepared the ship, and addressed problems during the mission that will eventually find out what went wrong, fix the problems, and rebuild the program.

The coverage of the Columbia accident is indicative of many of the issues concerning the ideal of public service today. Had the Columbia arrived home safely as it had many other times, there would have been little mention of the mission and the landing. The success of some of the experiments and other discoveries would have been noticed here and there and perhaps would have been referenced in news stories or articles in the coming years. However, the success of the mission would have been considered the norm and the challenges and risks associated with it would rarely be mentioned. Instead there has been a constant barrage of news reports and public events discussing what went wrong and how the failures, some of which were due to complacent bureaucrats wherever they exist, need to be fixed.19

---

19 After the accident, the Columbia Accident Investigation Board was established to review the events surrounding the flight. Several managers of NASA were removed, reassigned, or chose to retire. The report, issued in August 2003, suggested some cultural and technical failures and has made recommendations to correct some of these issues. However, NASA had been criticized for not implementing many of the recommended steps to correct these issues yet. There has been extensive coverage of these issues in Government Executive and other newspapers since the February 2003 tragedy.
It is the same for many other areas of the public service. It is rare for news to circulate on how many benefits checks get delivered to the right people for the right amount each month or for programs to come in under budget. As we go about our daily lives we expect our government, via the fellow citizens who have chosen to be public servants, to provide services to us, fight our wars, pick up our trash, preserve our parks, and maintain our roads. We expect this to happen with minimum participation and minimum investment. We are rarely disappointed. However, despite the many successes, big and small, that our public service achieves each day, despite “the honest and faithful service” to government and society, persistent stories and myths about lazy bureaucrats still seem to dominate discussions of the public service.

When Nixon, in his first inaugural address, shifted the focus of the discussions to the limits of government rather than the potential of government, some assumed that the need for the public service and competent public servants had lessened. The notion of institutions comprised of public servants who had dedicated themselves to policy areas or technical specialties was called into question. Do we need a public service with such skills and knowledge if the private sector is capable of providing similar skills? Do we need a public service that values the ideals of duty, sacrifice, and commitment in a society that has become accustomed to watching calamity as it happens, a society suffering from collective attention–deficit disorder because of the speed of technology, or a society that must teach its children in fifteen to thirty minute increments because that is the limit of their attention span? If events are moving so fast, what good is institutional memory and loyalty in a public agency? Finally, do we need a public service fulfilling jobs that are similar to jobs in the private sector that some claim could be done more efficiently by the private sector?

There is no doubt that the world has changed since the Founding Fathers talked of their obligation to serve and the debt of service owed. It has changed on numerous occasions from the positive events and negative events that influenced this country. When Wilson realized we could no longer be observers of events in Europe, it changed. When the country was attacked at Pearl Harbor in 1941, the world changed for America. The world changed again in 2001 on that tragic day of September 11. Along with the many questions we are still trying to answer about how to secure ourselves from future terrorist attacks, how to prepare ourselves for the unknown threats
we face, and how to deal with uncertainty, there have been some constants which reassure many of us. We saw a government that withstood the attack and we saw public servants continue to do their jobs with the same sense of duty and dedication as they had on September 10, 2001. We saw a government capable and competent to deal with the changing reality that surfaced on that day in September – a government that was flexible and adaptable to deal with the events of the day.

Recently, there have been two government actions that provide hope and opportunity for the reinforcement and advancement of the ideals of public service. These two actions are the creation of the Transportation Security Administration in 2002 and the newly established Department of Homeland Security\(^\text{20}\) in 2003. The creation of these agencies is an opportunity for today’s political leaders to create organizations that embody the positive rhetoric that has been spoken about the public service. The movement of 180,000 employees into the Department of Homeland Security will be a significant accomplishment of the political leadership and the public service. Its success and effectiveness will depend on how these public servants work together within the agency, and the support and cooperation between the political leadership and the career public service. If the ideals of public service are still able to flourish, then this agency may become an example of what is possible when they do.

The importance of the public service and the ideals that enrich it should be a major component in dealing with the changing world of different security requirements and new and different roles for government. There is no need for the public service and what it stands for to be put in the middle of the debate about how much government we should have. Whether we have a government that takes on “big problems” as it did in the 1930s or handles more focused and localized community issues is a debate that will and should continue. However that debate is resolved there will be a need for a dedicated, competent, and capable public service to carry out the will of the people. Despite the political views and visions of past presidents, it is evident from their inaugural addresses that they have always realized the importance of the ideals of public service and its role as a strong and vital contributor to American government. We can

\(^{20}\) The Transportation Security Administration is part of the Department of Homeland Security as of March 1, 2003.
only hope that today this public service and the public service of tomorrow is imbued with the ideals of sacrifice, duty, commitment, justice, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and compassion. It is those ideals that should not be lost in the debate.

The purpose of this dissertation was to discuss the ideal of public service, what it is, and what it should be. My original concern was that the ideal of public service, a guiding principle for public administrators and government, had been diminished by the emphasis in American public administration on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. While my findings, after analyzing the inaugural addresses, show that this was not exactly what has happened, the findings do show that the ideals of public service have changed over time, and not all of those changes cast the public service in the most positive light. It is time for the practitioners and academicians of the field to reflect upon why they came to the profession and reignite the flames of inspiration that have kept these ideals of public service burning in American government and public administration for the past two hundred years. It will be this action of reflection and recommitment that will attract the next generation of public servants to continue making a difference.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>1st Term</th>
<th>2nd Term</th>
<th>3rd Term</th>
<th>4th Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Monroe</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Quincy Adams</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jackson</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Van Buren</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Henry Harrison</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Polk</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Taylor</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Buchanan</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses S. Grant</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Garfield</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Harrison</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Howard Taft</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren G. Harding</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Coolidge</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Hoover</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry S. Truman</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight D. Eisenhower</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon Baines Johnson</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Milhous Nixon</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Carter</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Reagan</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clinton</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aid</td>
<td>calls</td>
<td>guiding</td>
<td>offers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aided</td>
<td>carried</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aids</td>
<td>carries</td>
<td>helped</td>
<td>opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeal</td>
<td>carry</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>overburdened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeals</td>
<td>carrying</td>
<td>helpfulness</td>
<td>pursuance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask</td>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>helping</td>
<td>pursue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asked</td>
<td>challenged</td>
<td>helpless</td>
<td>pursued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asking</td>
<td>challenges</td>
<td>humanity</td>
<td>pursuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask-not</td>
<td>claims</td>
<td>humanity's</td>
<td>pursuit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asks</td>
<td>considerations</td>
<td>humanity-seeing</td>
<td>pursuits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration</td>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration - must</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>humbled</td>
<td>rewarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspirations</td>
<td>considerately</td>
<td>humblest</td>
<td>rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspire</td>
<td>destinies</td>
<td>humbly</td>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assist</td>
<td>destiny</td>
<td>humility</td>
<td>sacrificed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance</td>
<td>dignity</td>
<td>indignity</td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisted</td>
<td>ennobled</td>
<td>inspiration</td>
<td>sacrificing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bear</td>
<td>ennobling</td>
<td>inspirations</td>
<td>salvation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bearing</td>
<td>follow</td>
<td>inspire</td>
<td>saved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bears</td>
<td>followed</td>
<td>inspired</td>
<td>seek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beckon</td>
<td>following</td>
<td>inspiring</td>
<td>seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beckons</td>
<td>follows</td>
<td>inspires</td>
<td>seeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beg</td>
<td>forbearance</td>
<td>invoke</td>
<td>self-help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficence</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>invoked</td>
<td>self-sacrificing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficent</td>
<td>generosity</td>
<td>invokes</td>
<td>stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficial</td>
<td>generosity-shared</td>
<td>invoking</td>
<td>strive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit</td>
<td>generous</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>strives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>striving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits</td>
<td>given</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>summon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benevolence</td>
<td>gives</td>
<td>leading</td>
<td>summoned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benevolent</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>leads</td>
<td>summons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestow</td>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>led</td>
<td>try</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burden</td>
<td>gratefully</td>
<td>magnanimity</td>
<td>unworthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burdened</td>
<td>gratification</td>
<td>magnanimous</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burdening</td>
<td>gratified</td>
<td>noble</td>
<td>values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burdens</td>
<td>gratifying</td>
<td>nobler</td>
<td>view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burdensome</td>
<td>gratitude</td>
<td>noblest</td>
<td>viewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>call</td>
<td>guidance</td>
<td>nobleness</td>
<td>views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>called</td>
<td>guide</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>called-always</td>
<td>guided</td>
<td>offered</td>
<td>vision - to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calling</td>
<td>guides</td>
<td>offering</td>
<td>witnessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept</td>
<td>disobedience</td>
<td>serve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance</td>
<td>duties</td>
<td>served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepted</td>
<td>duty</td>
<td>serves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>duty -the</td>
<td>serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepts</td>
<td>fraternity</td>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act</td>
<td>honorable</td>
<td>service -a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acted</td>
<td>honorably</td>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acting</td>
<td>honoring</td>
<td>servile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action</td>
<td>honors</td>
<td>servitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td>irresponsible</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>irresponsibility</td>
<td>settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acts</td>
<td>locality</td>
<td>subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cities</td>
<td>metropolis</td>
<td>subjects - in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city</td>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>subordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city's</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>subserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>neighboring</td>
<td>subservience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship -than</td>
<td>obedience</td>
<td>subserviency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic</td>
<td>obedient</td>
<td>take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil</td>
<td>obey</td>
<td>taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civility</td>
<td>obeyed</td>
<td>takes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil-service</td>
<td>obeying</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colonies</td>
<td>obligation</td>
<td>town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td>obligations</td>
<td>towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>undertake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community-not</td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td>undertaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>councils</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counties</td>
<td>responsibility - I</td>
<td>villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>responsibility - to</td>
<td>voluntarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deeds</td>
<td>responsibly</td>
<td>voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonorable</td>
<td>self-serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account</td>
<td>condition</td>
<td>obliges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountable</td>
<td>conditions</td>
<td>obliging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect</td>
<td>confirm</td>
<td>owe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected</td>
<td>confirmed</td>
<td>owes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affecting</td>
<td>conviction</td>
<td>owing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirm</td>
<td>convictions</td>
<td>patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmation</td>
<td>covenant</td>
<td>patriotically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmations</td>
<td>covenants</td>
<td>patriotism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmed</td>
<td>declare</td>
<td>pledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirms</td>
<td>declared</td>
<td>pledged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americanism</td>
<td>declaration</td>
<td>pledge - and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amity</td>
<td>declarations</td>
<td>pledges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assurance</td>
<td>declares</td>
<td>pledge - to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assurances</td>
<td>declaring</td>
<td>pledging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assure</td>
<td>dedicate</td>
<td>promise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assured</td>
<td>dedicated</td>
<td>promised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assuredly</td>
<td>dedication</td>
<td>promises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assuring</td>
<td>devote</td>
<td>promising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attest</td>
<td>devoted</td>
<td>reaffirm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avow</td>
<td>devoted - to</td>
<td>rededicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avowed</td>
<td>devotion</td>
<td>renew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avowal</td>
<td>devoting</td>
<td>renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avowing</td>
<td>discharge</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bind</td>
<td>discharged</td>
<td>renewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding</td>
<td>discharging</td>
<td>represent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binds</td>
<td>fellowship</td>
<td>represents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bond</td>
<td>friendship</td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonds</td>
<td>idea</td>
<td>resolve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound</td>
<td>ideal</td>
<td>resolved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commit</td>
<td>idealism</td>
<td>resolve - of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committed</td>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>resolves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committing</td>
<td>ideals</td>
<td>self-devotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>ideals-so</td>
<td>unbounded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitments</td>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>uncompromising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compact</td>
<td>oath</td>
<td>vow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compacts</td>
<td>oaths</td>
<td>vowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compromise</td>
<td>obliged</td>
<td>vows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compromises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>distrust</td>
<td>injustice</td>
<td>righteous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocated</td>
<td>distrusted</td>
<td>injustice</td>
<td>righteousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>ensure</td>
<td>insure</td>
<td>rightful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>ensured</td>
<td>insuring</td>
<td>rightfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character</td>
<td>entitle</td>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>rightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coequal</td>
<td>entitled</td>
<td>intrust</td>
<td>rightness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collective</td>
<td>entitles</td>
<td>intrusted</td>
<td>right - without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collectively</td>
<td>entrust</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>entrusted</td>
<td>justice</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonly</td>
<td>equal</td>
<td>justifiable</td>
<td>secured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonplace</td>
<td>equaled</td>
<td>justifiable</td>
<td>secures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commons</td>
<td>equals</td>
<td>justify</td>
<td>security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common-law</td>
<td>equality</td>
<td>justly</td>
<td>security-for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicate</td>
<td>equally</td>
<td>mistrust</td>
<td>self-righteousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communion</td>
<td>equally - and</td>
<td>moral</td>
<td>share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonwealth</td>
<td>equitable</td>
<td>morality</td>
<td>shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compensate</td>
<td>equitably</td>
<td>morally</td>
<td>shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compensated</td>
<td>equity</td>
<td>morals</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compete</td>
<td>equivalent</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competing</td>
<td>even-handed</td>
<td>neutrality</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concord</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>parity</td>
<td>trusted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence</td>
<td>fair-dealing</td>
<td>partial</td>
<td>trustful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>fairer</td>
<td>partialities</td>
<td>trusting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidently</td>
<td>fairest</td>
<td>partiality</td>
<td>truth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscience</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>prejudice</td>
<td>truths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consciences</td>
<td>fair-minded</td>
<td>prejudices</td>
<td>unequal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientious</td>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>principle</td>
<td>unequaled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientiously</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>principles</td>
<td>unequivocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscious</td>
<td>honestly</td>
<td>privilege</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consciousness</td>
<td>honestly</td>
<td>privileged</td>
<td>unfairly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider</td>
<td>honor</td>
<td>privileges</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered</td>
<td>honored</td>
<td>prudence</td>
<td>untrusting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering</td>
<td>impartial</td>
<td>prudent</td>
<td>untruths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute</td>
<td>impartially</td>
<td>prudential</td>
<td>virtue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>impartiality</td>
<td>prudently</td>
<td>virtues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discretionary</td>
<td>inequality</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>virtuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accord</td>
<td>cooperate</td>
<td>kindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accordance</td>
<td>cooperating</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>sincerely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care</td>
<td>co-operation</td>
<td>sincerest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cared</td>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>sincerity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careful</td>
<td>coordinate</td>
<td>solemn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carefully</td>
<td>earnest</td>
<td>solemnities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>earnestly</td>
<td>solemnity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cares</td>
<td>earnestness</td>
<td>solemnly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charity</td>
<td>harmoniously</td>
<td>sympathies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassion</td>
<td>harmonize</td>
<td>sympathize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>harmony</td>
<td>sympathized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern</td>
<td>humane</td>
<td>sympathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>humanize</td>
<td>zeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerning</td>
<td>kinder</td>
<td>zealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns</td>
<td>kindly</td>
<td>zealously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Public Policy-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administer</td>
<td>execution</td>
<td>reforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administered</td>
<td>exemplar</td>
<td>regulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administering</td>
<td>founded</td>
<td>regulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrated</td>
<td>founding</td>
<td>regulates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>immigration</td>
<td>regulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration's</td>
<td>initiatives</td>
<td>regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrations</td>
<td>institution</td>
<td>regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative</td>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>reinvent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alliances</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>representing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application</td>
<td>militarize</td>
<td>republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appoint</td>
<td>nonpartisan</td>
<td>republic - those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointing</td>
<td>officered</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment</td>
<td>offices</td>
<td>rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointments</td>
<td>officially</td>
<td>ruling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritative</td>
<td>partisanship</td>
<td>spoils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorized</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td>states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorizing</td>
<td>policies</td>
<td>statesmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorizes</td>
<td>politic</td>
<td>technological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congressional</td>
<td>polity</td>
<td>territorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>execute</td>
<td>polity-municipal</td>
<td>treaties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executed</td>
<td>priorities</td>
<td>treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executed-these</td>
<td>reform</td>
<td>unauthorized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executes</td>
<td>reformed</td>
<td>well-regulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Related Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abundance</td>
<td>calculation</td>
<td>customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abundant</td>
<td>canal</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abundantly</td>
<td>canals</td>
<td>dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounted</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>dealings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquisition</td>
<td>capitals</td>
<td>debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affairs</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>debts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afforded</td>
<td>child-labor</td>
<td>debt-paying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affording</td>
<td>coal</td>
<td>debt-through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affords</td>
<td>coast</td>
<td>deficits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural</td>
<td>coasts</td>
<td>deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>deserts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount</td>
<td>coinage</td>
<td>disbursed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antitrust</td>
<td>coined</td>
<td>disbursement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriation</td>
<td>commerce</td>
<td>dockyards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriations</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>dollar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art</td>
<td>commodities</td>
<td>due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts</td>
<td>companies</td>
<td>earn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance</td>
<td>company</td>
<td>earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balanced</td>
<td>compensation</td>
<td>earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balances</td>
<td>compensations</td>
<td>earns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank</td>
<td>computation</td>
<td>economical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banks</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td>economical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banking</td>
<td>contract</td>
<td>economically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bankrupt</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bargain</td>
<td>contributions</td>
<td>economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bartered</td>
<td>corn – all</td>
<td>economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bill</td>
<td>corporation</td>
<td>employ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billion</td>
<td>corporations</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billions</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bills</td>
<td>cost – and</td>
<td>employs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bimetallism</td>
<td>costly</td>
<td>enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bountiful</td>
<td>costs</td>
<td>enslaved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>cotton-producing</td>
<td>enterprise -a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td>cottons</td>
<td>enterprise-an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>credit</td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculate</td>
<td>creditable</td>
<td>estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculated</td>
<td>credits</td>
<td>estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculating</td>
<td>crops</td>
<td>estimation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculations</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ever-richer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extravagant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>factories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>factory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fiscally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foreclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frontiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fortune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fortunes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>franchises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frontier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frontiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>furnace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>furnaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>harbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>harbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>job</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harvests</td>
<td>job</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highways</td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>mountains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hillsides</td>
<td>labor</td>
<td>national-bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>labors</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hundreds</td>
<td>laboring</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill-clad</td>
<td>lakes</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill-housed</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>necessities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill-nourished</td>
<td>lands</td>
<td>necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impoverished</td>
<td>lands-some</td>
<td>necessity-of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impoverishing</td>
<td>land--the</td>
<td>need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impoverishment</td>
<td>livelihood</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incalculable</td>
<td>loans</td>
<td>needful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>machine</td>
<td>needing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomes</td>
<td>machinery</td>
<td>needless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indebted</td>
<td>manufactured</td>
<td>needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indebtedness</td>
<td>manufactures</td>
<td>need-the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial</td>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>needy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrialism</td>
<td>marine</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrially</td>
<td>maritime</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industries</td>
<td>market</td>
<td>occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td>markets</td>
<td>occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry-rolling</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflation</td>
<td>materials</td>
<td>ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflation's</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>paid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflations</td>
<td>mercantile</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inherit</td>
<td>merchandise</td>
<td>payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>merger</td>
<td>paying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheritances</td>
<td>metals</td>
<td>payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inherited</td>
<td>microchip</td>
<td>payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheriting</td>
<td>mill</td>
<td>pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovation</td>
<td>million</td>
<td>pecuniary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet</td>
<td>millions</td>
<td>pension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interstate</td>
<td>mills</td>
<td>penury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interstate-railway</td>
<td>mine</td>
<td>plains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invented</td>
<td>mineral</td>
<td>plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventions</td>
<td>mines</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventory</td>
<td>mining</td>
<td>ports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invest</td>
<td>misappropriation</td>
<td>postal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invested</td>
<td>monetary</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments</td>
<td>moneys</td>
<td>priceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>island</td>
<td>monopoly</td>
<td>prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>islands</td>
<td>monopolies</td>
<td>product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>seaboard</td>
<td>thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productions</td>
<td>seas</td>
<td>thousand-fold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products</td>
<td>seas-thousand</td>
<td>thousands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profit</td>
<td>sell</td>
<td>tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profits</td>
<td>shelter</td>
<td>toil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profit – has</td>
<td>ships</td>
<td>toiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property</td>
<td>shop</td>
<td>trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosper</td>
<td>shops</td>
<td>traded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospered</td>
<td>shore</td>
<td>trading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperity</td>
<td>shores</td>
<td>transaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperous</td>
<td>skies</td>
<td>transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperously</td>
<td>slavery</td>
<td>transcontinental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosperous</td>
<td>slaveholding</td>
<td>transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
<td>soil</td>
<td>transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchasing</td>
<td>spend</td>
<td>trusts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>spending</td>
<td>uneconomical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rail</td>
<td>statistics</td>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rails</td>
<td>steamers</td>
<td>unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railroads</td>
<td>steamship</td>
<td>utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railway</td>
<td>stream</td>
<td>valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railways</td>
<td>streams</td>
<td>valleys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receipts</td>
<td>subsidiary</td>
<td>values-gold-and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repay</td>
<td>subsidies</td>
<td>wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource</td>
<td>subsistence</td>
<td>wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>sugar</td>
<td>wants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>watercourses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenues</td>
<td>sums</td>
<td>waterway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td>supply</td>
<td>waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richer</td>
<td>surplus</td>
<td>weal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riches</td>
<td>surpluses</td>
<td>wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richest</td>
<td>tariff</td>
<td>wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river</td>
<td>tariffs</td>
<td>welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rivers</td>
<td>task</td>
<td>well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road</td>
<td>tasks</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads</td>
<td>tax</td>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sale</td>
<td>taxation</td>
<td>worked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>taxes</td>
<td>working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>save</td>
<td>taxing</td>
<td>work – not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td>technologies</td>
<td>works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saving</td>
<td>territories</td>
<td>workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savings</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>work – work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea</td>
<td>territory</td>
<td>write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seaboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability consequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability consequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplished effected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishing effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishment effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishments effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve effectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved effectually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving efficacious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievements efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attainment enterprising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capable entrepreneurial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capability incapable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacities incapacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity incapacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competency incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequence incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences ineffectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meritoriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress-or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprofitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheapness</td>
<td>measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiencies</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>producing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiently</td>
<td>proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frugal</td>
<td>profitably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frugality</td>
<td>tasked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrious</td>
<td>thrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficiency</td>
<td>unwasted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficient</td>
<td>wastage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficiently</td>
<td>waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage</td>
<td>wasted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managed</td>
<td>wasteful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td>wastefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, JQ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, WH</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley 1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower 1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Sacrifice</td>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon 1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, G</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton 1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, GW</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att to Policy</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, JQ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, WH</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt F 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att to Policy</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, GW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Academic Experience


BA Providence College, Providence, RI. Major: Political Science. Concentration: Public Administration. 1979

Work Experience


Responsibilities have included management positions in a variety of policy and program areas including budget and financial management, administrative management over an international program, policy development and formulation, program management, web content management and development, and strategic planning and program evaluation for immigration service and law enforcement programs.


Responsible for budget preparation and justification, financial execution and acquisition reporting for shipbuilding, research and development, and operations and maintenance for several naval ship programs including the $28 billion fast attack submarine multi-year program.

Other Experiences (1981 to 1984) in the Federal Government level include:

• Special Assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, Washington, DC. November 1982 to March 1984.

• Management Analyst, Department of Justice, Civil Division, Washington, DC. September 1981 to November 1982.

• Special Assistant to the Director of Operations, Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement, Washington, DC. Summer 1980.


Teaching Experiences: Graduate level Budgeting course, Virginia Tech. Several budgeting courses taught to Naval civilian and military personnel, and Introduction to Public Administration and Research Methods taught at undergraduate level at Southern Illinois University.