University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1991-05-22

A Study of Leadership: A Qualitative Case Study of Intended Changes within the County Government of San Diego

Shelia Quinlan Williams EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Quinlan Williams, Shelia EdD, "A Study of Leadership: A Qualitative Case Study of Intended Changes within the County Government of San Diego" (1991). *Dissertations*. 566.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/566>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP:
A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY OF INTENDED CHANGES
WITHIN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF SAN DIEGO**

by

Sheila Quinlan Williams

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

May 22, 1991

Dissertation Committee

**Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director
Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D.
Wallace Cohen, Ed.D.**

Copyright @ 1991 by Sheila Quinlan Williams
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP: A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY OF INTENDED CHANGES WITHIN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

WILLIAMS, SHEILA QUINLAN, Ed. D. University of San Diego, 1991, 305pp.
Director: Joseph C. Rost, Ph. D.

This research addresses the nature of leadership. Reflecting a sound theoretical base, the researcher studied the people involved in a complex change process, and listened to their perceptions about change and leadership. The study goes beyond the idea of the individual leader into the notion of a leadership relationship. It is a study of the persons who were active in the relationship, a study of their behaviors and language as they changed how the county government served the public. One of the primary purposes of the study is to demonstrate how these insights regarding change and the nature of leadership are relevant to the study and practice of public administration in a regional government in the United States.

This is an interactive, in-depth study of a specific change process in the County of San Diego, the fourth largest county government in the United States. In 1983 County Supervisor Leon Williams convened a task force to study and evaluate the formulation of public policy making and program implementation in the county's government. At the same time, the news media called for changes in county government in a 1984 series of articles in the San Diego Tribune titled "County in

Chaos." The researcher provides an analytical narrative of seven years of this change process based on the data that were compiled through nonreactive research, participant observation, and extensive interviews with over 60 key decision makers and participants in the change processes.

The findings of the study indicate that intended changes have occurred in the county government and that these changes were perceived differently among the participants. The changes most difficult for the county to actualize without a leadership relationship were those which involved its culture and valued meanings. Although the county officials and other participants demonstrated great interest in the concept of leadership, they had no working definition of leadership. There were shared descriptors, but no commonly understood definition.

The researcher concluded that there is a need for a working definition of leadership for the practitioner that can be understood, used and taught. It must allow for the purposes of a diverse society to be heard and reflected in the processes of the future. The working definition, the author suggests, is: Leadership is a dialectical, influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes which reflect their mutual and evolving purposes.

DEDICATION

This composition is dedicated to my daughter,
Sarah Fairchild Williams,
who enriches the present and provides hope for the future

to my longtime companion,
Guy Frederick Williams,
with whom I share a deep devotion

to my parents,
Frederick Fairchild Quinlan
and
Mariam Lilley Quinlan,
in loving memory

to my cherished friends,
who have believed in my ability to think new thoughts

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time

"Little Gidding", Fourth Quartet, T. S. Eliot

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To each participant, your voice brought life to this document and because of your contribution, you have given the reader the rare opportunity to glimpse a collage of perceptions about the county government of San Diego, the process of change and the nature of leadership. I was privileged to talk with you, listen to your thoughts, and learn from you. You were my teacher and co-participant in this process of discovery. Thank you.

John W. Adams, Executive Vice President, Pacific Ship Repair & Fabrication, Inc., Retired Admiral of the United States Navy

The Reverend Glenn Allison, Chief Administrative Officer, Episcopal Community Services, San Diego

George F. Bailey, Board of Supervisors, District 2, County of San Diego

Augie Baren, Director, Department of Transborder Affairs, County of San Diego

Brian P. Bilbray, Board of Supervisors, District 1, County of San Diego

Bruce Boland, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Paul Boland, Treasurer/Tax Collector, County of San Diego

Granville Bowman, Director, Department of Public Works, County of San Diego

G. Curtis Branscome, City Manager, City of Decatur, Georgia

Rod Calvao, Auditor and Controller, County of San Diego

Ethel M. Chastain, Director, Department of Human Resources, County of San Diego

Larry Cook, Executive Officer, Civil Service Commission, County of San Diego

Robert Copper, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation, County of San Diego

J. William Cox, M.D. Ph.D., Director, Department of Health Services, County of San Diego

Anne Doshier Ph.D., Special Consultant to the Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

John Duffy, Former Sheriff, County of San Diego

John J. Dullea, City Manager, City of Greenville, South Carolina

Paul Eckert, President, Eckert Van and Storage, Former Supervisor, County of San Diego

Edward Fike, Recently Retired Editor of Editorial Section of San Diego Union

Susan Golding, Supervisor, District 3, County of San Diego

Clifford Graves, President, Grigsby Graves Environmental Directions, Former Chief Administrative Officer

Michael Greer, Former Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San Diego

Robert Griego, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Lee Grissom, President, Chamber of Commerce, City of San Diego

William Hansell, Executive Director, International City Managers Association, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd W. Harmon, County Counsel, County of San Diego

James Hatcher, Chief of Staff, Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Norman W. Hickey, Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Roger Honberger, Washington, D.C., Representative, County of San Diego

Jane Huston, Director, Department of General Services, County of San Diego

Richard Jacobsen, Director, Department of Social Services, County of San Diego

David E. Janssen Ph.D., Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

June Komar, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Robert Lerner, Public Affairs Officer, County of San Diego

John Lockwood, Director of General Services, State of California, Former City Manager, San Diego

Manuel Lopez, Director, Office of Financial Management, County of San Diego

Catherine Lucas, County Librarian, County of San Diego

John MacDonald Ph.D., Chairperson, Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego

A.E. Madrid, Director, Governmental Relations of Pacific Bell, City Mayor, La Mesa, California

Edwin Miller, District Attorney, County of San Diego

Bruce Moore, Retired Executive Partner, Barney & Barney Insurance Company, San Diego

Victor Nieto, Director, Equal Opportunity Management Office, County of San Diego

J.A. "Tony" Ojeda, Jr., Assistant County Manager, Metro-Dade County, Miami

Lynn O'Rourke Bride, Deputy Director, Department of Human Resources, County of San Diego

Frank Panarisi, Chief Executive Officer/President, Construction Industrial Federation, San Diego

Thomas Payzant, Ed.D., Superintendent of San Diego City Schools

Gabriel Rodriguez, Director, Department of Housing and Community Development, County of San Diego

Lari Sheehan, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, County of San Diego

Elizabeth Sherman, Director, Member Services, International City Managers Association, Washington, D.C.

Carl Sisskind, Editorial Director of KFMB Radio, San Diego

Jimmie Slack, Chief of Staff, Supervisorial District 4, County of San Diego

Gregory Smith, Assessor, County of San Diego

Cecil Steppe, Chief Probation Officer, County of San Diego

John Sweeten, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, County of San Diego

John Thomas, D.P.A., Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration, Former Executive Director, National Association of Counties, Washington, D.C.

Stephen Thunberg, Court Administrator, South Bay Municipal Court, County of San Diego

Kathleen Thuner, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer Weights, and Measures, County of San Diego

Revan Tranter, President of International City Managers Association, Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments, Oakland, California

Claude Walbert, Staff Reporter, San Diego Tribune

The Reverend George Walker-Smith, Pastor, Christ United Presbyterian Church, San Diego

Leon L. Williams, Supervisor, District 4, County of San Diego

Beverly Yip, Founding Director, Union of Pan Asian Communities, San Diego

To Dr. Joseph Rost for your scholarship devoted to the nature of leadership, commitment to teaching, willingness to continually challenge me over the past five years, and your close attention to this study.

To Dr. Mary Scherr for your gift of warmth and sensitivity to the other voice that so often goes unheard.

To Dr. Wallace Cohen for your natural dignity, wisdom, constancy, and way of restoring a hope-filled balance.

To Supervisor Leon L. Williams for your singular way of caring for those who have been forgotten, your courage to seek change, and your commitment to prevent recurring pain felt by the society you serve.

To Mr. Norman Hickey, my co-researcher. Your trust, desire to learn, wisdom, sensitivity, integrity, capacity to suffer, intuitive way of discovering, and irrepressible joy with the unexpected made this research possible.

And to my other friends, a whole dedication is yours. My life is enriched by your presence: Nancy Browne, Ann Ellis, Connie Pollock, Barbara Partridge, Margaret Gates, Deirdre Doyle RSCJ, Adriana Zylmans, Betty Jones, Mary Powers, Jane Hett, and Sweet Truffle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	.iii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Appendices	xii
CHAPTER ONE. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
The Issue	2
Purpose of the Study	8
Research Questions	10
Definition of Terms	10
Descriptions of Administrative Officers and Committees	13
Conclusion	15
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Introduction	17
Leadership: The Nature and Process.	19
Change Theory	31
Public Administration	38
CHAPTER THREE. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	44

Introduction	44
The Qualitative Case Study	47
Participants and Site Selection	51
Group One	52
Group Two	54
Group Three	54
Group Four	55
Data Gathering	56
Participant Observation	56
Nonreactive Research	59
Interviews	60
Analysis	70
Ethical Concerns	72
Conclusion	73
CHAPTER FOUR. The Narrative of the Changing County, Part One	74
Introduction	74
Leon L. Williams, The Beginning	75
Issues Task Force, 1983	84
The News Media, 1984	94
Proposition A	98

Events of 1985	100
Norman Hickey, A New Administration	103
Conclusion	121
CHAPTER FIVE. The Changing County, Part Two.	124
Introduction	124
The Process of the Dialogue	126
Analysis of the Dialogue	128
The Long View and the New View	129
The County in Chaos	137
Intended Changes	141
County Earns Respect	143
News Media	145
Build the Community	148
Mission Statement	152
Culture of the County	153
Restructuring County Administration	162
Budget Process	166
Board of Supervisors and Executive Team	168
Additional Observations and Analysis	173
Conclusions	187
CHAPTER SIX. The Nature of Leadership	193
Introduction	193

Participants' Thoughts on The Nature of Leadership	199
Leadership	203
The Leader	208
Examples of Leadership	222
Leadership and Management	227
Researcher's Definition of The Nature of Leadership	229
Implications	236
Limitations of the Study	239
Conclusion	241
REFERENCES	247
APPENDIX	255

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

In any society where government does not express or represent the moral community of the citizens, but is instead a set of institutional arrangements for imposing a bureaucratized unity on a society which lacks genuine moral consensus, the nature of political obligation becomes systematically unclear. (MacIntyre, 1984, p. 254)

A public philosophy develops out of the insight that the quality of personal life is grounded in social relationships, an insight that is embodied in the political art of integrating the various kinds of self-concern into an awareness of mutual interdependency. (Sullivan, 1986, p. 208)

Introduction

The central issue of this research is the process of intended institutional changes which have occurred within the county government of San Diego from 1983 through 1990. The subject matter of this qualitative study, which concentrates on the process of intended changes, consists of an in-depth study of the following: (1) the pursuant processes of change both recorded and observed, (2) the interactions between individuals participating in the process, and (3) the perceptions of both participants in and observers of the change process. The study includes extensive description and exploration of these intended changes, what the intended changes were, how they came to be known, realized, or thwarted. This study also includes a close

examination of the pursuant progress of both the designed institutional development process and the guidance system which the present administration has sought and is seeking to implement. The scope of this case study is limited to the process of intended changes in the county government of San Diego from 1983 to 1991. The parameters of the research study are defined by four research questions. The study will enhance our understanding of relationships in the process of change. Through a greater understanding of change processes and the leadership relationships inherent in such processes, the county can better serve its mission and in turn serve as a model to other complex institutions.

The Issue

The pertinent need for a county government to be the subject of scholarly research was articulated in a recent article in the Public Administration Review (Schneider & Park, 1989, p. 350). Despite some extensive work in the 1950s and 1960s, and some scattered work during the last decade, more study is clearly needed on county governments in metropolitan areas.

In the last two decades, as population has continued to shift out of central cities and into suburbs, and as suburbia itself has sprawled into the vast stretches of unincorporated land in metropolitan areas, county governments have become increasingly important delivery agents. County governments play a direct role in delivering services to the population of unincorporated areas, and they have increased their role in the delivery of urban services to incorporated communities through contracts and other joint service arrangements. The expansion of the role of county

government has not been paralleled by a corresponding expansion of systematic academic research (Schneider & Park, 1989, p. 345).

In the body of the article, Schneider and Park reinforced the call for research (p. 351) by referring to the text by Marando and Thomas written in 1977 titled The Forgotten Governments. In a parallel vein, Marando and Thomas had called for innovative research on county governments. They bemoaned the neglect of county governments in academic inquiry. The county is a unique form of government, one that needs to be closely studied at a time when there is a pressing need to modernize its structures as well as its underlying philosophy. According to Marando and Thomas, these reflection and change processes are necessary before the county governments can respond to the ever-increasing demands being placed on them in a time of increasing urbanization, diversification of population, greater service demands, and uncertain sources of revenue. In their study Marando and Thomas used a political systems framework and modern survey research techniques along with sophisticated statistical analyses to uncover how and why county boards of supervisors perceive their policy-making roles as they do. Counties "have been neglected as objects of analysis; much of what is known about them has been inferred from research on cities" (Marando & Thomas, 1977, p. x). This work highlights the uniqueness of county government. It is not a study limited to analysis determined by the generalizations from which research on city governments is often conducted. Their interest is with process, "not in how counties ought to respond to public problems but with how they do, in fact, respond, given the configuration of problems confronting

them" (p. 8).

The authors conclude their book with this statement:

Our analysis at a minimum has illustrated that counties are a hybrid form of local government, dependent in many areas for direction on other units and levels of government. We conclude that counties are undergoing change in response to public problems and that this change needs to be examined empirically in order to determine its causes and consequences. At present, too much of what we know about counties is based on "logic" and on the reform ethic, not research. The reform ethic surrounding counties needs to be tested and the political processes of counties systematically researched. (p. 140)

In 1982 Leon L. Williams was elected 4th District Supervisor of San Diego County and assumed the elected office in January, 1983. Prior to his election he was aware that the San Diego County government was under siege both internally and externally. Proposition 13, passed in 1978 by the voters in California, had severely affected the availability of appropriate funding for the services the counties of California usually offered. Despite the ceiling placed on available resources, the San Diego County government had been mandated to assume the responsibility for a growing number of services for a rapidly increasing and greatly diversified population; at a time which marked the beginning of a steady decrease in revenue, the county was expected to do more. It was expected to perform state-mandated functions, administer federal programs, and respond to the needs of county residents with less money. The voters had, in passing this proposition, displayed a mistrust in the administration of

public funds by local bureaucrats throughout California. This public outcry contributed to a demoralized state within local governments. Priorities had to be re-evaluated and changed to accommodate the demand in services and the loss of revenue.

The culture within the county government seemed to be one that encouraged isolated, privatized decisions rather than ones which reflected a sense of interconnectedness with a dynamic whole. As a result, only the most politically astute could survive in the competition for scarce resources. The complexity deepened and Supervisor Williams felt there was a pressing need to seek help to gain a better understanding of what had exacerbated the dilemma. Williams made a decision to do this by beginning a careful study in the first quarter of 1984. His decision to study central issues in the county began a series of events which ultimately led to an environment which would invite and encourage the kind of systematic, academic research called for by the four scholars cited above.

Williams and others were aware of a breakdown in communication among some of the key participants of county government, both appointed and elected. He and others observed an estrangement between the county government and members of the constituency in the community it served. The media frequently targeted the county and was highly critical of its way of doing business. At the same time a number of key people in the county government and in the community felt that the county was doing its job satisfactorily. They determined that the mandates were being met and the needs in the community were being satisfied. They felt that the criticism

during that period of time was not justified. Rather, the criticism was really a result of two factors: (1) ignorance on the part of the public as to the complexity of county government, (2) an underlying bias, prevalent in a politically conservative environment, which encouraged a general distrust of the bureaucrat and the public sector as a whole.

With an understanding of this complexity, Williams perceived the county government as an entity which existed to serve the whole community and provide for the common good. He determined that this entity and its members were in need of help. As a result of his studies at San Diego State University, Williams believed there were alternate ways of knowing that could be aided by some research in the social sciences based on nontraditional perspectives. The following supports this way of thinking:

Thus, theory is important; in our usage it provides a way of seeing. More importantly, administrators who have more ways of seeing--more theories--accessible to them also have more available options and choices for practical action. By providing alternative theories we provide alternative perspectives and ways of seeing. In doing this, we provide the possibility of a more reflective practice, one that combines theoretical insights with practical action (Foster, 1986a, p. 12).

Supervisor Williams believed that if this kind of knowledge were applied to the situation existing in 1983, the county would benefit and be able to serve the citizens with equity and compassion despite the lack of funding. The county could learn to do

more for the community with less resources. An enlightened change was necessary in order to create an environment which was conducive to this challenge. According to Williams, a better understanding of the workings of the county within its unique context was crucial. It would enable the persons in governmental service to govern with greater insight and subsequently be able to serve the community and its escalating needs in an environment of mutual respect. He looked to the local academic community for assistance in addressing the many complexities associated with the governance of San Diego County. Because of this desire to better understand, Supervisor Williams formed a group known as the Issues Task Force. There were nine members.

The charge given to this Task Force was one directed toward the achievement of two interrelated objectives. First, the Task Force was asked to accept the challenge of envisioning a framework which spoke to the overall quality of life within the San Diego region for all citizens of the county. This framework, while visionary, was to be designed in accordance with the configuration of local political jurisdictions, particularly the county in 1983.

The second objective of the Task Force was to establish the design of "a rational, comprehensive process which, if applied, could pragmatically effect the realization of the quality of life framework recommended by the Task Force" (CAO Academic Team, 1983, p. 1). This procedure was to address a series of "integrated action steps which the County Board of Supervisors or individual supervisors could take to foster the formulation, implementation, and amendment of a county quality of

life framework and associated public policies" (p. 1).

Several months after Williams formed the committee and its members had begun to gather information unobtrusively to meet its two objectives, the first article in a series on the county government appeared in the San Diego Tribune on February 27, 1984. The author portrayed the county government of San Diego as a "County in Chaos" (Schneider, 1984, p. 1). A supervisor's aide was quoted as saying "The county government is almost near collapse, we have absolutely no idea why we are here. There is no plan. No one knows where we should be five years from now. We don't even know where we will be a year from now" (p. A6). In the same article a supervisor described how the Board of Supervisors worked with the department heads. "I don't think the department heads had the courage to come back and buck us . . . The end result was that we destroyed morale, we destroyed the department heads' credibility" (p. A6).

In the midst of this tumult, Williams assembled a team of advisors focused on the difficult questions facing the administration of the County of San Diego. In the subsequent seven years, he and other supervisors have helped to change the way the county government functioned. Aiding them in a very substantive way was Norman Hickey, whom the Board of Supervisors selected as the Chief Administrative Officer in 1985.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to explore, analyze, and write an interpretive case study describing the change processes in the San Diego County

government and the implications of these change processes on our understanding of the nature of leadership. The case study begins with the election of Supervisor Williams in 1983, the appointment of the Issues Task Force in 1984 and continues to analyze the change process through 1990.

The case study has four specific purposes.

- (1) To provide a written, analytical narrative of the change process in the government of the County of San Diego from 1983-1990.
- (2) To draw inferences from the analysis about the actualization of intended changes.
- (3) To articulate the implications the study has about our understanding of the nature of leadership in a multifarious, political context.
- (4) To demonstrate how these insights regarding change and the nature of leadership are relevant to the study and practice of public administration in a regional government in the United States.

The ultimate goal of the researcher is to make a significant contribution to the search for understanding undertaken by the administrators and supervisors of the county government of San Diego. Additionally, the researcher hopes to make a contribution to the leadership paradigm of the 21st century which will stand up under the scrutiny of scholarly research, and which will serve as an instructive model that can be used to educate working practitioners participating in complex public institutions.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the objectives stated above, the inquiry has centered around these four research questions.

(1) What were the changes that the administrators and the Board of Supervisors intended for the County of San Diego?

(2) How were the intended changes designed, articulated and realized in this large, complex public institution?

(3) Within a complex political context, how did the persons acting in decision-making positions internal and external to the administration of the County of San Diego government perceive and interpret the intended changes during the process?

(4) While exploring the process of intended change in a multifarious political context, what implications can be drawn about the nature of leadership in public administration?

Definition of Terms

City Government "is, to a significant extent, an independent political organization and not a political subdivision of the state" (County Counsel, 1984, p. 1).

County Government "is a political subdivision of the state for purposes of government, and the legislature has inherent power to prescribe the powers, duties, and obligations of such a subdivision in exercising governmental functions on behalf of the state" (County Counsel, 1984, p. 1).

Dialectic is a dialogue, an exchange, a public conversation which helps

participants make sense of the context, metaphors, and social structures in which the participants operate.

Influence Relationship is one which is multidirectional and noncoercive, involving voluntary participation.

Intended Change is when people "purposefully desire certain changes in an organization and/or in the society. The desire is not accidental or developed by chance. The intention is deliberate and initiated on purpose" (Rost, 1989, p. 29).

Leader is a person among persons intending real change actively and freely engaging in a multidirectional and noncoercive relationship.

Leadership is a dialectical, influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes which reflect their mutual and evolving purposes.

Manager "is the formal authority over an organization who: ensures efficient organization, designs and maintains organizational stability, adapts the organization to a changing environment, ensures that organizational goals are met, provides communication between the organization and the environment, and assumes responsibility for the operation of the organizational status system" (Mintzberg, 1984, pp. 78-85).

Management is "the art of getting others to do something through the use of incentives, extrinsic rewards, and/or punishment. Management implies the use of force or something less than voluntary involvement" (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, p. 26).

Morphogenesis is "applied to changes similar to those that occur in natural evolution. Here change is of a form that penetrates so deeply into the 'genetic code'

that all future generations acquire and reflect these changes. In morphogenesis the change has occurred in the very essence, in the core, and nothing special needs to be done to keep the change changed" (Smith, 1982, p. 318).

Organization: "An organization does not exist in any physically verifiable way. It is a system of relationships and, like all relationships, is both viable and knowable only in an abstract, derivative way, as with any other construct such as ego and God" (Smith, 1982, p. 368).

Paradigm: "A paradigm is not a theory or a leading idea. It is an entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by members of a given community" (Kuhn, 1970, p. 175). "In other words, several theologies are possible within a single paradigm" (p. 215).

Proposition 13 is a state constitutional amendment passed in 1978 that changed the provisions controlling property tax rates in California and the approval process required for any future changes in property tax rates. Proposition 13:

- (1) Eliminated the tax setting authority of local governments
- (2) Lowered property tax rates in 1978 to 1% of the 1975 assessed valuations.
- (3) Limited the inflationary index increase in property tax assessed value to 2% per year provided no change in ownership or new construction on existing structures had occurred.
- (4) Mandated that property, upon changing owners, was to be reassessed at market value.
- (5) Required an election to be held to consider any proposed change in

property tax rates, and that two thirds of the eligible voters voting in such an election must approve any change in property tax rates.

Real Change is change that is substantive and transforming.

Descriptions of Administrative Officers and Committees

Administrative Council: The primary function of the council "is the design of county government strategies and implementation plans to address [the] major issues facing [the] county government (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 1).

Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (ACAO): "As the principal subordinate of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer shares the Chief Administrative Officer's authority in the administration of county government. The Assistant Chief administrative Officer heads the Chief Administrative Officer's Executive Staff and represents the Chief Administrative Officer on Administrative Councils" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 1).

Board of Supervisors: "As authorized by general law and County Charter, the Board of Supervisors is the elected governing and policy body for San Diego County. The Board adopts the county budget and provides for the overall delivery of county services and programs through the appointment of county officers and the enactment of Board policies, Regulatory Ordinances and Administrative Code" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 1).

Chief Administrative Officer (CAO): "As authorized by the County Charter and directed by the Board of Supervisors, the Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for the effective and efficient administration of county government. The

Chief Administrative Officer provides policy-based support to the deliberations of the Board of Supervisors and provides the administrative framework and mechanisms to guide activities of individual departments in the achievement of county goals. The Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for managing the allocation of county personnel, capital and budgetary resources to the maximum advantage of the organization. Chief Administrative Officer directives are effected through administrative policies and functions of the executive staff" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 1).

Chief Administrative Officer's Executive Staff "The staff is composed of the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer and the Deputy Chief Administrative Officers. The Executive Staff plans and designs the administrative systems, structures and standards for the operation of the county government. It formulates and recommends administrative and public policy to the CAO and implements the goal establishment process for the organization" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 2).

Department Directors, Elected Officials, Court Administrators "Department Directors are responsible for the administration of county services and programs under their direction in accordance with general law, the County Charter, federal and state regulations and the policies of the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer. They ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the services under their authority. Department Directors participate on Administrative Councils and issue-specific task forces, to advise on public and administrative policy and ensure a systems approach to planning, service delivery and problem solving. These same

responsibilities pertain to Elected County Officials and Court Administrators, in their roles as managers of county resources" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 2).

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer (DCAO): "The Deputy Chief Administrative Officers are responsible for carrying out the policies and procedures of the Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer with their respective departments and offices. They oversee daily county operations, including budgetary and personnel matters and service delivery. Deputy Chief Administrative Officers review departmental goal development, monitor goal attainment and conduct executive performance evaluations" (Administrative Manual, 1989, p. 2).

Executive Team is made up of the CAO, the CAO's executive staff, and the department directors. The CAO invites the full participation of elected officials and court administrators. A committee of department directors having a functional interrelationship within the county government is known as the Administrative Council.

Public Administrator is an appointed or elected official responsible for directing the implementation, maintenance, and/or enforcement of public laws and policies, and recommending new or changed laws and policies to appropriate legislative bodies.

Conclusion

Supervisor Williams's decision began a change process which continues in the county government in 1991. His decision served as an appropriate beginning to a systematic academic research project. This research focuses on a county that has

demonstrated the integrity, courage, and enormous creative energy necessary to address a change process at a time when many, though not all, perceived the institution to be in chaos. The officials in the county government have not only been committed to this challenging process for seven years, but they have actively participated in this study which involved extensive and self-reflective processes of analytical discovery. It was only in an environment which invites inclusive critical inquiry that a research project such as this could occur. The County of San Diego opened itself up to the scrutiny of in-depth observation and analysis. By doing so, the county gave me, the researcher, an opportunity to study the nature of leadership and the process of change from the perspective of set of theories while participating in a complex playing field of vital practitioners, and it gave to the readers of this document a rare and valued experience to glimpse such a process.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

We will not recognize or accept any kind of truth that pretends to be ultimate or absolute. We will consider and weigh all claims as provisional conclusions. If examination shows them to be stop signs on the road of inquiry, we will ignore them; if they are signposts, we will note them and move on. (Leshan & Margenau, 1982, p. 70)

Introduction

This literature review covers three major areas, including a review of current literature in the field of leadership, change, and public administration. A discussion of the industrial paradigm will provide the reader with an appreciation of the background assumptions of the majority of the theories under discussion. The review of literature in public administration focuses on recent works which include some mention of leadership and change in county government in the United States. Very little has been written on the subjects of leadership or change in research involving county governments. This review includes, however, a representative sample of the research done on county governments in order to provide a way to demonstrate how county governments have been perceived in the past.

The primary purpose of the literature review is to see what ideas exist in the literature which can assist the researcher to better understand the nature of leadership and its relationship to the change process in the county government in San Diego.

The theories in question will be scrutinized by the practitioners' world. As Foster stated, theory does not exist in "some kind of a temporal sphere, untouched by human action or emotion--[it] must also be questioned, because not only does theory inform practice, but practice must inform theory. Each exists in a dialectical relationship to the other" (1986a, p. 12).

There is, however, a concern about inadequate and simplistic explanations in much of the standard leadership, change, and public administration literatures. They fail to explain the nature of leadership and the process of change in a complex dynamic institution. The final analysis of data may demonstrate some of these inadequacies. The study of theory is vital to this research, however, because theory provides "a way of seeing, a perspective on the world, a means for putting together the disparate events of our life in a meaningful fashion" (Foster, 1986a, p. 12).

In light of the importance of theory and the lack of such inclusion and global perspective in much of the aforementioned literatures, the researcher has included representative works from thinkers in various disciplines such as anthropology, ecology, literature, philosophy, physics, and theology. Their conceptual frameworks provide a means to better understand the phenomenon studied in the County of San Diego. Their inclusion is important because they serve as a lens through which the researcher can observe and interpret the process of intended institutional change in the County of San Diego. This lens enables the researcher to focus on a complex, evolving process with more sensitivity and wholeness. Indeed, Peacock said it best.

The focus is necessarily soft or, in a deep sense, holistic, in order to capture

the elements surrounding the object of focus as well as the object. The resulting picture is multidimensional, a kind of holograph that can be glimpsed with tantalizing clarity from certain angles, but that from others dissolves into hazy depths owing to the complex convergence of forces that create the image. (Peacock, 1986, p. 91)

The topics are discussed in an historical and integrative manner when possible. The composite provides a reflective backdrop for the narrative and analysis in later chapters. The discussion of the nature of leadership as defined by Rost (1991) as well as the works of Foster (1989), Bellah et al. (1985), and Grob (1984) is expanded in the analysis in Chapters Five and Six.

Leadership: The Nature and Process

The primary source for the theoretical thought on the nature of leadership for this research is articulated in two texts: The Nature of Leadership in the Postindustrial Era (Rost, 1989) and the comprehensive study on the nature of leadership most recently published, Leadership for the Twenty-First Century (Rost, 1991). The influence of these works and other papers written by Rost cannot be overemphasized. The theories emanating from these works have been internalized to such a degree that it is difficult at times for the researcher to make a clear distinction between Rost's original thinking and her own theoretical work in progress. Formal and informal acknowledgement of the contribution of his work is necessary throughout this study.

Other significant works in the process of thinking include: Paradigms and

Promises (Foster, 1986a), Reconstruction of Leadership (Foster, 1986b), "Toward a Critical Practice of Leadership" (Foster, 1989), "Leadership: The Socratic Model" (Grob, 1984), and Habits of the Heart (Bellah et al., 1985). Each work contributes new ways to think and know in the search to better understand the nature of leadership.

The works of Bellah et al., Foster, Grob, and Rost present ideas of real note, but perhaps more importantly, they stimulate new questions. Their works create a sense of urgency to take their ideas into the practitioner's world and discover answers. New questions are, in turn, stimulated by this form of inquiry. The theories and questions could be explored intellectually in and of themselves. I decided, however, to explore their concepts in a field study among and with practitioners in order to better understand the concepts and give me an opportunity to reflect on their pertinence. I chose to explore the theories in a context which serves society from the premise that "The Noblest Motive Is the Public Good," the motto on the seal of the government of the County of San Diego.

Before discussing these works, it is important to review a representative selection of leadership literature which preceded them. This will give the reader more of an historical perspective and a greater appreciation of the aforementioned authors' work in view of the complex problems facing the 21st century in the postindustrial paradigm. In the works of Bellah, Foster, Grob, and Rost, there is a dramatic shift away from the mechanistic background assumptions of the industrial paradigm, assumptions which are based on rationalistic and reductionist thinking. The traditional

models of leadership commonly found in the consultants' satchel are, however, deeply embedded in the industrial paradigm and are most often peripheral to the understanding of leadership. They need to be included in this review because their influence is felt in much of our society today.

Traditional models have been based on managerial principles resulting from the industrial era of the 19th and 20th centuries. The industrial era has been a time in which an entity's value and worth were determined by quantifiable output. Leadership could only be determined and evaluated in retrospect. The models have been content/knowledge oriented rather than process oriented. Also they have been based on various background assumptions including the following: scientific (Hershey & Blanchard, 1977), rational management oriented (Morgan, 1988), quantitative and goal-oriented thinking as seen in the path-goal theory (House, 1971), and technocratic and cost-benefit driven (Peters & Waterman, 1982). They are personalistic, male, hierarchical, short term, pragmatic, and materialistic. They reflect the background assumptions of the industrial paradigm.

The industrial paradigm, present throughout this century, began in the 1800s. The most pervasive metaphor in the paradigm is that of a well-run machine designed and controlled by rational men whose "organizations work most effectively when environmental turbulence and the personal preferences of participants are constrained by norms of rationality" (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p. 32). This mechanistic way of seeing posits that reality is a concrete body of knowledge which is knowable by all. This background assumption contributed to a society that has celebrated production

and, subsequently, endless consumption. "It focuses on how to find some arrangement--a pattern of roles and relationships--that will accommodate organizational needs (p. 33). What is of value is quantifiable, and effectiveness can easily be measured. Although many feel comfortable in a world such as this, the adverse effect of this way of thinking is reflected upon by the eco-theologian, Berry (1988), as he considered the present in light of the last century which has been deeply influenced by the industrial constellation of thought.

We were the sane, the rational, the dreamless people, the chosen people of destiny. We had found the opening of a more just society, a more reasoning intellectual life. Above all we had the power to re-engineer the planet with our energy systems, our dams and irrigation projects, our great cities. We could clear the forests, drain the marshes, construct our railways and highways, all to the detriment of other forms of earth, to the elimination of needed habitat, to the obstruction of migration paths, to the cutting off of access to waterways. We could subdue the wilderness, domesticate the planet. We were finally free from the tyranny of nature. Nature was now our servant, delivering up to its energies, altering its biological rhythms in accord with our mechanical contrivances. (Berry, 1988, p. 203)

The industrial paradigm fosters the concept that a person's value is determined by an individual's output capacity. Pragmatic values fostering self-interest and autonomy prevailed. The future will be determined by tradition, not by an organized plan. Work is subdivided into increasingly elemental and less intrinsically significant

increments. Prediction and control became the guiding values which fostered the idea that there is one right answer to every question discernable through logical positivism. Within this framework individuals have the unlimited ability to understand their universe. As a result truth is a concrete, knowable reality. But that reality is only known through hard data provided by the physical senses. These data can only be studied and analyzed rationally.

This background assumption deeply influenced our way of designing and running organizations. "That very rational process that we exalt as the only true way to understand is by a certain irony discovered to be itself a mythic, imaginative dream experience" (Berry, 1988, p. 205).

This mechanistic way of viewing the world led to a theory of leadership which precluded any multidirectional leadership process; its basic underlying assumptions were self-limiting. Leadership was embodied in the great man theory with positional top-down authority. In this paradigm deterministic outcomes were explained by cause and effect. The leader was thought to embody certain "leader-like" traits. The great man and trait theories espoused that leaders were born, not developed, that these men possessed special characteristics which separated them from nonleaders regardless of context or process. In 1948, Stodgill formally challenged the trait approach because it did not include the notion of change in the nature of leadership. Despite this challenge the trait theory thrives today as illustrated by Senge (1990) when he described leaders as persons distinguished by "clarity and persuasiveness of their ideas, the depth of their commitment, and openness to continually learning more" (p.

359).

The 1900s brought the rational, managerial, therapeutic, group, systems, situational, and human resource theories of leadership. In 1950 the behavioral approach was apparent in the Ohio State and Michigan studies. In the two-factor model of leadership, high consideration and high structure were considered best. The conclusions drawn from these studies were that leaders can be trained, leadership can be systematically explained, and models can be scientifically developed. These models did not include notions of influence or power in their rationale. These models postulate that the task leading to output was the end, and the people involved were instruments, the means. True to the industrial paradigm, outcome was the measure of effectiveness. To treat people as means was to devalue and dehumanize. In 1967, Fiedler presented the contingency approach. The theory posited that it was necessary to match the leader to an existing situation and that to determine effectiveness, outcomes had to be measured. Outcomes, not process, determine effectiveness. It was necessary to match leadership style to organizations or change conditions in the organizations to fit the leader because the individual's leadership style is unchangeable. The focus was on how to manage short-term goals. The importance of values and ethics was minimal, and followers were passive tools, not persons with wants and needs, much less purposes.

In the late 1960s to mid 1970s, the prime concern of industry was to get workers and worker groups to produce more effectively or more efficiently by having the employees learn how to follow leader directions and to subscribe to or buy into the

leader's viewpoints. House (1971) put forth ideas in which the leader prepared a path for followers to follow and to achieve organizational goals. Vroom and Yetton's decision-making tree (1973) provided a prescriptive analysis of how leaders should make decisions from autocratic to democratic. The vertical dyad linkage theory of Graen and Cashman (1975) emphasized the relationship of a leader to individual subordinates, as opposed to leader/group, where special subordinates are granted extra autonomy and influence in exchange for greater commitment, loyalty, and assistance to the manager. Finally the attribution theory, articulated by Sonja Hunt (1984), also contributed to the subject of leadership. This theory posits that people develop assumptions about the nature of leadership through the leader's behavior and from these assumptions generalizations are developed; here leadership is viewed as a psychological construct that people use to explain the inexplicable events of the world and their lives, it does not account for any change of the status quo.

In 1978 Burns published Leadership which looked at biological, psychological, political, and sociological antecedents of leadership. His thinking about the nature of leadership was revolutionary. He provided a new theory about leadership, but perhaps of greater significance were the unprecedented questions he posed which challenged the scholars who followed him.

The crisis of leadership today is the mediocrity or irresponsibility of so many of the men and women in power, but leadership rarely rises to the full need for it. The fundamental crisis underlying mediocrity is intellectual. If we know all too much about our leaders, we know far too little about leadership. We

fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age and hence we cannot agree even on standards by which to measure, recruit, and reject it. Is leadership simply innovation--cultural or political? Is it essentially inspiration? Mobilization of followers? Goal setting? Goal fulfillment? Is a leader the definer of values? Satisfier of needs? If leaders require followers, who leads who from where to where, and why? How do leaders lead followers without being wholly led by followers? Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth. (Burns, 1978, p. 1-2)

Burns introduced the concept of transactional and transitional leadership (p. 4). He described leadership as a special form of power and power as utilization of resources in order to achieve valued goals and ends. According to Burns, power does not need to be the power of one person over another, but rather it could consist of the empowerment of one person by the other (p. 17). Transformational leadership releases and develops human potential. It is a mutually purposeful relationship which raises the consciousness to motivate aspirations, wants, and needs, commitment to change. Politics is the heart of transformational leadership. Ethics and values are essential elements, as are engagement and power (p. 20).

Transactional leadership, on the other hand, happens when people are parties to the relationship for the purpose of exchanging of valued things. There is no common enduring purpose. The relationship is based on a measurable goal. Transactional leadership "must lead to short-lived relationships because sellers and buyers cannot repeat the identical exchange; both must move on to new types and levels of

gratifications. Most important, the transactional gratification itself may be a superficial and trivial one" (p. 258).

After Burns there emerged the movement which defines leadership as excellence in outcome. Peters and Waterman (1982) called for the leader to shape the culture in order to increase efficiency and productivity. Schein (1985) further developed the significance of culture to the leadership process. Bennis and Nanus (1985) returned to the traditional managerial approach to leadership: Leaders have a vision, communicate and articulate the vision and direct activities toward its accomplishments. The authors speak of empowerment as the act of creating an organization where individuals can accomplish quantifiable output.

The scholars who have most influenced this study are ones who are looking to the future.

Whether we are in transition or we are already in a new era, there is a pervasive sense that our values are changing radically, and that the values built into the industrial paradigm are not going to be the ones that support a transformed Western civilization. Leadership is one such value, and it is being transformed. (Rost, 1989b, p. 10)

Unlike the industrial paradigm which permeates the aforementioned literature, Rost defined leadership as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (1991, p. 102). There are four essential elements to Rost's definition.

(1) The relationship is based on influence.

- (2) Leaders and followers are the people in the relationship.
- (3) Leaders and followers intend real changes.
- (4) Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. (1991, p. 104)

In his definition there is no single actor playing a positional role in a hierarchical setting. There are multiple leaders and followers. There are no goals; there are purposes. The purposes are mutual. They are not predetermined by one person with a special gift of seeing, which is often referred to in the leadership literature as a vision. Results are not mentioned. The definition is in the present tense. Change is not singular. It is intended and need not be actualized. It is real, substantive change, not transitory. It is not limited to any context, personality, set of values, skills, or content. The definition is unique and thought provoking. It disturbs the rational, linear thinker who can only determine the presence of leadership in retrospect, within a well-defined structure while using quantifiable data to measure effectiveness.

According to Foster (1988), leadership involves critical practice defined as praxis, which is based on linking intellectual theory to practical activity. Leadership for Foster is a collective purpose aimed at social change and betterment. The change is going toward an end that is based on virtue ethics: liberty, equality, freedom, and justice. Leadership is transformative, as in Burns' definition. It is both educative and socially critical. It addresses social change and human emancipation. There is a goal. The goal is the achievement and refinement of the human community.

Leadership, in the final analysis, is the ability of humans to deeply relate to

each other in the search for the perfect union. Leadership, then, is a consensual task, a sharing of ideas and a sharing of responsibilities, where a "leader" is a leader for a moment only, where leadership exerted must be validated by the consent of followers, and where leadership lies in the struggles of a community to find meaning for itself. (Foster, 1988, p. 41)

Grob (1984) contributed to the study of leadership through the use of the metaphor, the midwife. The metaphor is drawn from Classical philosophy.

Perhaps the most powerful metaphor for the Socratic image is to be found in the Platonic dialogue Theaetetus. Here Socrates refers to himself not "merely" as the gadfly who awakens a "sluggish" people from their slumber but also as a "midwife" who knows that such an awaking is precisely the birth of all learning. (p. 46)

Grob sees the leader as the midwife of wisdom, not the creator. As a result the leader has no ownership of the outcome. Grob sees the leader working as a conduit for thought. "The Socratic leader teaches no doctrine, no fixed body of knowledge: what he or she teaches is the desire to be taught" (p. 41). Grob holds that the leader is a philosopher, and leadership is a dialogue in a political sphere.

Bellah and his associates (1985) contributed to this study of leadership even though they do not discuss the nature of leadership as such. They challenged the background assumptions of the industrial paradigm, which provided the metaphors that have served as the foundation of leadership theories in the past. Bellah et al. postulate the need for thinking based on the biblical and republican strands of American

thought, not the individual utilitarianism and expressive individualism stands which have controlled our thinking in the past decades. If one accepts Bellah's prescription for the future, leadership would exist within the context of a community working toward social change. The relationship to leadership could be described this way: "Sharing practices of commitment rooted in religious life and civic organization helps us identify with others different than ourselves, yet joined with us not only in interdependence and common destiny, but by common ends as well" (Bellah et al., 1985, p. 252).

From the study of leadership has emerged such theories as the trait theory, the great man theory, and the theory that a well-trained manager can become an effective leader/manager by assuming a learned leader-like style. There have been theories that assumed that a leader was born with special characteristics and gifts. The trait theory went so far as to assume this endowed individual would inevitably be placed in a position in which he/she could exert power over a constituency of followers. Leadership has more often than not been viewed as a single-actor, male-dominated phenomenon which occurs in a linear fashion from the top of a hierarchy to the bottom. Its reality was determined by quantifiable outcomes. There has been a change in some of the literature of late. Leadership, according to Foster (1986a), is being considered as a process which takes place in a contextual environment of structure, people, culture, and politics. Most recently, leadership has been viewed as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (Rost, 1991, p. 102).

Change Theory

In the County of San Diego there is a stated plan for change found in documents and formal descriptions. There are also multiple perceptions of this plan, which is in process of implementation. Both realities need to be considered. They need study in order to interpret and articulate the narrative of the intended change process in and of itself as well as in relation to the nature of leadership. In a study focused on an intended change process, it is important to consider in the analysis major ways of viewing change and the background assumptions which influence one's perceptions and theory of choice.

Change is generally thought to be the process of moving an organization from one state into another state. One can view organizational change from several schools of thought which include: the personal-therapeutic model (micro-level), the rational-managerial model (meso-level), the political/economic model (adaptive), the organic systems model (macro-level), cultural/symbolic (micro-, meso-, and macro- levels), and a new change paradigm which is oriented toward critical inquiry.

The first model, personal-therapeutic, views the social world as a constructed reality with a subjective world view. A major assumption is that change begins at a personal/interpersonal level; real, intended change will occur by developing human potential. Furthermore, responsible persons can change and be empowered in a creative and innovative environment. Lewin (1951) advocated creating cognitive dissonance to unfreezing, moving/changing, and refreezing the thinking in the persons in an organization. The focus is on unfreezing self-image, then disconfirming self-

image and allowing for change to occur, and finally providing cognitive redefinition of beliefs and values to refreeze a new image. Alderfer (1982) suggested that the change-resistant elements in an organization exist because people have behavioral patterns with associated intellectual justifications, e.g. racism. According to Alderfer these elements are only malleable with the use of organizational development strategies, team building, survey feedback, structural changes, environmental interfaces, and cognitive development. He addressed change as a resistant element in an organization which can be altered only if a microcosm of the whole is empowered to shape and monitor a process of self-reflective learning. His theory incorporates microcosmic groups and cooperative learning based on the premise that people have behavioral patterns which are associated with intellectual justifications, e.g. racism. Argyris (1982) contributed to this model of change with his concept of single and double loop learning, theories-in-use versus espoused theories, and the governing variables which, according to Argyris, inhibit people's learning and consequently their ability to change. Smith (1982) posited that to change we must first resolve epistemological issues, and so he made a distinction between morphostatic and morphogenetic change. Staw (1982) stated that individuals' deep-lying belief and value systems act as resisters to change and are counter-forces to commitment, perseverance, and escalation. The goal for a change agent, according to Staw, is to alter beliefs and cognition about the world. Argyris (1982) posited that there are variables which inhibit people's learning as explained in the definition of single and double loop learning. He also made the distinction between theories-in-use and

espoused theories in the process of change. The personal-therapeutic model does not take into consideration the political, environmental, or gestalt aspects of an organization. The basic tenet is that organizational change rests in the individual. If one changes the individual, the organization will in turn change.

The second model, the rational-managerial, assumes that humans are rational beings. From this premise other precepts follow. The organization is populated with rational actors who can be swayed by evidence of the need for change. Change is accomplished by a sequential strategy that is data dependent, which we call the scientific method. The environment is static and planned. The success of the organization does not depend on structure, technology, or size but rather on the rational activities of the manager. Rational actors can be swayed only by the presentation of evidence of the need for change.

This way of perceiving change is deterministic, mechanistic, prescriptive, systematic and logical positivistic. With these background assumptions there is a concentration on goals, tasks, the one right answer, concrete reality, mandates, planned logical strategies, hierarchical decisions, hard statistics, and expertise. Taylor (1911) integrated a theory of scientific management. Fayol (1919) defined functional management. Weber (1947) defined the bureaucratic structure. Haveloch (1973) created a six-stage strategic plan for change within an expert-centered context with the use of the outside consultant. Lawler (1981) emphasized shared values and goals as essential for successful change.

The political/economic model contends that change is not brought about by a

process of intervention, rational strategies, or personal change but rather the manipulation of political and economic processes. This theory posits that the manipulation of rewards, periodic changes in supply and demand, and the development of interest groups have the most profound effect on organizational change in a messy, chaotic, hidden environment in which conflict, brought about by the unequal distribution of power and resources, is the *modus operandi*. This model does not deal with the technostucture but rather agitation, bargaining, and coalition building. The model emphasizes the importance of manipulating external institutions, economic control, internal accounting/reporting, and internal politics. Change is constant. Cohen and March (1974), in their garbage can model, perceived the organization as an entity filled with an intermingling of problems, solutions, history, and choice opportunities in an arena of complex and ambiguous intentions. Bolman and Deal (1984, p. 144) concluded that: "The political frame says that power and politics are central to organizations. This perspective represents an important antidote to the antiseptic rationality sometimes present in structural analysis and to the excessive optimism that appears in some of the less careful human resource discussions."

The organic systems model stimulated the organizational development movement. To place the organization into an adaptive mode involves adjusting the organization to meet the needs of the environment. The assumption is that the organization is similar to a living organism made up of interrelated and interdependent subsystems. Organizations grow, develop, change, and die. They change through

adaptability, problem solving, by maintaining access to resources, and being responsive through communication. Change is a developmental process; it is not product oriented. It is holistic, dialectical, and often an intellectual investigation. Other theorists who considered the organization as a learning organism include Argyris and Shon (1978), Bennis (1966), Churchman (1971), and Lewin (1951). This model is unable to account for political and economic power issues.

The cultural/symbolic model is a combination of cultural anthropology and phenomenology. The study of organizational culture has become a favored model since Peters and Waterman (1982) wrote their best-selling book In Search of Excellence. The work focused on the values, beliefs, and attitudes of the organization which create and maintain meaning. Peters and Waterman (1982) placed an emphasis on the rite of passage, the rite of time management, the ritual of performance, and the telling of myths which in and of themselves provide collective unity in an organization.

Bolman and Deal (1986) wrote, "One way for organizations to achieve legitimacy is to maintain an appearance that conforms to the way society thinks such organizations should look" (p. 170). They discussed meanings and belief, yet their focus was primarily on manifestations of culture. These manifestations include myths, humor, metaphor, stories, rituals, legends and ceremonies. These were characterized as important because they "provide meaning, absorb energy and conflict, and reduce ambiguity. Structures, activities, and events also signal to the outside world that all is well" (p. 168).

Schein (1985) defines culture as:

A pattern of basic assumptions--invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration--that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

Because such assumptions have worked repeatedly, they are likely to be taken for granted and to have dropped out of awareness. Note that the definition does not include overt behavior patterns. I believe that overt behavior is always determined both by the cultural predisposition. . .and by the situational contingencies that arise from the external environment. Behavioral regularities could thus be as much a reflection of the environment as of the culture and should, therefore, not be a prime basis for defining culture. (p. 9)

Smircich (1985) viewed organizations as symbolic forms in which the reality is a symbolic construction. Weick (1977) defined culture as patterns of cultural processes and shared perceptions which together comprise the environment of the organization. Smith (1982) called for the use of metaphors as a way to reframe or redefine ways of doing things in a formal and/or informal way. Bates (1984), like Smith, was concerned with metaphor. "The links between language, metaphor, and ritual and their celebration of particular social ideals or myths form the essential administrative culture. . .The culture is a translation of myths into action and relationship" (p. 268).

This significance of this model on this study is evident in the following:

Organizational culture is the newest and perhaps the most controversial of the organization theory perspectives. Its theories are based on assumptions about organizations and people that depart radically from those mainline perspectives. One important difference is that the organizational culture perspective does not believe that quantitative, experimental-type, logical positivist, scientific research is especially useful for studying organizations. In the structural and systems perspectives of organization theory, organizations are assumed to be institutions whose primary purposes are to accomplish established goals. Goals are set by people in positions of formal authority. In these two schools of thought, the primary questions for organization theory involve how best to design and manage organizations so that they achieve their declared purposes effectively and efficiently. The personal preferences of organizational members are restrained by systems of formal rules, by authority, and by norms of rational behavior. (Ott, 1989, p. 2)

Critical theory approaches change as a process in the spirit of phenomenology. In this new paradigm of change developed from the constructivist view, people construct facts as defined by their values. The purpose of critical inquiry is to engage in empirical nonpositivist research. Foster (1986a) suggested that one gathers the facts of the situation, does critical inquiry of meaning and interprets the meanings or understandings that participants give to events: exposes and analyzes the conditions that suppress, empower, and disempower individuals in the organization. "We

approach the idea of change as praxis, that is, as practical action aimed at clarifying and resolving social conditions. Praxis must be thought as practical action, informed by theory, that attempts to change various conditions" (p. 167).

Public Administration

We need to understand the language regarding leadership and change which permeates the study of public administration today, especially in the administration of county government in the United States.

The literature search revealed thoughts reflecting several of the models of leadership and change that were discussed in the previous sections. In regional governments the public administrator manages and implements the policies made by a legislative body. There can be, according to selected authors, an influence relationship between the administrator and the legislative body, but the most commonly expressed model is that of the positional role expressed by Berkley (1975), Graen and Cashman (1975), and Marando and Thomas (1977). The primary challenges facing the public administrator as defined in a recent text are: "(1) maintaining constitutional order, (2) achieving technical competence, (3) coping with public expectations, (4) managing complexity, uncertainty, and change, and (5) behaving ethically" (Perry, 1989, p. 4). Perry did not use the word leadership but rather wrote of the effective public administrator as one who "must aspire to two potentially conflicting personal attributes: specialized knowledge on the one hand; and an awareness of and sensitivity to common, shared values, on the other" (p. 626). Bollens (1969) stated a

need for the research to consider relationships in county research: "basically, most research into county government has suffered from a lack of concern about relationships" (Bollens, 1969, p. 31).

There were no references to the process of change and/or leadership in the recent public administration literature which reflected the working definition of this study. The three most often repeated themes concerning leadership/change in the literature are: (1) the trait theory of leadership, (2) positional/top-down leadership, and (3) change (or modernization) as a result of strategic, rational planning.

Given the enormity of the change and inherent internal forces for stability, executive leadership must be involved in the specification of strategy, structure, people, and organizational processes and in the development of implementation plans. . . Executive leadership is directly involved in reorienting their organizations. . . . Direct personal involvement of senior management seems to be critical to implement these system-wide changes. (Tushman, Newman, Romanelli, 1986, p. 40)

The work of Marando and Thomas (1977) on the "forgotten" governments was discussed in Chapter One. In the 1980s the county gradually became the subject of more research. One reason for this change is that by the end of the decade many counties provided more services to more people than ever before in the history of county governments. This increased interest was a departure from the form of government which Gilbertson (1917) referred to as the "dark continent of American politics," a largely unknown and mysterious institution. In the same vein, Childs

(1925), the widely acknowledged author of the council-manager plan of municipal government, labeled county government as ramshackle and the "plague spot of American politics." Childs asserted that counties lacked professional administration, were not responsive to the public, had archaic and fragmented organizational structures, and, finally, lacked accountability. One of the first and few academicians who took an interest in the county as a subject for serious research was Porter in 1922. He described the origins of local government, described the legal status of the county with its offices and functions and set forth a reform program. Reform or change in county government, according to Porter, resided in function and structure.

The development of thought in the 1980s can be illustrated in a study by Giles, Gabris, and Krane (1980) in which they surveyed elected county supervisors and chancery clerks in 82 Mississippi counties to obtain their views of public policy issues, such as the need to provide more services and their attitudes toward county administration. Interestingly, they found no evidence that administrative development precedes policy development.

In the past three years there seems to be more written about change and leadership in the regional government literature. Luke and Caiden (1989) introduced quite a different concept to public administration, one which goes beyond the instrumental management approach, which they called "catalytic leadership." It is a term which looks away from the single actor, effective, power-over leader which is common to public administration texts.

Catalytic leadership is the ability to coalesce key public and private

stakeholders around a critical global-local issue. . . . A catalytic leader stimulates the development of a critical mass of diverse policy actors motivated by a goal or vision created collectively among them. Only such facilitators are able to move the interdependent web of government and corporate actors. A charismatic leader, with his or her individual vision, is seldom able to move the web of government and corporate actors in a particular policy direction. Whereas most traditionally oriented public executives view environmental constraints created by the various webs of interdependence as a source of substantial grief, catalytic leaders understand that interconnectedness generates possibilities for new and as yet undiscovered opportunities. (pp. 90-91)

The authors go on to discuss the need to understand and master "the new interconnected environment of public administration" (p. 92).

A more prevalent theory in public administration, however, is that change must occur from top of the hierarchy.

What the leader must understand is how the institutional process itself works and why strong government throughout is needed for effective policy performance. . . .The understanding at the top of how organizations and institutional processes work and the ability to use such knowledge is the critical missing link needed to guide that political power in the desired direction. (Williams, 1987, p. 189)

Some authors call for new thoughts concerning public administration. "What is

needed in public administration is an intellectual tension between what the state requires and the alternative possibilities that public administration may pose for itself in shaping public affairs" (Ventriss, 1987, p. 33). Paraphrasing Ramos's concern "that the field [of public administration] has fallen into a dangerous Hegelian trap that the 'real is the rational,'" Ventriss suggested that scholars not fall into the trap "that we believe to question critically and examine the 'real' is tantamount to questioning and, ultimately, circumventing the goals and purposes of American public administration" (p. 35). In the spirit of critical inquiry, Ventriss intended to raise more questions than answers.

Mitchell and Scott (1989) discussed the preservation of the status quo. At a time in history when the climate of individualized self-interest reigns, there is often a popular cry for ethical public leadership in the process of re-evaluation of resource allocation and coordination. Despite this espoused desire for ethical behavior, Mitchell and Scott proposed that:

The institutional status quo could be preserved as long as Americans value the material advantages it gives them. Americans may simply expect far less virtue in their leadership, because it is not administrative virtue but administrative power that makes a difference in the quality of lives. Thus, a distinct possibility is that rather than reformed institutions or enhanced individuals, people will simply accept the status quo: a situation in which abuses of power and corruption are tolerated in exchange for goods and services. As long as these goods and services reach most people in sufficient

quantities, they may cynically withhold trust but support the current structure of the administrative state. (Mitchell & Scott, 1987, p. 451)

In March, 1991, Menzel presented a paper to The American Society of Public Administration in Washington, D.C. The title of the paper was Setting a Research Agenda for the Study of the American County. He described past research and presented future ideas for needed county research, asking for more researchers to consider the study of county leadership. According to him there has been very little research of this nature attempted.

Studies of county leaders and leadership are underway, although work in this area is still quite limited. Much more needs to be known about how leadership at the county level is exercised, whether or not power elites have replaced "courthouse gangs" of the past, and what skills and abilities are necessary to become an effective county leader. (Menzel, 1990, p. 23)

Clearly, some scholars in the American Society of Public Administration believe that more research needs to be done on leadership at the county level. As far as I know, there is no qualitative case study in public administration literature which concentrates on the intended change process and the nature of leadership in a county government. This research will be the beginning.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Anne Doshier, Special Consultant to the Chief Administrative Officer, and I met each other when I was doing a research paper on leadership. Our first interview was on March 10, 1988. We talked extensively about the nature of leadership, change processes, the County of San Diego, and her role as a consultant to the institutional change process. I listened to her and as I did I knew that someday, through my research, I would have the privilege to enter public service. I had no idea how. I just knew that I would. She learned in the conversations to follow that I was interested in the county and fascinated by what she and the administration were attempting to do. In the fall of 1989 she told me that I might contribute something of value to the county and at the same time pursue my interests in institutional research and design within a public institution. She arranged for me to meet with the Chief Administrative Officer of the County of San Diego, Norman Hickey, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, David Janssen, and her in the Chief Administrative Officer's small conference room of the County Administration Center one morning in late October, 1989. I had not previously met Hickey or Janssen.

We met for nearly an hour, discussing what they were doing to change the county government. They explained that there was no written chronicle of the change

process that had begun several years before. There were instead various memos, documents, notes, newspaper articles, and recollections—not correlated or compiled.

We discussed how a formalized cohesive narrative of the change process could be reconstructed and how it could help the county administrator in several ways. First of all, it would give the county administration a vehicle to better understand what the intended changes were in this process and how they were designed. It would also explore, how were the changes realized or not realized? The document would give the county a lens through which to see what has been happening and how, according to the reconstructed narrative, the process has been realized. The second way the narrative serves the County of San Diego is by creation of a document that would contribute to public administration literature and research. Because Hickey, Janssen and Doshier felt this change process was unique, they suggested that a well-written document added to the public administration literature could, in and of itself, serve two purposes. (1) It would provide the practitioner in governmental service a new way to consider and approach the complexity of change in local government, possibly serving as a model for future institutional change. (2) The document would also enhance the reputation of the county government of San Diego locally and throughout the United States.

During our meeting Hickey and Janssen asked me questions about my professional and academic background. Janssen read my resume and an analytical paper I wrote on appreciative inquiry in organizations. I asked about their priorities and how I could help the county. Hickey and Janssen asked if I would be interested

in researching and writing a detailed description of the process by which designed institutional changes occurred under the present administration. I very happily accepted the opportunity to do this research and write the document.

At the meeting the four of us agreed that the research would be:

1. A qualitative case study
2. Reflective of the complex and many faceted institution that is the County of San Diego
3. Nonintrusive of the work flow
4. Not manipulated by any of the county administrators
5. Inclusive of many viewpoints
6. Comprehensive and long-term
7. Conducted over a long period of time
8. Done with access to all public documents
9. Accomplished in an environment of mutual respect and trust
10. Written to inform, not self-validate

The researcher was given the responsibility to create and execute the design of the case study. I chose to research the process, analyze the findings, write the narrative, and then explore what implications could be made from the study on the nature of leadership. The research process began during that meeting and continued for 17 months.

The county administrators understood that the research document would be submitted as a doctoral dissertation to the School of Education at the University of San

Diego and that the researcher would defend the document in a public oral examination. When the dissertation is approved by the university dissertation committee, it will to be housed in the Copley Library at the University of San Diego and in the Governmental Reference Library in the County Administration Center.

The Qualitative Case Study

The qualitative case study is the methodology used in this research. No other method could adequately address the research questions. Merriam (1988) defined the qualitative case study as "as an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit. Case studies are particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic and rely heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources" (1988, p. 16). Thus, qualitative case studies provide a way of empirical inquiry wherein the researcher is able to study contemporary phenomena within a real-life context and at the same time gain an historical perspective of processes.

The case study provides a way to do unobtrusive research in a complex setting which is driven by dynamic, multidirectional interaction and constant flux. Researchers choose this method when the boundaries between the phenomena and context are not clearly evident. The goal of such research studies is not to prove an hypothesis but rather "deal with the presentation of multiple social realities, with the reconstruction of the constructions, with deciding how to make the case for each construction, and with deciding about what data can or may be marshaled to support, defend, or render uncredible any given construction" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, pp. 135-136).

Lewis, a political scientist and researcher, wrote me an encouraging note after we had discussed my approach to this research project. We talked while attending the research conference sponsored by the American Association for Public Administration in Washington, D.C.

Your suggestions on approaches to interviewing county sheriffs were well-heeded and I plan to read the Guba and Lincoln book (see Chapter Three) before embarking on interviews this summer. There is considerable richness in taking a case-oriented, phenomenological approach and I look forward to climbing out of my survey research/crank-the-data shell and attempting something new. (1991, p. 1)

To include many interviews when studying a complex political context is not the usual approach to county research on county governments. This study did not rely on an antiseptic, time-efficient, linear approach to analysis. It is difficult to imagine how it could, when there were so many players in a seven-year drama.

According to my review of county government research, the research method of choice in past decades is the paper-and-pencil survey. The surveys are mailed out to the respondents. The respondents prioritized their choices by checking the appropriate box. They are sometimes asked to write short answers to specific questions. The results of a survey can be easily quantified in a short time. Reactions to prescribed questions can be analyzed and charted. The researcher need never meet the respondent. The researcher does not need to be the person who designs the survey. The survey can and often does impose the author's presuppositions on the

respondent, easily limiting and controlling the scope of the study.

In this research, the county government of San Diego was studied very differently. When doing a qualitative case study, the researcher is the instrument and the respondent is the participant. There is an active relationship, a uniquely human interaction expressed through the dialogue between two persons who are both discovering something new.

The dialogue process is an integral part of the story. Hours were devoted to the process of interviewing as well as to analysis. The researcher chose this method because in order to tell the story of the county, it was imperative to have a rich and meaningful data base from which to draw. By providing this broad base, an in-depth study of the language was possible and meanings could be discovered. Common and uncommon perceptions were noted. A representative selection is included in this document, interwoven into a tapestry. The tapestry provides a way for the researcher and reader to discover meanings and acquire an understanding of the various and common perceptions existing in and about the county.

The researcher proposes that such an approach is essential and allows for an enlightened story of the county's attempt to change. An inclusive methodology such as this invites many participants to construct meaning and in a substantive way co-author the complex story of the county. To rely on one spokesperson would be to miss the distinctive character of diversity which thrives in the county government of San Diego.

Lundberg (1985) asked the researcher to avoid the self-limiting "careful"

approach often present in institutional research. He suggested that persons doing such complex institutional research should avoid the pitfalls of the careful approach which fosters only "careful optimism." "I suspect," Lundberg wrote, "it is this emotional tone that ultimately separates us" as institutional researchers. "I would have him [/her] dream more boldly, advocate more ardently, and let his [/her] passions as well as his [/her] intellect lay down challenges for us " (1985, p. 66).

A qualitative case study attempts to understand the meanings which cannot be discovered through experimental or quasi-experimental research. In this case study the researcher decided to concentrate on the process of intended change while exploring the implications which can be drawn from the process on the nature of leadership. The study also notes perceptions that express shared and disparate meanings about the change process and the nature of leadership.

Pettigrew (1985) supports contextual research in his writing. He posits that research within the context is the natural way to link theory and practice.

Systematic description of the properties and patterned relationships of any process and of the changes in context through which such processes emerge and, in turn, influence that context is a critical form of knowledge for theoretical development and for practice. In conducting such process-in-context research, it is critical for theoretical developments in organizational analysis that context no longer be defined just as intraorganizational context and that organizational environment not be defined just in terms of the activities of other organizations. We have to bring socioeconomic and political

contextual factors into our analyses, not only because they are in today's world so empirically crucial but also because incorporating such a broad treatment of context into our analyses will release organizational analysis from much of the misdirected and in many cases impotent managerialism that informs "theories" guiding management practice. (1985, pp. 242-243)

The intended change process begun in 1983 in the County of San Diego fits the description Merriam used for a case study and research, to wit: "a highly subjective phenomenon in need of interpreting rather than measuring. Beliefs rather than facts form the basis of perception. Research is exploratory, inductive, and emphasizes processes rather than ends" (Merriam, 1988, p. 17).

Participants and Site Selection

The purpose of this research is to understand how change actually occurred in the County of San Diego and what that process had to do with the nature of leadership. In order to accomplish this purpose it was necessary to hear the perceptions of the process from many persons who were involved in the changes that took place from 1983 to 1990. I asked 66 persons for an interview and 62 accepted my invitation. The first formal interview of this study took place on October 29, 1990, in the San Diego County Administration Center. The final one occurred on March 25, 1991, in Washington, D.C.

The sample consists of four populations of individuals: (1) participants working within the county government of San Diego during the change process being

studied, (2) participants who were actively involved within the county government of San Diego during part of the change process but who are no longer so involved (each of whom has remained active in the San Diego community), (3) participants working outside of the county government of San Diego who observed the process from the vantage point of an active member of the San Diego community at large, (4) participants working as administrators in other local governments within the United States who have experienced a process of intended change in their institutions.

Group One

Hickey gave the researcher permission to invite any person working within the county government of San Diego to participate in an interview. There were no restrictions placed on whom I selected. Participation was voluntary. I chose a group of participants and decided to go over the list with Hickey and Janssen out of courtesy and in recognition of the sensitivity of this process. They suggested four persons that might add valuable insight to the study, and I accepted their suggestions. No participant was deleted as a result of these two conversations.

I selected these persons for the research for several reasons. Because of the size of the institution--of more than 17,000 employees--necessary criteria were established, and ground rules were created. Time constraints, not a judgment of value of their contribution to the change process, prevented the researcher from interviewing persons below a certain position in the hierarchy. Although a formal interview was not possible, I, as the researcher, had continual, informal interaction with many persons on different levels during the 17 months working within and about the county

government. The data from these interactions enriched my understanding of the county and its processes. The data are used in the study and the discussion of shared meanings therein.

After 10 months of observations and interactions with county personnel, I was ready to conduct the interviews. I based the decision to include a person in the list on one or more criteria: (a) the person's recorded importance, contribution, and relevance to the change process, (b) observations made by the researcher, (c) the number of times other people suggested that I interview the person, and (d) the person's historical sense of the county. There were 40 persons asked to participate in the study, and all of them were interviewed.

Participants from Group One include the following people. The number in the parentheses indicates how many individuals are included in each category.

1. All members of the 1989-90 San Diego County Board of Supervisors (5)
2. Chief Administrative Officer (1)
3. Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (1)
4. Deputy Administrative Officers (4)
5. Chief of Staff to the Chief Administrative Officer (1)
6. Special Consultant to the Chief Administrative Officer (1)
7. Selected elected officials: Assessor, District Attorney, Sheriff,
Treasurer/Tax Collector (4)
8. Court Administrator (1)
9. Former Presiding Judge (1)

10. Representatives from the extended executive team, both appointed and elected (19)

11. Representative for San Diego County, Washington, D.C. (1)

12. Board of Supervisors' Staff (1)

The researcher interviewed a several persons in Group One a number of times. These persons include Williams, Hickey, Janssen, and Doshier.

Group Two

The researcher chose these three individuals because of the unique functions they performed in the county during the years included in the study. Participants from Group Two include the following:

1. A Former Chief Administrative Officer (1)
2. A Former Member of the San Diego Board of Supervisors (1)
3. A Former Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (1)

Group Three

This group includes people from the news media, military, clergy, other local governments, private businesses, and civic organizations in the San Diego area. The researcher selected these persons because of (a) their function in the community, (b) their familiarity with the county government, and (c) their recognized importance by other community stakeholders. These are the 12 people in this group.

1. Members of the clergy (2)
2. Military officers (1)
3. News media people: An editor, reporter, and television commentator (3)

- 4. Local government officials (2)
- 5. Educational administrator (1)
- 6. Community spokespersons from a community-based organization, The Chamber of Commerce, and business person (3)

Group Four

The researcher selected seven persons because of their experience and recognized prominence in the field of public administration. Six of these persons were delegates to the International City Managers Association Symposium on Managing Local Government in Pacific Rim Countries held in Kona, Hawaii, in January, 1991. The seventh member of this group could not attend the Symposium. I interviewed him in Washington, D.C. Participants from Group Four include the following:

- 1. Executive Director of the International City Managers Association (ICMA) (1)
- 2. Executive Director of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) (1)
- 3. Executive Director of the Association of Bay Area Governments (1)
- 4. City Manager of Decatur, Georgia (1)
- 5. City Manager of Greenville, South Carolina (1)
- 6. Assistant Manager of the Metro-Dade County (Florida) Government (1)
- 7) Director of Member Services of the International City Managers Association (ICMA) (1)

Data Gathering

As the researcher, I used multiple sources of evidence throughout this study.

"The researcher will be the primary instrument for data gathering and analysis" (Merriam, 1988, p. 19). Evidence was gathered in the natural setting, from documents, artifacts, systematic interviews, spontaneous interaction, noninteractive observation, and limited participation in the processes being studied. "Evolutionary or emergent in nature, qualitative research is an interpretive process that analyzes and describes symbols, norms, values, beliefs, attitudes, and underlying assumptions of the participants" (Putman, 1982 p. 194).

I gathered data for this study in order to provide a broad base of information from which I could reconstruct and analyze the narrative of the county. The process of intended institutional change in the county government is a complex one to study. For me to understand and write the analytical narrative, I drew the data from three sources: participant observation, nonreactive research, and interviews. A brief description of each source follows.

Participant Observation:

Guba and Lincoln explain this method of research;

Observation (particularly participant observation) maximizes the inquirer's ability to grasp motives, beliefs, concerns, interests, unconscious behaviors, customs, and the like; observation (particularly participant observation) allows the inquirer to see the world as his [/her] subjects see it, to live in their time frames, to capture the phenomena in and on its own terms, and to grasp the

culture in its own natural, ongoing environment; observation (particularly participant observation) provides the inquirer with access to the emotional reactions of the group introspectively—that is, in a real sense it permits the observer to use himself [/herself] as a data source; and observation (particularly participant observation) allows the observer to build on tacit knowledge, both his [/her] own and that of the members of the group. (1981, p. 193)

I observed, listened, and interacted throughout the 17 months of this study in formal and informal settings. At times it was appropriate to take notes. There were also many times I listened and engaged in conversation and decided not to write notes, for various reasons, while people were talking. My notebooks had a life of their own. Sometimes they were elsewhere. There were times when note-taking would have made the person or persons with whom I was talking very uncomfortable. The conversation would have become one-sided and could have become stilted. Note-taking was distracting to me at times. At other times it was an aid to the interaction. There were persons who seemed to enjoy my demonstrating an interest in their thoughts. Several of these asked me if I would audio-tape their words.

When I did not take notes, I wrote down my observations as soon as possible after the event or interaction. Sometimes I drew a rough sketch of the setting, wrote the purpose of the interaction as well as my impressions. I often recorded my observations on my tape recorder and listened to the tapes in the car as I went about my work. I quite literally immersed myself in the sounds, tastes and smells of the

setting. My notes are contained in four notebooks and on many audio-tapes. They have not and will not be shared with anyone. They are a confidential log of my perceptions and a record of words I heard. No one set of notes is meaningful in and of itself. It is the collage of meanings which makeup the story.

The researcher observed while attending conferences, meetings, classes taught by county personnel, social events, and seminars, all of which related to the county in one way or the other. Some of these events were held in a county facility, others were not. In some instances the researcher was a participant in the meeting, and at other times the researcher was there as a reflective observer. In every event the researcher chose to inform Hickey prior to being present at the event. There were occasions that Hickey invited me to attend events--local community and county functions, professional meetings, and out-reach interventions for the county which took place throughout the San Diego area, in Hawaii, and Washington, D.C.

The researcher engaged in extensive and ongoing observations, interactions, and conversations with Hickey, Doshier and other administrators in the Office of the CAO and throughout the county government. During this time, the researcher worked primarily in the County Administration Center. I wrote the entire text of the document at home.

I also engaged in multiple conversations with numerous persons, in many administrative and support positions throughout the county work force. These conversations took place in the cafeteria, library, at my desk, rest-room, elevator, various offices, parking lots, walking down the hall, and at informal dinners. The

researcher made an attempt to go quietly about the world of the county, engaging others when welcomed, after a slow process of building a sense of trust and legitimacy.

Nonreactive Research

Brewer and Hunter explain this method of research:

Nonreactive research centers around the use of two kinds of measuring techniques: unobtrusive observation, in which the subjects are unaware of the researcher's activities, and indirect observation, in which the researcher studies archives, artifacts, and other naturally occurring data sources. . . . This method serves to reduce the risk of errors stemming from the effects of observation and from the bias of studying only living, competent, and cooperative subjects. (Brewer & Hunter, 1989, p. 80)

The researcher used this method in this research when data were collected from the reading of the minutes of meetings, newspaper articles, memos, television and radio programs, written reports, the Administrative Manual, and correspondence. The county archival documents were read to gain factual information and also study the perceptions of the media reporters whenever possible. There was extensive observation, both participative and nonreactive. There were instances when I sometimes observed participants when they were not aware of my presence, however, the researcher never embraced the spirit or the stance of an investigator. The situation gradually evolved wherein I was accepted by most county personnel as part of the operation, and they naturally went about doing their work as usual even though I

observed them.

There was an instance when the legitimacy of my presence was sorely and overtly tested. That interaction was very painful at the time, but it gave me the chance to experience the pain others feel when administering to this complex political context. It was a good experience for me as a researcher. It raised my sensitivity and consciousness to the people of the institution. The experience also made me more aware of the complexity of change to collaborative thinking when working with players who are accustomed to determining each player's impact by accumulation of power. I learned from the reaction of those players, that when the parochial priorities of one or several key individuals are in conflict with the sense of shared whole, the system thinking which is integral to the intended change process in the county administration, is put in jeopardy. The rules of the game had been changed, these individuals felt vulnerable, and reacted because of a perceived loss of individual power. Through the interaction, I learned a facet of the county administrative change process I would have been perhaps less sensitive to if my presence had been always accepted and never challenged within the county environment.

Interviews

This study calls for multiple interviews. This story needs many authors to gain authenticity. Guba and Lincoln noted that multiple interviewing

Is a search for multiple realities, truths, and perceptions. Those multiple realities are contained in the unique, the singular, the idiosyncratic, the deviant, the exceptional, the unusual, the divergent perceptions of individuals,

as they live or lived the experience. The "elite" interview is thus an attempt to reach the nonnormative: the person who has a singular view because of his [/her] expertise, position, or insight; the respondent with special information; and/or the interviewee who is central to a situation or otherwise holds a unique position. (1981, p. 157)

The formal interview process began when a letter was sent to each person explaining the focus of the research and inviting them to participate. My administrative assistant contacted each person by phone and scheduled each interview. Only four persons out of 66 could not be interviewed for one reason or another. The interviews took place at the convenience of the participant. In search of an interview with key participants, I went to various offices, took a walk in a park, rode about in a golf cart and traveled as far afield as Hawaii and Washington, D.C.

Before the interview began each participant read and signed the Consent Form (Appendix A). The researcher asked permission to audio-tape the interview. In one instance the researcher decided not to record the interview. All other interviews were taped and the tape transcribed. Taping allowed the researcher the opportunity to interact more freely and yet assure the accuracy of the data collection. It also gave me the opportunity to hear the interview many times and allowed me to become immersed completely in the language of the persons in the culture of the county. Each interview covered the basic questions, the order often determined by the flow of the interaction as well as the background of the participant. After the individual tapes were transcribed, each participant was sent an unedited transcript. They were

given the opportunity to delete or clarify any portion of the transcript without question or reprisal. Each participant returned the transcript initialed and dated. The information contained in the edited transcripts is considered not confidential. If the participant indicated a portion of the transcript was confidential, that information was not used in writing up the study. This edited transcript is the data that has been included in this study.

There was no expense incurred by any participant in the interviewing process. I explained to the interviewees that the interviews were on the record and that the information gained from the edited transcripts of the interviews might be used in the written document resulting from the study. If the interviewee wanted to give the researcher some confidential information not on the record, the researcher turned the tape recorder off and allowed the interviewee to proceed. Once that information was given, the researcher turned the tape recorder back on and proceeded with the interview as before.

The interviews lasted from 30 minutes to six hours. Most interviews took between one and a half to two hours. The participant was told the interview would not exceed an hour unless she/he so wished. An interview guide was used in the interviews. The four groups described in the preceding section had a slightly different interview guide, however the participants discussed the same themes in each interview. The researcher and the participant engaged in a conversation of varying length. I went to the participant in all but two cases, when the participant chose to come to my place of work. At first I guided the conversation, and then each

interview took on a life of its own, depending on the participant.

When interviewing the persons in Group One, the researcher asked the following questions. They were slightly modified to accommodate the background and preferences of the interviewee.

1. In 1984 the county government was portrayed in the San Diego Tribune as a "County in Chaos." There was a series of 13 articles dated from February 7, 1984, to March 12, 1984, which described the crisis as it was perceived both internally and externally. If a series of articles were to be published in the San Diego Tribune today, would the story be the same or different? Please explain.

2. Name some of the things that are different now, what changes have occurred?

3. Which of these changes were intended, designed? By whom? Who authored the design? Were you aware of the design process? Were you involved in the process? How were you involved? How were you informed of the intended changes?

4. Are there some changes that have occurred by accident? Name some of them. How do you know they were accidental? How do you differentiate between intended and evolutionary change?

5. Who were the participants in the process?

6. Describe their relationship with one another and to the process?

7. How did the participants bring about changes? What did they do and not do in the process?

8. What has not happened that initially was intended? What has remained unchanged?
9. Why were these things not changed?
10. Who and what in the county government contributed to maintaining the status quo?
11. Are you participating in the process of change? How would you describe your participation in this process?
12. As a student of leadership, I would be interested in hearing your definition of the nature of leadership.
13. According to your definition, does leadership exist here in the county government? If yes, please give an example of a time you experienced it. How did you recognize leadership was happening?
14. Lastly, if you were asked today to write a headline describing the county government of San Diego for the newspaper, how would it read?

For the interviewees in the second and third groups, a brief explanation about the study was given. I then asked if they were familiar with the 1984 articles in the San Diego Tribune. After a brief discussion the researcher asked the following questions.

1. From your perspective, what changes have occurred in the last decade within the county government?
2. How have these occurred?
3. Does the community recognize a change? How do the persons of the

community view the county?

4. As a student of leadership, I would be interested in hearing your definition of leadership. How do you know when it is happening? Can it be known in the present or only from an historical perspective?

5. Do you think leadership exists in the county government today? If so, please give me an example.

Since the people in group four were not familiar with the particular change process of the County of San Diego, I asked them thematic questions about change, the nature of leadership and public administration.

1. From your perspective how does intended substantive change occur within your governmental institution?

2. What is the nature of leadership?

3. Can leadership exist in public service? Please give me an example of a time you experienced it.

The insights gained from the interview responses to the above questions provided a background for the final stage of the research. This composite enabled the researcher to be more knowledgeable and sensitive when engaging the formal analysis process.

The researcher was able to work within a known context which facilitated a better understanding of the perceptions and discovered meanings of 62 persons who were formally interviewed in the study. The questions provided structure to the interview in an atmosphere that encouraged freedom.

This freedom enabled the themes to emerge in a natural way based on the participant's own background assumptions. Sometimes a person answered one or several questions without ever being asked. I made no attempt to stop the flow of conversation and control the order of questioning. Each in his or her own way provided the information I sought. There were other participants who seemed to naturally gravitate toward a pattern of formal questioning. This was absolutely acceptable. The researcher made every attempt to sense the format which would best accommodate the participant.

During the interaction all but one person selected to expand the interview and offer additional self-reflection. Five participants asked me to meet with them for additional time. I accommodated each request. Two came to me and asked to talk more about leadership as we walked in the hall of the county building. Three persons called me at home for the same purpose. Numerous participants clearly stated that they were available to the researcher if I needed them and they could be of help at a future date to assist in the process. Each participant made a singular contribution to the study of the county through her or his choice of questions, answers, spontaneous comments, moments of humor, tone of voice, tears, periods of silence, and body movements.

All participants received a letter describing the focus of the research prior to the interview. The majority of participants in Group One seemed well informed and ready for the process to begin. Almost all of the internal people

had met or at least seen me about the county office buildings at various functions. There were other participants, primarily from the second and third groups, who were reluctant at first; they did not know me. It was very understandable that we needed to know more about each other before we began the interview. I took time to discuss with them the purpose of the project and answer any questions they might have. When the participant indicated it was time to begin, we began.

All participants were given the opportunity to direct me to sit where they wished me to sit when I arrived for the interview. Different ones wanted me in different places. Many of the participants chose to sit near me during the dialogue, either at a round table, at the end of the conference table, or in adjoining chairs. There were those who gave me the choice. Several offered me coffee or other refreshments before we began.

There were participants who positioned me at a distance, separated by an imposing physical barrier. These often chose to sit behind their desk, which was filled with memorabilia and papers. One participant had a witness present. Sometime the office door was left open, other times it was shut. There were participants who took telephone calls, others asked that all calls be held.

One participant immediately informed me when I arrived that time was short. "Five minutes ought to do this." I gave no response and simply began the interview. I was ready to leave the room at any given moment. At the

same time I was trying to work out a strategy on how to handle the interview. I wanted very much to talk with this particular individual. The participant chose to walk in and out of the office as the interview progressed. This journey in and out of the room lasted for 45 minutes. After 45 minutes, the participant stopped walking in and out of the room, sat down slowly and began swiveling back and forth in the desk chair. This lasted for another 10 minutes. The chair was then still. In the last moments of our conversation the participant expressed a singularly thoughtful interpretation of the change process occurring in the county. Our interview was over, and I was escorted to the outside door. I walked out of the office exhilarated and at the same time weary. My mission was accomplished.

Another person chose to begin the dialogue by standing in the corner of the room against the wall answering questions by asking other questions in return. I was to sit. This uneven interaction went on for a half-hour. Eventually this individual sat down, sought eye contact, and remained seated until the interview was mutually ended.

Despite all the differences displayed each participant shared something in common. Sometime during the dialogue, each person I interviewed, without exception, expressed a respect for the research process that the county was undergoing, an interest in the findings, and in most cases a desire to read the entire study when completed. The interest in some cases seemed to become more and more perceptible as the process unfolded.

This observation of the practitioner's interest seems a significant finding in itself. There is an opinion, unfortunately expressed by academic researchers, that the practitioner is not interested in research or its findings. This assumption was articulated most recently in Washington, D.C. during an informal gathering of research academicians who focus their work on county governments in the United States. I attended a series of meetings in March, 1991, at the recent convention for members of the American Society of Public Administration.

During one informal gathering, I listened to a conversation among academic researchers who study county governments. The group was discussing some future trends in this kind of research. I heard a prominent person say to a group of peers, "You know they [the practitioners] never read anything longer than a memo unless they have to, surveys are the only way to catch their attention, and they have to be short and have a gimmick--and even then you're lucky to get a 40% response." None of the other researchers expressed any disagreement with this statement. Apparently, there was no need to comment on an accepted fact.

I found in my research, however, that to assume that the practitioner has a lack of, or at best a cursory, interest in research is incorrect. The reaction of over 60 practitioners in this study was one of interest in the subject, process, and in the final document. It was a unanimous response. I suggest that the use of dialogue, quality of time, and mutual interchange elicit a greater

interest than the anonymous survey from thinking and feeling individuals who shoulder heavy societal responsibilities.

Whatever way the dialogue began, each one ended in such a way that I felt a new mutual respect and relationship had evolved. Time and time again I heard words similar to those of this spokesperson, "It was good to have a chance to think, to really talk, a chance to be heard. You really listened."

Analysis

Relevant academic literature in the leadership and change theory was studied and compared to the public administration literature. Both literatures were read, prioritized, and analyzed. Their relevance to the present study was considered. The researcher made an effort to see if there was a common theme in both the academic and the public administration literatures. Inferences were drawn after studying the language, actions, and interactions of people and groups of people. Various social constructs were apparent.

By gathering data in this way, the researcher derived a way which allowed the story to be written and the meanings analyzed. The method allowed the researcher to analyze data based on grounded observations and theory, to "reveal the general through the particular, the abstract through the concrete" (Peacock, 1986, p. 83). The composite made for a meaningful narrative which "depicts diversity, conflict, and individual choice. . .in the context of the whole" (p. 82).

The chronological narrative--the official story--was constructed first and

verified by triangulation from three sources. (1) The researcher gained extensive information from Doshier. She provided a detailed oral and some written account of the process. (2) The county archives provided limited written documentation of the change process. (3) The interviews, both formal and informal, provided insights and facts which added to or corroborated the other evidence. The researcher correlated and analyzed the data, in order to create a cohesive and validated story line.

The researcher read/heard each transcript, some of them several times. I met with Williams, Hickey, Janssen, and Doshier on many occasions throughout this research process. The researcher studied the story contained in each interview. Each one enriched the narrative. The researcher studied the language of interviews and analyzed it to discover the meanings beyond the agreed-upon chronology. I made an effort to discover both the shared and disparate meanings of the phenomena of change as well as the nature of leadership expressed by each participant. The researcher studied and noted the use of metaphors. I looked for common and dissimilar meanings and searched for the participant's perceptions of how change occurs and does not occur in a democratic institution such as the county government of San Diego.

During the analysis, the researcher listened to the expressed perceptions of a common experience by key participants. The researcher listened for different and similar perceptions and postulated why these differences occurred. The researcher listened to their thoughts about the process of change and the

nature of leadership in the county government of San Diego.

Finally, the researcher placed the research data in dialogue with the recent literature on the nature of leadership with an emphasis on Rost's (1991) framework. I wanted ultimately to see if what I discovered through my analysis of the research data, gathered in my work with the County of San Diego, enriched, correlated with, or disputed the framework.

Ethical Concerns

The researcher acted with a constant awareness of the highest ethical standards. The rights and welfare of each participant were protected. No person other than the transcriber, the researcher and the participant has or will read any transcript. My handwritten notes are contained in four notebooks. My verbal notes are on 20 audio-tapes. They have not and will not be shared with anyone. They are a confidential log of my perceptions and a record of many words I heard.

All consent forms required the signatures of the participant, the researcher, and a witness. The consent form (see Appendix A) clearly states the purpose of the study and the extent of participant involvement. A statement assuring absolute confidentiality of the transcript was also included on the form. I told each participant that the manuscript would be a public document. Hickey signed a consent form (Appendix B) for the special study of the County of San Diego. Each participant agreed to be acknowledged by name in the study. Any participant requesting to edit his/her transcript was

given every opportunity before the transcript was considered data to be analyzed for the study.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research done within the context of multifaceted, multidirectional change phenomena is two fold: (1) To provide a self-reflective narrative which will serve the county administration, the county work force, and the citizens, both now and in the future. (2) To gain a greater understanding of the nature of leadership in a democratic institution. As an interpretive and participative scribe working within the perimeters of a qualitative case study, I hope as the researcher to illuminate the complex processes of change, offer material for speculation, and provide matter for evaluation when I describe the nature of the leadership relationship that I observed and experienced during the 17 months of this research.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE NARRATIVE OF THE CHANGING COUNTY
PART ONE

Introduction

This chapter begins the analytical narrative of the change process in the government of the County of San Diego from 1983 through 1990. The narrative is one of the four specific purposes of this research and has been divided into two parts. The first part, the formal description of the process, is found in Chapter Four. This part addresses the first two research questions: (1) What were the changes that the administrators and supervisors intended for the county government of San Diego (during this time frame)? (2) How were the intended changes designed, articulated, and realized in this large, complex public institution? The second part of the story, found in Chapter Five, addresses Research Question Three: Within a complex political context, how did the persons, acting in decision-making positions internal and external to the administration of the County of San Diego government (during this time frame), perceive and interpret the intended changes during the process?

By approaching the narrative in this way, the researcher can answer a priori questions and at the same time demonstrate that a story of this magnitude cannot be told without addressing all three questions. The researched narrative will show that

while Parts One and Two are interdependent and together will equal a whole, neither tells a complete story. This approach also demonstrates the appropriateness of the choice of qualitative case study methodology, which in this instance depended on participant observation, nonreactive research, and interviewing to gather data. The three data-gathering methods, combined in the same endeavor, provided a way to triangulate the findings to assure validity and at the same time enrich the story with meanings that heretofore had not been explored or recorded.

Leon L. Williams: The Beginning

In 1982 Leon L. Williams was elected 4th District Supervisor of San Diego County. He assumed office in January, 1983. He came to his new position with a rich background of 27 years in San Diego local government.

He brought a certain level of decorum and appropriateness, [to a] kind of savage environment, a kind of inquisition, that virtually everyone had to experience when they went before the Board—either staff or individual citizens—it was just a public forum to be avoided if at all possible. (L. Grissom, personal communication, January 29, 1991)

The professional experience and background assumptions that Williams brought to his position as supervisor are very significant to this research, because it is from his background assumptions that he spoke in 1983, with a voice that had not been heard in recent times, if ever, by a supervisor in the San Diego County government. He began to question what had not been questioned; he expressed a care for what and whom had been left unattended; he sought to prevent, not perpetuate; and he spoke

softly from an inner strength. His professional background was not common to his peers or predecessors. Williams had just completed 13 years on the San Diego City Council, a tenure in office that began with his appointment in 1969. He was the first African-American councilperson to serve on the San Diego City Council, and he was the first African-American supervisor to serve on the San Diego County Board of Supervisors. Before he became an elected official, Williams was an employee of San Diego County for 14 years. While an employee, he worked in both the human and criminal justice service areas. These areas remain for Williams as a focus of concern, priority, and expertise. As a citizen of the San Diego community, he had served as the project director for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and was Director of the San Diego Urban League.

Williams was elected to fill the seat vacated by a supervisor who had served from 1974 through 1983. This former supervisor is remembered by several county government executives and community members as "the lowest common denominator" serving on the Board of Supervisors. The unwritten rule of the day during his tenure in office was to avoid public confrontation. According to several executives who worked in the county government at that time, county people avoided all contact with him in a public arena. If a department head had to make a presentation, the best choice was to simplify the language. This method, according to four interviewees, was sometimes a successful way to avert a verbal assault and public humiliation. Others simply withdrew and offered only what they knew was acceptable.

The former supervisor participated in teaching an in-service class for county

executives entitled "Presentations Under Pressure." A long-time county executive remembered one comment of the supervisor that indicates the environment at the Board of Supervisors meetings between 1974 and 1983.

Jim [Supervisor J. Bates, 1974-1983] came into that class, and he made a comment that I will remember forever. He said, "On Board day I come out and I'm like a dog, I sniff the air and if I smell blood, that's the one I go for." I mean, that was the environment. And so you [as an executive] began to understand. I used to go to Board hearings, when I had no idea before they had video-taping [of the weekly Board meetings], to keep in touch with the guts and the sinew of this Board. . . . I remember my first budget that I had to present personally was the 1980 budget, and I remember going into that Chamber scared to death. . . . It was the beginning of a whole era of distrust. (C. Steppe, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

The culture of the county had not always been characterized or perceived in this way. When referring to an earlier time, prior to 1968, Steppe described a different drama with a different cast of characters. He articulated, as did a number of other participants, that a change occurred around 1968 with the election of the first of several supervisors who thought their role was motivated by very different political agendas and aspirations from the supervisors who came before them.

I think you have to start with the idea that the elected Board of Supervisors in previous years [prior to 1968] were people typically who had retired and were successful somewhere else who took on the job of supervisor as a way of

paying back the community. . . . They were not interested in salaries; I mean they didn't require an awful lot of money, but it was a philanthropic attitude of "I owe this community. I am going to pay something back." They had very little, if any, staff because there was the faith in the bureaucrats to make sure that things ran appropriately. You begin to see that deteriorating. Going back, I guess the one point that I would recall would be Jack Walsh coming in as a member of the Board of Supervisors [in 1968]. A younger man who had aspirations beyond the Board and he began taking a very strong leadership role for political reasons. (C. Steppe, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

Prior to his election to the Board of Supervisors, Williams was keenly aware that the San Diego County government was under siege both internally and externally. Proposition 13 had been passed in 1978 by the voters in California, and it affected the basis for the funding of services in the counties of California. Despite the ceiling placed on available resources, the San Diego County government had been directed to assume the responsibility of providing a growing number of services to a rapidly increasing and greatly diversified population. At a time of a steady decrease in revenue, the county was expected to fulfill and perform state-mandated functions, administer federal programs, and respond to the pressing needs of county residents with less money to fund these necessary programs.

In passing Proposition 13 (see Chapter One), the citizens stopped local governments from increasing revenue from property tax except by a 2% annual

increase, which was supposed to compensate for inflation. This and the passage of the Gann limit, two years later, meant severe cuts in subsequent revenues to the counties of California. According to several community spokespersons, the passage of Proposition 13 also displayed a general mistrust by the citizenry with the administration of public funds by local bureaucrats throughout California. County programs were, as a result, left unfunded.

During that time frame, David Speer submitted his resignation as Chief Administrative Officer of San Diego County. The Board of Supervisors knew that the county needed financial expertise in the new administrator. The person had to be one who could see the institution through this fiscal crisis. In July, 1978, Clifford Graves, the Chief Administrative Officer for Management and Budget for the County, was selected to be the new Chief Administrative Officer. He was recognized by the Board of Supervisors, his peers, and subordinates for his financial expertise and "indisputably brilliant analytical mind" (Spokesperson, personal communication, November, 1990). Graves recalled how these cuts contributed to a demoralized state within local government.

Proposition 13 was seen by public servants as a personal repudiation of everything for which they stood. It was a very emotional time for public servants, because most public servants are there because they want to be, because they believe in what they are doing, and they believe they are doing the public good. And to have the public whom they think they are doing good for kick them in the head, which is the way they read Proposition 13, it was

very traumatizing. (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991)

In the years that followed Proposition 13, priorities had to be re-evaluated and changed in order to accommodate the needs of the community within the decreased revenue. With scarce resources came bitter division and fierce competition. Since the voters had overwhelmingly approved the proposition and very few elected officials had backed it, some of the politicians wanting to please their constituency seemed to see "themselves as the avenging angels of the voters" (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991).

Williams and others were aware of a breakdown in communication among some of the key participants of county government, both appointed and elected. They observed an estrangement between the county officials and some of the constituents in the community they served. The media frequently targeted the county and were highly critical of its way of doing business. "For several years, beginning probably about 1979 through probably 1985-6, there was a lot of attention paid to the county because of some very obvious problems . . . that needed to be written about in order to call the public's attention [to them]" (C. Walbert, personal communication, January 28, 1991).

At the same time there were those persons in the county government, as well as in the community, who felt that the county was doing its job satisfactorily. They determined that the mandates were being met and the needs in the community being satisfied. One county executive recalled that time as a time of efficient government, a time when the county was represented by the media unfairly.

The county was not an organization in chaos. The services were adequately delivered to the people. How do you measure whether or not government is doing well? Are they processing the permits? Are the welfare checks getting out on time? Are the prisoners being taken care of, etc.? If you use those measures of "is the organization working?", the county was not in chaos, because the county was producing all the services that it was supposed to be producing. (D. Janssen, personal communication, November 15, 1990)

There were 14 other interviewees who agreed with the above statement and felt that the criticism during that period was not justified. Their observations can be summed up in three arguments. The negative view of the county government resulted from: (1) ignorance on the part of the public and the news media as to the complexity of county government; (2) an underlying bias, prevalent in a politically conservative environment, which existed and encouraged a general distrust of the bureaucrat and the public sector as a whole; (3) a pervasive distrust of an administration which was headed by an African-American who was relatively new to the community, considered by most as an outsider who was by nature reserved.

Supervisor Williams had a sensitivity to and an understanding of the polarity of perceptions in the community and county government. He also observed and felt the pain which resulted from a culture which rewarded individualism over a commitment to community. He envisioned a government that needed to focus on its complex responsibilities. He perceived the county government as an entity which existed to serve the whole community and provide for the common good. He decided that in

order for the institution to fulfill its responsibility, it had to rise out of an environment which fostered victory or defeat. The county government needed to refocus its priorities. The county officials needed a way to analyze and reflect on the way the county government did business. Williams wanted "to strengthen the Chief Administrative Officer's hands," according to one informant. He had come onto the Board from the San Diego City Council knowing the city manager form of government. He had championed a strong executive in 1973 and 1974 when he supported a series of San Diego City Charter amendments to strengthen city government and its administration's autonomous authority.

The culture within the county government seemed to Williams to be one that encouraged isolated, privatized decisions rather than ones which reflected a sense of interconnectedness with a dynamic whole, with only the most politically astute able to survive in the competition for scarce resources. In 1983, as in the preceding decade, the supervisors had direct, and sometimes capricious, access to the department heads. In this arrangement one supervisor could request one thing of a department head while another supervisor could expect quite the opposite. One person described the situation in the Board of Supervisors' meetings simply as a "crapshoot. . . Many folks just gave up and put on what they thought was going to sell." Graves, according to the interviewees, did not support the department heads in public, when they were under siege. His management style has been described as "hiring the best person for the job, let him have maximum authority, and only pull in the reins under the most dire circumstances" (Schneider, 1984, p. A-4).

When describing the situation in 1983, Williams discussed the way the Board of Supervisors affected the people and workings of the county government.

The way the Board conducted business was not a respectful way of receiving information, asking questions and giving directions to the staff. So staff was intimidated in many instances. So the staff out of, perhaps, self-protection in many instances would not make recommendations. They would just present information and leave it to the Board. . . .The Board had reduced significantly the administrative capacity of the county in that it had destroyed the Office of Management and Budget [in July, 1982], which had existed then and decimated the Chief Administrative Officer's staff. The departments were more or less on their own to try to make their presentations to the Board of Supervisors. It was a Board of Supervisors who was trying to make the decisions, coming from all across the county, and it was not in the position to set the appropriate kind of priorities, in my view. I think that was the major issue. They [county officials] were rocking under the impact of Proposition 13, and the state bailout money had more or less run down by that time, by the time I came on the Board, which was 1983, and we began immediately to try to focus the ability of the county to set priorities on a conscious, coordinated basis, rather than on a chaotic basis. (L. L. Williams, personal communication, November 15, 1990)

It was this commitment -- the need for the county to refocus-- that led Williams to make two key decisions in 1983. The first was to establish the Issues

Task Force for the purpose of studying the county government from a theoretical perspective. The second decision was made after extensive discussions in the community and the backing of the editors of Copley Press in the San Diego Union

County voters would be asked to correct two basic flaws in the charter that will diminish the supervisors' authority. In relinquishing this authority, the supervisors would provide a degree of accountability that has been missing from San Diego County government and has prevented it from achieving the level of public confidence enjoyed by San Diego city government. (Warren, 1984, p. B-6).

Williams decided to author Proposition A, an amendment to the County Charter, which was approved by the voters in November, 1984. This amendment established a clear differentiation and distinction between administrative and legislative roles in the County of San Diego. The resulting changes provided accountability and clarity to a public institution that not more than a month previously had been labeled by the same newspaper as a "County in Chaos."

The Issues Task Force

A fortuitous event occurred one evening in the spring of 1983. Dr. Stuart H. Gilbreath, Professor of Urban Studies in the School of Public Administration at San Diego State University, attended a dinner where Williams was also a guest. During the evening he approached Williams and asked if he, Gilbreath, and his colleagues could be of help to the supervisor and the county.

Dr. Anne Doshier, a distinguished community psychologist, also attended the

dinner that evening. In an interview, she recalled the conversation between Williams and Gilbreath as follows:

A colleague of mine, Dr. Gilbreath, who was presiding over the County Psychological Academy, met me and Williams at a dinner and asked if there was anything that the Psychological Academy [could do] to assist the supervisor. The supervisor said that he thought if an issues task force was formed with key academic personages, it would be very helpful in assisting to frame the questions and frame an initiative to get this county out of its crisis. So the key connector was Dr. Gilbreath. (A. Doshier, personal conversation, December 14, 1990)

Williams accepted the offer of help, and the Issues Task Force began that evening. When asked why he turned to academia for help, Williams explained his decision very simply.

When I was a college student, I knew that we had a lot of information. Academia has a lot of information about human behavior and how we can organize things, which if put into actual practice could improve our results significantly. So the thrust was to get academic people in a position so that they could give direct input . . . where the decisions are made. (L. L. Williams, personal communication, November 15, 1990)

Doshier and Gilbreath met and discussed what disciplines should be represented in the Task Force to best uncover the issues. They also considered who might be interested in serving the community on such a team. Doshier recalled:

We designed a team that would bring in economics and finance, criminal justice administration, and the Dean of the College of Human Services [at San Diego State University]. We brought together the academic actors from the university that would parallel the areas of crises. . . . So if you look at the profiles of the team, they add up to a system of thought that, together with some research and practice backgrounds, could mirror what we thought would be, if you will, a social brain, out of the full limelight that could together look at the county. (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990)

The team consisted of nine members. Seven were selected by the process described above and two were selected by Williams. The Task Force members were:

1. Jose Romulo De La Garza, Assistant Vice President of DAI-ICHI Kangyo Bank
2. Stuart Gilbreath, Ph.D., Psychologist, School of Public Administration, Urban Studies, San Diego State University
3. Darrel L. Pugh, Ph.D., School of Public Administration, Urban Studies, San Diego State University
4. Anne W. Doshier, Ph.D., Community Psychologist, Consultant
5. Joel Henderson, Ph.D., Criminal Justice, School of Public Administration, Urban Studies, San Diego State University
6. Faustina Solis, M.S.W. Provost, The Third College, University of California San Diego
7. Peter Dual, Ph.D., Dean of Public Health, College of Human Services, San

Diego State University

8. Frank Panarisi, former Assistant Chief Administrator Officer, Deloitte, Haskins & Sells, San Diego

9. Winnie Willis, M.D., Public Health, Graduate School of Public Health, San Diego State University

In 1984 Dr. Diane Rothenberg, an anthropologist from the University of California, San Diego, joined the team for approximately a year. In addition to the nine persons on the Task Force, there were two administrative support persons. They worked with the Task Force and communicated with Williams about the process of the team. The first was Wes Pratt, the Chief of Staff for Supervisor Williams. The second was Jimmie Slack, an academic intern from San Diego State University.

Before the study began, the committee went through a structured process to "agree on our research design" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990). It took several meetings and lengthy discussions to "agree upon a common language" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990). She described the model that she recommended as a "legitimate framework for looking through a framework at a multilevel overlapping series of organizations in the institution" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990). The model was drawn from the work of Yehezkel Dror (1971), Design for Policy Sciences.

The Task Force volunteered its time and expertise to the county. It met on a regular basis, from July, 1983, to March, 1986. Some members found that the time commitment was too much. Others felt that their interests were met after a time, and

they went on to other interests. There were different opinions among the team members. One Task Force member said: "The idea was to look at some long-range issues, key issues for the county. Frankly, it [the task force] was not well defined; it wasn't well structured. . . .Some of it was good, some of it I didn't think, frankly, was practical for the county" (Spokesperson, personal communication, January, 1991).

Another said that the Task Force experience taught him that "the government in books is not the one found in reality" (J. Slack, personal communication, March 14, 1991). He observed prominent academicians in the field of public administration learn about county government as it was in actual practice. He saw them realize that, despite all of their academic background, "There was still surprise left when confronting the complex reality of county government" (J. Slack, personal communication, March 14, 1991). Slack noted that several of the Task Force members grew to understand the need for interdependency among the various services in the county. They became less protective of their own field of concentration and more able to look at the county government from a broader perspective.

The Task Force met in the Board Library on the third floor of the San Diego County Administration Center. They looked first at the mission, then at the framework and finally developed three research questions. The three questions were: (1) Is there a framework, which speaks to the overall quality of life? (2) Is there an administrative mechanism for developing policies and implementing this framework? (3) If no such mechanism exists, how is policy made?

The Task Force members agreed not to write lengthy papers but rather limit

their written output to short statements and recommendations. They agreed upon a low visibility and did their work unobtrusively. They did not want to assume a political stance. The work of the Task Force was to serve as a resource for Williams, and he in turn would serve as the connector with the other supervisors. The Task Force did not communicate with the other supervisors. "Williams was the lateral informer and consensus builder with the Board The intent was to have the supervisor build his own consensus group, work with his own peers, attempt to move them to a level, the same level of questioning" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990). Various members of the Task Force conducted a series of individual as well as group interviews with key players in the county government. Often several members of the Task Force were present to interview a key informant. "Our interview process gave hope to various key actors throughout the system, who were feeling disconnection because of the really merciless dynamics between the Administration and the Board of Supervisors. They did not know that anybody cared about their plight" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990). Some of these interviews were held off site, e.g. on the campus of the University of California San Diego. This method was used in order to "shelter key informants. . . . They had to be sheltered because of the way that the Chief Administrative Officer at that time administered the county and related or did not relate to key administrators in the system. . . . As we worked, we started small initiations for collaboration for system healing, for confirming that somebody cared. . . . We didn't want to simply be drawing information, not without giving back. That was an intentional strategy"

(A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990).

The Task Force was charged with two interrelated objectives. First, the Task Force had the challenge of envisioning a framework which spoke to the overall quality of life within the San Diego region for all citizens of the county. This framework, while visionary, was to be designed in accordance with the configuration of the local political jurisdictions in the county in 1983.

The second objective of the Task Force was to design "a rational, comprehensive process which, if applied, could pragmatically effect the realization of the quality of life framework recommended by the Task Force" (Chief Administrative Officer Academic Team, 1986, p. 1). The Task Force was to provide a series of "integrated action steps which the County Board of Supervisors or individual supervisors could take to foster the formulation, implementation, and amendment of a county quality of life framework and associated public policies" (p. 1).

The Task Force issued its findings in July, 1985. First, although the quality of life goals existed, they were known only by a few persons, they were not used as a framework for policy making, and no one in the institution was formally given the responsibility for their implementation. Second, although the County Charter and the Board agenda provided a mechanism for dealing with policy issues, there was no design established for policy development. Third, a strategy to realize the quality of life goals did not exist. The goals were not reflected in the institution's ways of doing business. They were not incorporated in the Chief Administrative Officer's contract, and there was no built-in accountability for their realization. They were not reflected

in setting priorities during the budgetary process. No institutional instruments were in place to see that they influenced the workings of the county or the citizen boards, commissions, and committees.

When the Task Force reported its findings and conclusions to Williams in July, 1985, and then later in April, 1986, to Hickey, the Task Force was not known outside of a small group of county executives and Board members. One executive said, "I was flabbergasted when we had that first meeting in here [Chief Administrative Officer's small conference room (April, 1986)] with Norm [Hickey, Chief Administrative Officer] and the whole Task Force. I didn't know who they were, and it was really surprising to me that they had been working for almost three years on the county, and I had never heard of them" (Spokesperson, personal communication, November, 1990). Only one person I interviewed was aware of the Issues Task Force and its findings.

I think when Williams was elected, he saw himself as being on the Board for four or eight years [one or two terms]. He had a pretty good idea of what he wanted the county to be like when he was through, and he came in and started [the process]. That task force, as I recall, was one of first things he set up, which later went to the Charter Review. . . process, which led to Proposition A. . . . He and I did not talk about his agenda in detail, but I knew that's what he was doing. (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991)

The findings led the Task Force to come to five major conclusions. They were reported to Williams in July, 1985. They are contained in a document presented to

Hickey in April, 1986.

1. Fiscal and political constraints [in the county government] drive the programs.
2. Incremental change [within the county government] is based on budgetary considerations only.
3. Policy making occurs [in the county government] according to a laissez-faire approach, which produces the lowest common denominator value. Emphasis is placed on special interest representation, outside consultation, and minimal institutional investment.
4. Policy failures are blamed on revenues, state mandates, waste, inefficiency, and mismanagement in county bureaus.
5. Since 1978, the County of San Diego has been managed but not administered. (Issues Task Force, 1986, p. 5)

Dosher interpreted the conclusions in this statement:

The whole thing [the county] was crisis managed. . . There was a lack of administrative coordination, either vertical or horizontal. There was none. . . .Because no time was given to administer the planning, there was no opportunity for creativity. So, we had an institutional culture that fractured administrators and managers who were severely inflected with depression, alienation, futility, hopelessness, distrust, and the inability to be creative. They [the county executives] could, they were creative people but there was no time to be creative. I found this to be a very important piece of the finding.

(A. Doshier, personal communication, December 14, 1990)

The Issues Task Force submitted three major recommendations to Williams for his consideration in 1985 and later contained in the April, 1986, document.

1. We recommend an institutional redesign that facilitates planning and policy development, administration, and program monitoring and evaluation.

2. We recommend the development of a strategic planning process. Such a process would include both an established procedure for new policy design and a procedure for review of current policy.

3. We recommend the institutionalization of an ongoing learning process, leading to the development of improved human resources and organizational design.

(Issues Task Force, 1986, p. 7)

These recommendations provided a framework from which the county Board of Supervisors and Chief Administrative Officer began to define the intended change process.

The language of this model, under the guidance of Doshier in her role as consultant to the Chief Administrative Officer and the Executive Staff, still exerts influence in the county and on the intended change process. For this reason it pertinent to define the terms that are used. The definitions were articulated by Doshier in many conversations with the researcher. These constructs are heard in meetings and read in memos.

mega policy: The guiding framework for the quality of life.

meta policy: The policy which governs the process for making policy.

policy: A guiding method, course of action, principle or procedure designed to direct or influence decisions

realization strategies: Those contracts, procedures and mechanisms by which policies are implemented and evaluated.

administration: A function devoted to policy development, organizational planning, and realization strategy design so as to achieve program implementation.

management: Program operation, maintenance, evaluation, and redesign (Mission Statement: Issues Task Force, Fourth Supervisorial District, 1983).

The Media, 1984

Several months after the Issues Task Force was formed by Supervisor Williams, and its members had begun to unobtrusively gather information to meet its two objectives, an article appeared in a San Diego newspaper which was to be the first of a series. After three months of investigation, the 13 articles appeared in the San Diego Tribune between February 27, 1984, and March 12, 1984 (see Appendix C). The San Diego Tribune portrayed the county government of San Diego as a "County in Chaos, [where] The Board sits at center of Storm, Scandal, Embarrassment, Weak Leadership, Investigations. These words have been associated with the county government in recent months" (Schneider, 1984, p. 1). The articles analyzed various components of the county, including the Board of Supervisors present and past, the Chief Administrative Officer, the Office of the Assessor, the Office of Employee Services (personnel), Community Advisory Boards, the Departments of Planning and Land Use, General Services, Health Services including Environment and Mental

Health, Public Works, and Social Services. Issues discussed included errors in welfare cases, misuse of affirmative action in recruitment, the appointment and retention of incompetent employees, workfare controversy, public abuse of staff by elected officials, exodus of executives to other institutions both public and private, special interests over the common good, poor administration, manipulation of funds, lack of fiscal planning, wasted funds, the neglect and abuse of the mentally and physically ill.

The Board members came under scrutiny. "Many county officials say it was too much direct action by Hedgecock, Bates and other past supervisors that undermined the power of Graves and other top administrators. That power-stealing eventually eroded morale from the department heads down, leaving the county open for scandal after scandal" (Schneider, 1984, p. A6). The Chief Administrative Officer was "criticized for failing to lend a firm hand running the day-to-day operations, [he] appears hemmed in by the County Charter, which makes him little more than the supervisor's chief advisor and the person who carries out Board policies" (1984, p. A6).

Frank Panarisi, former Assistant Chief Administrative Officer under Graves, was quoted as saying: "'The county enjoyed a reputation of being one of the best and most progressive in the country a few years ago. It's certainly changed.' What happened? Many observers cite a series of management changes coupled with a you-get-yours, I'll-get-mine attitude among current and former supervisors and the weak leadership of the politicians and top administrator" (p. A6). When describing the state

of the county, a supervisor's aide was quoted as saying, "The county government is almost near collapse, we have absolutely no idea why we are here. There is no plan. No one knows where we should be five years from now. We don't even know where we will be a year from now" (p. A6).

In the same article a supervisor described how the Board of Supervisors worked with the department heads. "I don't think the department heads had the courage to come back and buck us . . . the end result was that we destroyed morale, we destroyed the department heads' credibility" (p. A6).

The picture portrayed by the San Diego Tribune was a bleak one filled with controversy, disunity, and errors. In the interviews done for this research, I asked each participant from San Diego County about these articles. All but a few were familiar with them and had a definite reaction. One person close to both the former and present Chief Administrative Officers said:

I hasten to say that the newspaper, the media are an awesome device. It's a very powerful instrument and it can definitely, it does shape public opinion. And once it [the media] have started shaping it, once they have decided that this is their target, whatever this is, they very narrowly zero in on that target and they work hard at doing whatever it is they want with that target. (J. Hatcher, personal communication, November, 1990)

Some participants felt the articles represented only "isolated and random things that had been selected for investigation and in no way reflected the totality of the services as provided by the county government." The participants judged the

influence of the articles by "how many persons picketed this building. How many alarmed citizens wrote letters, how many made phone calls, how many showed up with placards demonstrating what we were supposedly doing." (Spokesperson, personal communication, January, 1991)

The articles caused no public outcry. The significance of the articles was dismissed by some of the interviewees. However, at the same time and in the same building, there were those who felt differently.

We spent a great deal of time talking on the inside, "What are we going to do about this? How do you change people's perception?", when it isn't what they want to believe, and they don't believe it's true, and in fact it's impossible. It was impossible to do. We worked very hard to try from the inside to do that, to think strategies to do it--but in fact, the only way to make that change was to change the Board and to change the CAO, which is what eventually happened. And it [the change to a new Board and Chief Administrative Officer] was a culmination, I think in large part, of the articles. The articles triggered changes in the Charter in 1984, the Board established a Charter committee, and that was an attempt to try to head off the impact of the articles. (D. Janssen, personal communication, November, 1990)

One person recalled that time [spring, 1984] with a deep sadness when he said that the county workforce was "devastated and humiliated. . . .It was hard to go to work, it made it hard to look my family in the face. I didn't want to go on, I felt it was all over for me" (Spokesperson, personal communication, November, 1990).

Another person described the adverse effect of the articles in this way. "They [the articles] had a demoralizing effect on the county operation. . .very demoralizing to just about everybody in the organization. Particularly when the Board of Supervisors collectively refused to challenge the articles. . . . Tom Hamilton, I think, was about the only Board member who openly challenged the conclusions of some of those articles" (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991). (See Appendix J).

One county official who had the responsibility to recommend how the institution should respond to these articles recalled his reaction this way. "I had two recommendations. One was very simple and one fairly complex. The first thing was to stop screwing up. The second thing was to put together an information program by which the County could tell its story to the relevant elements of the community" (J. Sweeten, personal communication, December 21, 1990). This research will show that in fact the substance of his recommendations was what ultimately helped the county move into another culture and realize some of the intended changes.

Proposition A

On Tuesday, November 6, 1984, two years after Williams' election to the Board of Supervisors, Proposition A was passed by the voters of San Diego County and the County Charter was amended. The proposition incorporated three changes to the Charter which affected both the legislative and administrative branches of county government. A brief summation of the effects of the Charter amendment appeared in San Diego Tribune.

1. Removal of protections, similar to those under civil service, for top administrators. [The amendment] would give the chief administrative officer more authority over employment and removal of his top administrators.
2. Reduction to three from four the number of votes on the five-member Board of Supervisors necessary to fire the chief administrative officer.
3. Restriction of the supervisors to a policy-making role by making it illegal for them to meddle in administration. (Walbert, 1984, p. 1)

These changes cleared the way for a clear articulation of administrative and legislative roles. The Board was now required to channel all communication with the county workforce through the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could now act from a position of authority rather than one limited to an advisory capacity. The amendment limited the Board's appointive authority to the Chief Administrative Officer, the County Counsel, Probation Officer and Director of Equal Opportunity Management. The Chief Administrative Officer was given the power to appoint all other county officers. The Board members could seek information only from the Chief Administrative Officer's subordinates; they could not interfere in the administration of the county government as they had done before. The Chief Administrative Officer could be removed from office with a simple majority of votes on the part of the Board. Finally, the amendment called for certain specified managers to be placed in a non-civil service category.

The passage of this proposition was an integral part of the multifaceted, intended change process under consideration in this study. The roles were clarified.

The functions of the administration, supervisors, and the staff could be addressed without the confusion of the past.

Events of 1985

Two significant changes in the government of San Diego County occurred in 1985. The first was in the membership of the Board of Supervisors. The second change occurred in the person of the Chief Administrative Officer of the county.

The November 6 general election of 1984 not only saw the passage of Proposition A, it also resulted in a significant change in the Board members. Supervisors Hamilton, Fordem and Boarman (the 1983 appointee who filled Hedgecock's term by agreeing not to run for the Third District seat in 1984) were no longer in office. In their seats were Supervisor Brian Bilbray (First District), Supervisor George Bailey (Second District), and Supervisor Susan Golding (Third District). Paul Eckert of the Fifth District was still in office with two years left in his term. He would be replaced by Supervisor John MacDonald in 1986. Leon Williams of the Fourth District was serving his first term as Chairperson of the Board in 1985.

A number of people described the new Board during the interviews. A community spokesperson compared the old Board with the Board in 1991.

The Board of Supervisors saw themselves as five individuals, competing with each other for whatever resources could be produced by the county staff, and not of the county as an organization. Today they do not see themselves as five individuals, but five equals in a whole, in a unit, working together cooperatively, to enhance the effectiveness of the organization. (L. Grissom,

personal communication, January 29, 1991)

A former Presiding Judge of the Superior Court described the new Board of Supervisors in a way that captures the spirit of what many others said in different words.

Look at the difference we have. We have a Ph.D. [a reference to Supervisor MacDonald, Eckert's successor in 1986]; we [also] have a man who's very energetic and very bright in South Bay. In El Cajon we have a man that is the epitome of experience, an old fox, smart as they come, and nobody is going to pull anything over on him. And [then] a lady whose IQ is out of sight. . . . We have outstanding [people] and [we have] Leon's voice of experience from the old Board—a decent, honest man, who wants to do the right thing. . . . I sit in meetings, [and] listen to what he says. It's, "Watch out. This is what I've seen before. Let's take a look at it." That is all he's saying. . . . If you just listen to what he [Williams] says and listen, it's such a beautiful mix of a Board. (M. Greer, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

The new Board members came to their positions with extensive experience in local government. These persons had run on a platform calling for change. They reflected the atmosphere of the time. The media and voters had called for change. Three new supervisors were elected and Proposition A was approved in the same election. Substantial change within the county government was about to occur.

However, the Chief Administrative Officer, Clifford Graves, was under tremendous pressure. Despite a universal recognition of his "brilliant mind" and a

basic "decency as a man," his professional reputation was closely linked with the shared perceptions of "Chaos" and mismanagement. Although several key persons fought hard to reverse the trend, Graves was considered a political and administrative liability, and the decision was made that he had to go in order for the county government to move forward. The Board accepted his resignation on July 3, 1985, to be effective December 31, 1985. His last day to work as Chief Administrative Officer was November 18, 1985. Assistant Chief Administrative Officer David Janssen was named as Acting Chief Administrative Officer.

There was a great deal of discussion about what kind of person would be needed as Chief Administrative Officer to restore the perception of order and integrity to the government. The Issues Task Force was asked for input. Their findings were considered along with their conclusions. Citizen groups were vocal at this time. The Board called for a national recruitment effort. It was generally accepted that the new person would have to be a strong public administrator who could, according to one person, "turn the ship around" and "clean house" if necessary. The new Chief Administrative Officer was to have a reputation which evidenced impeccable ethical standards. The candidate had to have excellent interpersonal skills and a demonstrated the ability to reach out to the media and community successfully by being accessible and approachable. These qualifications were considered necessary in order to reconnect the county government with its citizens. In early autumn of 1985, the executive search firm, Korn-Ferry International, was retained to conduct the search for a new Chief Administrative Officer. On October 29, 1985, the firm came to the

Board with a list of 18 applicants. The field of applicants was narrowed down to five finalists by the third week of November. On December 2, 1985, the headline in the final edition of the San Diego Tribune read "County Picks Chief Executive." The choice was Norman Hickey.

Norman Hickey. A New Administration

Hickey assumed the responsibilities of Chief Administrative Officer on February 1, 1986. He came to the position with a background of over thirty years devoted to public service in the United States, the Orient, and South America. He came to San Diego from Hillsborough County, Florida (Tampa), where he was the county administrator for four and a half years. During his years in Hillsborough County, the county government had experienced and survived deep turmoil. The governmental system survived, according to observers in Florida, because the county had a chief administrator in Hickey who consistently and fearlessly sought the good of the community rather than personal or financial aggrandizement. "During Hickey's time in Hillsborough County, three county commissioners were indicted and later convicted in a zoning extortion scandal. . . . [Hickey] worked to solve the county's drainage, road and financial problems during a time when public confidence in the government was low" (Brydolf, 1985, p. 1A).

Hickey's reputation among his professional peers and the general public was that of a public administrator who had an uncompromising integrity and strength at times of volatile political adversity.

Norman Hickey is no stranger to government problems. The new San Diego

County Chief Administrative Officer has survived the arrest of three commissioners in his Florida county, scandals in the county's building department and the development of municipal governments in Vietnam. Now, he is ready to take on San Diego County's problems. (Holmbald, 1985, p. B1)

Honesty and strength were qualities that were important to the Board of Supervisors as well as the San Diego constituency in selecting a new Chief Administrative Officer. One county executive described Hickey in the following way:

I always refer to Norm [Hickey] as the mongoose. And the mongoose [is] the only kind of animal that can take on the most vicious fighters known in the animal world, and that's the cobra. And the way he does it, the mongoose just kind of languishes around like he is not in control of anything and waits for the cobra to make a silly mistake and then he's got him. And that's Norm Hickey. (C. Steppe, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

Williams reported to the news media that Hickey was the unanimous choice of the Board. In an article in the San Diego Tribune, Golding "praised Hickey's extensive background and commitment to local government. . . .[He has an] incredibly sound reputation. He was responsible for making government function, and function well" (Carrier & Turegano, 1985, p. A1). In the same article, Bailey said, "He [Hickey] knows how to deal with the board when it gets out of line. He is a man who can rise above troubled waters. He does not allow the troubles to drag him down" (p. A1). Before the offer of employment was made, Hickey's ethics of doing business were carefully screened by the District Attorney Edwin Miller as well as

informally by Sheriff John Duffy. Hickey's record for ethical behavior was irreproachable, according to all reports.

The day after his appointment was announced by the Board, an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times. The headline of the article was "A'Squeaky Clean' Florida Man Named New County Chief." The article reflected the Board's priorities and read as such:

They [the Florida county commissioners] said he [Hickey] was known there for hiring well-qualified assistants and setting them free to do their jobs. They said he has the backbone to defend himself and his staff when under fire but that he is flexible enough when it is time to compromise. "He's been a pillar of strength in this county at a very difficult time," Commissioner Jan Platt said. "He's a public servant of the old school. He's not in this for personal gain or glory or any of that. He's just a hard working man with high ideals who wants to get the job done." . . . "He's not flashy or flamboyant," Sessums [former Florida state representative] said. "For people looking for a strong leader on a white horse, he may come across as a little too soft-spoken or a little too plain. But I think it wears well. The more you work with him the more you appreciate what he has to offer. (Weintraub, 1985, p. 5).

The next day, December 4, an editorial appeared in the San Diego Tribune which signaled the beginning of a change in the media's portrayal and perhaps their perception of the San Diego County government. The editorial highlighted the story of the county's dilemma which preceded Hickey's arrival. It also clearly stated what

behavior the Copley editors expected of this new Chief Administrative Officer in his administration, behavior which would set aright the future of San Diego County government. The headline sums up the expectations by the press for Hickey's tenure: "Leading County Out of Chaos." It is interesting to note that this editorial appeared in the same newspaper that two years earlier devoted months of research to produce 13 articles focused on a county government perceived as embroiled in a state of chaos. The December 4 editorial indicated a trust in the new Board members to select an administrator who could do the necessary job. While supporting the choice of the Board, the editorial at the same time stated clear guidelines as to how Hickey should administer the county:

Now at last, county government can begin to straighten out under the guidance of a strong, independent administrator. The choice of Norman Hickey, an experienced county administrator from Florida, to be the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) appears to be exactly what is needed. County supervisors have chosen a good man. Now they should give him the scope and leave him alone to do the job that must be done. Under weak management, the county slid into a quagmire, as described in The San Diego Tribune's 1984 series of reports under the logo, "County in Chaos." A big part of the problem was structural. The County Charter did not give the CAO enough independence and authority. That was corrected by Proposition A, the county charter reform enacted in November, 1984, giving the CAO more power and requiring the individual county supervisors not to interfere in the professional administration of county

affairs. Another part of the problem was personal. Now that has been corrected with the election of the county Board of Supervisors (Brian Bilbray, George Bailey, and Susan Golding) and the appointment of Norman Hickey as CAO. The charter reform gives the CAO the right to hire and fire department heads. We expect Hickey to use that power forcefully. Many of the county's problems trace back more to a team of department heads who were working under former CAO Cliff Graves than to Graves himself. He did not seem to exercise strong enough supervision over them. Department heads must be accountable to a single strong executive--and that's the CAO, not the five-member Board of Supervisors. There must be no compromise with quality in choosing department heads. Appointing a top administrator who can't cut it or leaving such an administrator in place after it becomes clear that he or she can't do the job is no favor to that administrator nor to any group of which such an administrator may be a member. Affirmative action will work at top levels of county government only if appointees are fully qualified to perform their duties and have demonstrated a high level of personal integrity and devotion to public service. In brief, we need a CAO who can clean house when necessary. Hickey seems to be the man who can do it. His record in Florida is a record of strength, independence, and integrity. (Morgan, 1985, p. B10)

When Hickey arrived in San Diego, he chose to meet people in their own environment, listen to what they did and did not say, observe, and then evaluate them.

You have to communicate because there is a common goal. . . . It's through their eyes and feelings, and if you listen without hostility, they may be telling you about their perceptions, they may be telling you about their culture, and the community, and they can be indicating to you, even subtly, about who's pressuring them. (N. Hickey, personal communication, November 30, 1990)

Many employees in the county workforce expected quite a different approach. They expected to see the "heads roll, after all, he [Hickey] had a black belt, and you're not a black belt unless you're tough, a real man." Some of the officials waited with real trepidation; others waited with considerable resentment to see who was the first to go. No one went.

Many had envisioned and wanted the stereotypical "no-nonsense manager" who would "whip the place in shape." Instead, Hickey began slowly to build relationships. He made people "strangely comfortable." As one person put it, "He looked at me, right at me, and smiled." He also began to reach out beyond the confines of his office and building to the community he wished to know.

When the word was out that he was going to leave Florida to go to California, many Floridians asked him why he would ever leave Florida. He and his family had so many friends and their home there. Why would he go to a place where he knew no one? He answered: "I have many friends in California, I just haven't met them yet" (N. Hickey, personal communication, February, 1990). With this absolute confidence in humankind, he approached his new responsibility.

Janssen, the Acting Chief Administrative Officer in 1985, and the person who

has worked most closely with Hickey in the past five years, suggested that Hickey did two very significant things upon arrival. According to Janssen, Hickey placed responsibility where it belonged and dispelled any idea that he would not make mistakes.

Norm did two things that were brilliant. The first is he went to the press--editorial boards--and they asked him, "What are you going to do to fix this mess in San Diego County?" He [Hickey] said, "I'm not going to do anything. It's not my mess. It's yours. What are you going to do?" He said: "I'm just here to help. I'm just passing through. . . ." That just flipped it. Just flipped it right there. . . .

The second thing he did is he said: "I am going to fail. I am successful about 93% of the time," and he played that over and over so that their expectations weren't that he walked on water. . . And he was saying two things: first of all, "It's your responsibility," and second of all, "I am going to make mistakes." (D. Janssen, personal communication, November 15, 1990)

Janssen also discussed another premise upon which Hickey works, namely that if someone is in a given position, he or she does not own the position or the institution. Hickey feels a person is in dangerous territory if he or she personally identifies too closely with an organization. Hickey observed a public administrator of another organization who in 1986 was constantly referring to "my this" and "my that" when discussing the organization which he administered. Hickey was concerned about this attitude and spoke to the administrator, warning him of this dangerous

assumption. The person apparently did not or would not listen to Hickey. Hickey shared his concern with Janssen about the administrator in question. "That's going to kill him, because you cannot identify yourself with an organization. It's not his organization. You are just there to help it along" (D. Janssen, personal communication, November 15, 1990). Soon after this interchange the administrator lost the position. The organization was no longer his.

Hickey not only did not want to possess the institution, he worked to free it from constraints while reconnecting it to its natural environment, the community. Hickey looked to the outside of the institution knowing the perception of chaos had to be obliterated before the county government could establish itself as a respected force for good in the community. Janssen described Hickey's focus and its gradual effect. "So that eventually [it] led to opening the county organization again, bringing the walls down, and opening the county organization to cooperation with the community" (D. Janssen, personal communication, November 15, 1990).

Hickey told me that he came to San Diego County with "no preconceived ideas" (N. Hickey, personal communication, November 30, 1990). He believed in the innate dignity of the public servant. Although he had no predefined outcomes in mind for San Diego, he was here to help in any way he could, to restore a sense of honor where honor had been lost. With this in mind he went about to learn by engaging in conversations and listening.

Hickey did few of the things people expected. It was not easy to predict his next move. Many of the people working for the county government did not know

how to gauge this unassuming gentleman with a different sense of humor who carried brown-bag lunches and drove various vintage automobiles. This image did not seem to fit an ex-Marine sergeant or the person who had served as a public administrator in war-torn Vietnam and later in Bogota. He was known as the tough administrator who challenged and won in the face of corruption among the Board members to whom he reported. He had also been a formidable opponent of the Ku Klux Klan in the fiery Sixties.

In those first months Hickey met with Williams and the Issues Task Force to hear about the study and its findings. "Leon [Williams (April, 1986)] asked if as many of us as possible could come and would spend a half a day at the Chief Administrative Officer's conference room, taking the Chief Administrative Officer through the process and study" (A. Doshier, personal Communication, December, 1990). Four members participated in the meeting: Doshier, Pugh, Gilbert, and Henderson. Williams, Hickey, and Janssen were present to hear the findings and recommendations of the Task Force. The presentation was in the form of a conversation aided by the use of overheads.

The Task Force talked through their process and the rationale behind their conclusions. "I remember at the end he [Hickey] was very thoughtful. . . .He received it [the presentation] and I remember him saying that it was an incredibly comprehensive review of the county and I got the impression that he was startled by it. That's my impression" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December, 1990). Hickey told the group that he needed time to reflect, to think about their findings,

incorporate it into his discovery process, and that he would like to get back to them. Janssen, who was present throughout the meeting, responded differently, "I don't understand any of this. I was never interviewedDavid [Janssen] appeared to be absolutely startled at this" (A. Doshier, personal communication, December, 1990).

Hickey worked tirelessly to create his own acceptability in the community and the county workforce. He did this by learning as much as he could about the community's people and making himself available and visible. He often went where no other Chief Administrative Officer had ventured.

Norm Hickey, his first day in office, at about four-thirty or so on Monday, he calls me and he says, "Well, boss, I'm checking in." I didn't know Norm Hickey from anybody. . . .But I just thought it was really terrific that he called to say, I'm here and I'm a public servant here in your county, and I want you to know that I'm aware of a lot of problems that went on behind, in the past. I really want to get this organization moving forward. I want to work with you guys. You guys are really important." You can imagine how that made me feel, I mean, with all the pain we'd gone through before, I suddenly wanted to do whatever I possibly could, to make him a success. And, I mean, that was the way he worked with me, and I can imagine he worked with the supervisors in very much the same way. And that was his approach. He said, "I'm a healer. I'm here to make things work better." And he's done it. (L. Grissom, President, Chamber of Commerce, personal communication, January 29, 1991)

Hickey maintained an open and cordial communication with the news media. He joined 21 community organizations, including the YMCA, United Way, Rotary, and the Police Athletic League. On August 7, 1986, Hickey honored the military with a reception at the County Administration Center. This began a close affiliation for the county with the San Diego military community. In the years that followed, while internal design and changes were taking place and were a high priority for him, Hickey continued to feel a pressing need to deal with external issues. He was trying to reconnect the county government with its community, because alone neither could thrive. This work continues through the present.

In 1986 Hickey entered into his own discovery process. He made several major changes to the county and started other processes which continue today (1991). The following is a partial list of these actions which have had a far-reaching effect on the county government in the past seven years.

(1) In an attempt to bring stability and credibility to the beleaguered San Diego County Department of Health, a troubled department of more than 2,000 employees that served tens of thousands of local citizens, Hickey hired Dr. J. William Cox, a former U.S. Navy surgeon general and Retired Vice Admiral of the United States Navy, to direct the department.

(2) Hickey moved a Deputy Chief Administrative Officer to head the Department of Social Services and moved the former director of that department into the position of Deputy Chief Administrative Officer.

(3) He oversaw the resignations of the Registrar of Voters and the Director of

Planning and Land Use.

(4) He spearheaded the reorganization of the Public Works Department.

(5) He recognized the need and began a search for a forensic pathologist for the coroner's office.

(6) He made substantial changes in the relationship between the county and the legislative body in Sacramento and Washington, D.C., so the needs of the county were heard in a new way under Hickey's guidance.

(7) He decided to build on the findings and recommendations of the Issues Task Force, and help develop and realize a process of intended changes which had begun 1983.

In July, 1986, Hickey asked three members of the Task Force to meet with him a second time for an hour in his office. The three who attended were Doshier, Pugh, and Gilbert. Janssen was not present at this meeting. Shortly after, Hickey chose Anne Doshier, one member of the Task Force, to work as a special consultant for institutional development within the county government. "Quickly we isolated on Dr. Doshier as a person who could internally begin to assist us on awareness and begin to make the change" (N. Hickey, personal communication, November 30, 1990).

Hickey's original plan was to hire her when he spoke with her in July, 1986. She chose, however, not to enter into an employee relationship but rather to contribute her services as a pro bono consultant for eight to 12 hours per week. That was the amount of time she felt she could devote and also what she felt appropriate to the process which she referred to as an "important professional project" (A. Doshier,

personal communication, March 13, 1991).

Dosher felt it was important to stay on the boundary of the institution rather than enter into it. She wanted a time boundary (limited hours) as well as a role boundary. As a consultant to the Chief Administrative Officer, she made it clear to the members of the Board that she would no longer be available to them. She chose to do her work about the institution unobtrusively. The Chief Administrative Officer was her access to the institution. She had no office or desk. At the beginning, her workroom was where there was space. Sometimes it was the Chief Administrative Officer's small conference room, other times a Deputy's Office, the library, or Hickey's office. She went where she was needed.

After coming to an agreement about her role, Hickey and Dosher had their first meeting on August 6, 1986. In that meeting they discussed a new institutional design and made several proposals. They included: (1) The formation of the executive council (later to be known as the Executive Staff) which had two specific purposes. The fifty-five department heads would report to individual members of the staff. The Executive Staff was to "produce a plan for planning and to guide the institutional processes" (A. Dosher, personal communication, December, 1990). (2) The Chief Administrative Officer would need his own assessment and a proposed five-year administrative goal framework. (3) Provide the county with a common language.

There were as many languages as there were people interviewed. We needed to establish an agreed-upon framework or model of viewing the county. We needed concepts formed for conscious designing of institutional processes. We

needed a concept-forming process. We needed to establish the style and the settings and the times for this work so that it got done. Then we did a lot of work. He [Hickey] was very involved in this. (A. Doshier, personal communication, December, 1990)

The walls of the conference room were soon covered with sheets of paper of all sizes that could be easily moved about as ideas evolved and a new structure took shape. She came as a teacher would have, because her assumptions were based on the premise that the institution, the county government, was a system capable of learning. There were five basic steps to the process.

1. Doshier thought her first task was to have Hickey and Janssen analyze exactly what the county government was because there was no commonly accepted description. She began by putting a big sheet of paper up on the wall of the conference room. It became the place of planning. The findings of the Issues Task Force were written down for consideration. Goals for the county were discussed. Many hours were spent discussing what the county was and there was an attempt to establish a common language. Doshier asked these questions. "(1) What is the institution? (2) Are we developing this institution? (3) Can processes be put in place that will help it turn around its culture? (4) Can the institution learn to set goals?" (A. Doshier, personal communication, March 13, 1991).

2. The second step in the designed change was to define the Chief Administrative Officer's mission statement. Hickey was not immediately receptive to developing such a document. He asked Doshier first to interview certain persons

whom he identified as important to developing a mission statement. Doshier, Hickey, Janssen, and Pugh (a member of the Issues Task Force) met twice for five-hour sessions to create a language in the first draft of the mission statement. They included some ideas from the interviews that Doshier conducted and some ideas that Hickey obtained from the Board of Supervisors. Hickey took that draft and wrote thoughts. The work continued until late 1986 when Hickey agreed upon and finalized the statement. (see Appendix F)

3. The third design change Hickey sought was to the budget process. In the past, the budget process fostered a competitive atmosphere within the county government, particularly after the passage of Proposition 13. Hickey sought to change this embattled environment. He wanted in its place an institution which established a connectedness based on relationships built among various departments and services. By August, 1987, with the help of Doshier and Pugh, a new budget process was designed. It was an effort to break away from an institutional process which had been a controlling factor in all policy decisions. Doshier explained the new model:

We responded to the CAO's decision to attempt to move the county in a direction of needs-program driving the policy, moving the budget in as a plan. The model would be framed by the quality of life vision, and the policies and goals. . . .The current process was reactive and, starting with work indicators, held the system at status quo, allowing no proaction. Input and interaction with the CAO and department heads were too late, resulting in a system that was not driven by administrative goals and goal seeking. (A. Doshier, personal

communication, August 21, 1987)

4. The fourth step in the design process was to establish the concept of policy councils within the county government. A systematic inquiry began. Other governments, including the federal government in Washington, D.C. were contacted to find out if administrators used administrative policy councils as a way to encourage systems thinking in and among the various functional groups in the institution. The questions led to whether these councils helped to create interdepartmental goals. The inquiry received positive feedback. The decision was made to establish policy councils in the county government. They were to be made up of decision makers who in turn could establish administrative goals for the Chief Administrative Officer to approve or disapprove. There were disagreements with the Board aides on this issue because they did not feel that the administration was the proper vehicle for policy making. An effort was made to clarify that these groups would be a way to generate only administrative policy. The councils in no way were meant to conflict with the policy generated by the Board. The reason for their existence was simply to promote systems thinking capability among various departments that were totally out of control. Hence, the name change from policy councils to administrative councils. (See Appendix G)

5. The fifth step in the design process was to develop a profile of a county executive which introduced the idea that all executives were culture bearers by designed responsibility. (See Appendices D and H)

Soon Doshier identified as the vehicle to teach the institution the Executive Staff, a group of administrators which was formed and began meeting on a weekly

basis in 1987. It was composed of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (the chairperson), the Deputy Chief Administrative Officers, and the Chief Administrative Officer's Chief of Staff. At that time the group was formed, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer and chairperson was David Janssen. The Deputy Chief Administrative Officers were Bruce Boland, June Komar, Randall Bacon, and Lari Sheehan. James Hatcher was the CAO's Chief of Staff. Doshier was invited by the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer to attend these meetings when the group was formed, and she continues to attend them to the present (April, 1991).

The group meets every Thursday for approximately two hours. Doshier's roles are multilayered and interchangeable. She is a participant, educator, clarifier, facilitator, conscience, and observer. There are times when she is silent. Other times she speaks and is actively engaged in the process of the meeting. Doshier's actions depend on the issue and dynamics of the group as the members interact with each other and with her. Periodically the chairperson asks Doshier to write what are referred to as "thinking points," brief statements reflecting her observations and conclusions. Doshier gives these points to Janssen for his consideration and discussion.

In late 1987 there was an increased discussion about institutional learning and team building among the Executive Staff. Doshier considered the group as "the social brain of the institution" (A. Doshier, personal communication, March 13, 1991). It was during that time that Doshier, Janssen, and Komar began to develop guidelines for

administrative policy development, to be included in the Administrative Manual.

There was no written policy on administrative policy making.

As a way to learn how each deputy saw the county and the entity he or she administered, Doshier conducted a lengthy phenomenological interview with each member of the Executive Staff except Hickey. Doshier carefully analyzed and reviewed the results of the interview, and she realized that each person was administering a separate county. Each had his or her own construct. The findings were discussed openly in the Executive Staff meetings. This discussion led to further work with the Executive Staff and served as a vehicle for study. There were team-building retreats held for the staff. Some of these meetings Doshier attended, others that she did not. Some of meetings she has facilitated, and some were facilitated by outside consultants chosen by other members of the Executive Staff. Bacon left soon after this time, and Robert Griego was selected as a new Deputy Chief Administrative Officer after a national search to fill the vacancy.

From 1988 through 1990 there were extended executive team meetings comprised of Executive Staff members, department heads and the deputy directors of departments to discuss common as well as unique problems. Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Komar was assigned to head up the Institutional Design and Development. She worked closely with Doshier and Janssen in this role. She introduced the new language to the extended group of executives, the executive team. Definitions of words like mission, goals, objectives, and collaboration were delineated for the executives. Guidelines for the establishment of department goals were

distributed to the department heads. The concepts Condition A and Condition B were introduced and explained (see Appendix H). Executives were asked to adopt these concepts as working definitions in their daily operations. Gradually, these concepts were heard in conversations and read in written reports.

The establishment of the goal-setting process became a formal directive. In 1988 the first departmental goals were submitted for review. The next year they were also submitted, but in a somewhat more formalized style. On February 1, 1991, the extended executive team met, bringing the agreed-upon goals which were developed through the various administrative councils to the meeting. These goals, approximately 40 of them, were discussed by the whole group. At the end of the day there were 10 agreed-upon administrative goals to be presented to the Chief Administrative Officer for approval.

On April 23, 1991, Hickey submitted to the Board of Supervisors an administrative plan for approval. The Board Letter (see Appendix I) included: the Chief Administrative Officer's Five-Year Strategic Directions, an explanation of the strategic directions, and a copy of the administrative vision, purpose, county culture, and mission. The Board adopted this plan and these definitions on the same date. This adoption signifies a milestone in the process of intended change and the beginning of another phase in the ongoing process.

Conclusion

In Chapter Four the researcher addressed the issues in the first two research questions. The chapter provided a description of the changes which the county

supervisors and administration wanted to make. In addition to the passage of Proposition A and the election of five new Board of Supervisors members, there were, according to my research findings, eight specific intended changes articulated by the San Diego County administration and the Board of Supervisors. The intended changes were:

1. To create a government that earns the respect and the support of the people.
2. To change the perception of the county government expressed by the news media and community spokespersons from a negative one to a positive one.
3. To build the community of San Diego County, by raising the consciousness of stakeholders to the value of interconnectedness. To have the county convene and engage the various enclaves within the community in an atmosphere which invites a dialogue in which mutual purposes are explored and realized, e.g. clergy, military, educational institutions, community-based organizations, and private business.
4. To create a mission statement and infuse its principles into the day-to-day operation of the county government.
5. To change the culture of the county to one which is collaborative and engages systems thinking, pro-active behavior, organizational learning, and a formalized goal-setting process. All of these elements were included as means to establish long-and short-range planning and guide behaviors within the institution.
6. To develop a different, more organized structure for the organization reflecting functional responsibilities.
7. To change the budget process so that executive decisions would be policy

driven and not budget driven.

8. To foster a better relationship between the Board of Supervisors and the Executive Team.

This chapter addressed the issues in the first two research questions. It provided a description of the intended changes which the county supervisors and administration wanted to make, and included a chronological story of record which described the way in which these changes were designed, articulated, and realized.

This story is a complex one. There are many ways of seeing and interpreting the events the reader has just read. Chapter Five offers the reader a variety of lenses. The people in the next chapter will tell the story through their perceptions of the county government as they participated, experienced and/or observed a portion or all of the decisions and processes described in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE NARRATIVE OF THE CHANGING COUNTY
PART TWO
Introduction

This chapter addresses the third research question of this study: Within a complex political context, how do the persons, acting in decision-making positions internal and external to the county government of San Diego, perceive and interpret the intended changes during the process? The purpose of the chapter is to add another dimension to the narrative of change in the county government of San Diego. I analyze the interviews and the observations made while studying the process of change within the context of San Diego County between January, 1990, and March, 1991. After collecting and reading the responses, I selected representative quotations to include and analyze in an interpretive narrative. By doing this, the narrative of intended changes in the County of San Diego during the period between 1983 and 1991 is more complete. I suggest that the narrative concerned with the intended change process is enhanced because the researcher took the time to listen, and in this chapter I share with the reader the richness of what I heard. I listened to the voices of the people who lived and live the process. The participants in the study, each in her or his own way, grappled with the difficult work of self-reflection as they

addressed the issues involved with change. Their contributions are essential. They bring the story of record to life.

Through this analysis I intend to create for the reader a descriptive understanding of the process of change within its natural context. This study was a concerted effort on the part of the researcher and participants to ascertain perceptions that heretofore were unidentified and often obscured. Perceptions are important to consider in a process of intended change. They influence the accomplishment of intended changes. I learned in the study that perceptions of the changes varied. The participants expressed disparate, similar, and uncommon perceptions regarding the changes in the county. The County of San Diego is a multifarious political context. In this context it is necessary to appreciate and understand perceptions as realities which influence the process. If perceptions are understood as important, the public administrator can function more creatively, knowledgeably and constructively. The activity of this research was clearly a social process enriched by interaction, one not limited to paper-and-pencil responses which prevail in most county research.

There are as many perceptions and responses to the research question as there are people in the County of San Diego. It is impossible to know everyone's perceptions and interpretations. Even if one had access to the total population, there would be no way to obtain and analyze that amount of data within the scope of any research project. It is not necessary for our purposes to even contemplate the advantage of such an option. There is a significant discovery process that can occur without going to such extremes. The research questions posed in this study can be

addressed if the researcher uses a representative and diverse group of participants, which eliminates the inevitable limitations of homogeneity.

After careful thought I selected representative decision makers to participate in this study. Some of these work within the county government of San Diego and others do not. The researcher participated in extensive dialogue with these participants in an effort to discover, record, and consider for analysis their perceptions and responses to the research question.

The Process of the Dialogue

As I noted in Chapter Three, the interviews were divided into four groups. In Chapter Five, I discuss and analyze responses from the first three groups. I do this because they are most aware of the county administration of San Diego and many participated in the chronicled changes. The groups are briefly redefined, for the ease and clarity of reading, in the following list:

Group One includes persons who work within the county government in 1990-1991 and have done so for varying lengths of time.

Group Two includes persons external to the county government but who are active participants in the community of San Diego.

Group Three includes persons who were key participants in the county government during the intended change process but who no longer serve in that capacity. In 1991 each of these persons has an active decision-making position in the San Diego community.

In this chapter I analyze the words that the participants of the three groups

used to interpret and articulate their perceptions. Their words are sometimes set apart and at other times interconnected in the analytical narrative. Within the analysis, depending on the purpose of the quotation and the reason for its inclusion, the voices of the three groups are included in various ways. There are times when I chose to differentiate by proper name or group. There were also times when I decided to interweave the conversations with no note of proper names or group affiliation.

In some instances I felt that the inclusion of names was not necessary and might distract from the purpose or content of the narrative. In other instances quotations do not appear to be damaging or problematical; I chose to omit the names to avoid any possible discomfort to the participant or reader. I determined that in these cases that the content was important, not the identity of the participant. Each participant was given the opportunity to edit his or her transcript. It is important to again note that all quotations included in this document were drawn from the edited transcripts.

The responses which address change are reported in two broad categories within the narrative. The answers respond to two underlying questions: (1) What intended changes occurred between 1983 and 1990? (2) How did they occur? The quotations and responses included in the narrative are drawn from the data embodied in the edited transcripts. The quotations show the reader that there are various interpretations of the process of intended changes. Some of the responses reflect a concurrence with the story told in Chapter Four, while other responses suggest different perspectives. The diversity creates a broader, more complete picture.

Diversity allows, I think, for a more holistic approach to a complex story; it gives a representative flavor of the variety of actual ongoing thought. I suggest that the more voices we listen to and include in a narrative, the greater the story's authenticity. I attempted to discover through the art of dialogue what these individuals perceived and how they interpreted the changes which the administrators and supervisors of the county government of San Diego intended to realize between 1983 and 1990.

Analysis of the Dialogue

In order to understand the change process in the county this document includes a description of what I experienced, heard, and observed in the actual dialogue process. These participants are the public practitioners of change and they, along with others, influenced the county government. By including this impressionistic description of the practitioner in a self-reflective process, the narrative takes on a flesh-and-blood quality. This is offered to enhance the value of the narrative for the reader, making it more believable, plausible, transferable, and most importantly human.

Each interview was as unique as the individuals involved, and at the same time each dialogue included the two central themes of the research: (1) the process of intended changes and (2) the nature of leadership. The participants interpreted the process and discussed their own perceptions of the two. Fifty-one persons in the San Diego area were interviewed in search of answers to questions which involved these issues.

Three sets of interview questions served as guides in the process. It is

important to note, however, that in each case the participants and the researcher approached the themes in a variety of ways dependent on the natural flow of the dialogue. The participants were given the greatest freedom possible to articulate in their own way and in their own self-determined time frame what their perceptions were of the intended changes and the nature of leadership. Their interpretations were the subject of discussion. They listed changes that had occurred. They expressed their sense of what had occurred in the county that was intended and designed and identified who they thought were the designers and key players in the process. The internal people had more players in mind, while the external people thought almost exclusively of Hickey and the Board of Supervisors.

The participants explained to me how changes had occurred and not occurred. For many, the process of change was perceived as one that is still occurring in the county government. Every perception which I included in this analysis is based on grounded experience and/or observation in the past years as the government of the County of San Diego went through a process of intended changes.

The Long View and The New View: John Duffy and Robert Griego

Just as the challenges, mandates, and jurisdictional responsibilities of the county span a complex continuum, so do the backgrounds of the individuals who contribute to the county government and its workings. In the following discussion, I summarize two particular interviews to illustrate that this diverse range of backgrounds and the richness of differences associated with such backgrounds are important to the process of holistic understanding. Should either of these interviews have been omitted

from the study, the story would not have been as meaningful. To construct a way in which the county may be understood and to write this story, I have identified and included two persons' perceptions representative of the full continuum of background, tenure and the diverse perceptions associated with such a range. The perceptions of these two individuals regarding the county and its workings were very different. I would expect this. They came to the interview with different institutional knowledge, positional authority and background assumptions. The two interviews in their own way shed a unique light on the subject of the county. I learned from both persons. Their interviews were as different as the individuals who were involved, however, the issues we discussed were the same--the process of intended change in the County of San Diego and the nature of leadership.

Sheriff Duffy and I spoke for several hours one afternoon in his downtown office. When the interview ended his staff had already gone home for the day. Our conversation took place just three weeks before he left the county government which he served for 38 years in the capacity of both a civil servant and an elected official. As we began to talk I told him what I really wanted was for him to tell me the story of the county--his county--over the past four decades. He said "yes," he would. He began and then hesitated for a moment. He told me that in all his years with the county, he had never before been asked to tell the story he had lived for 38 years.

His story provided a rich historical perspective on the county administration and the Board of Supervisors. His story began in 1953, the year he joined the sheriff's department:

The department had 100 employees in it. I was the number 100 By 1970, when I was elected, we had 670 employees. The department was what I would call emerging but not yet a sophisticated organization. The county was the same way. O.K.? When I took office there were five board members. They were part-time. They were businessmen, guys like Bob Dent and DeGraff Austin. They met once a week to set policy. The Charter of the County of San Diego was scrupulously followed. . . . Now it's difficult psychologically [for the board members not] to see themselves as sort of being all-powerful, almost like the Supreme Court, sitting there--and people are running around-- staff members doing all sorts of things--it's a feeling of power. Prior to that, Bob Dent ran a clothing store, DeGraff Austin had a cemetery, and Henry Boney was the founder of what later became 7 Eleven, a speedy mart--a grocery store guy. And they donated their time and helped shape policy. The CAO then simply got his marching orders and carried out everything. The elected officials worked with the CAO, they didn't work with the Board. They worked with the CAO--all of which began to change--as more and more of these political climbers came on board. . . . The change [in the Board of Supervisors] began with two things. First of all, the election of Harry Scheidel and then Jack Walsh to the board in 1968. . . . Scheidel not so much, because he was more of a follower than a leader. Walsh was a silver-tongued devil who was headed for Congress. He was the bright hope of what was a very popular liberal element at the time. And he was a Republican, but

he was often referred to as the wrong kind of Republican in this town. I choose to think of him as a progressive. I still like him a lot as an individual. Politically miles apart. We had the classic battles here, we call it the Walsh years. . . . They probably call it something else. (J. Duffy, personal communication, December 13, 1990)

Duffy told how Walsh added 21 persons to his staff in the early 1970s and the proliferation of paper which was generated. He told how the other supervisors gradually followed Walsh's lead and added more people to their support staff, a significant change to the workings and culture of the county. It brought about an explosion of workers around the supervisors. With the additional workforce the supervisors began to interfere with administration and gather information from all directions. Duffy reflected on the culture of the county and the impact in the late Seventies when the Board of Supervisors stopped referring to county officials by name or specific title. They were "non-persons, simply referred to as staff." The move to enlarge board support, according to Duffy, distanced the board members from the county officials and at the same time brought about increased and sometimes meaningless demands. He described the proliferation of inquiries addressed to the department heads from the Board staff persons. The inquiries were frequent and often fruitless, according to Duffy. After a time of responding to them, he finally chose not to answer them anymore.

The Charter was ignored. "They were all going around the CAO, into the road department, into the public works department." Proposition A was necessary to

control the actions of the board members and redefine the roles of the administration and legislative body. Proposition A passed in 1984 and, according to Duffy, the Chief Administrative Officer

Immediately plugged in 20 new positions to his office to take care of constituent inquiries that the board members allegedly wouldn't be able to take care of now. . . . Only thing is the Board never laid off any of their staff. . . . So what government has become is a bunch of bureaucrats talking to each other. My bureaucrats talk to Norm's bureaucrats, Norm's bureaucrats talk to the Board's bureaucrats, and there's nothing getting done. (J. Duffy, personal communication, December 13, 1990)

Duffy talked of structural changes which prevent department heads from making decisions.

You see, there's too many people up there [in the CAO's office] second-guessing him [the department head]. . . . That was crazy because the expectation was somehow that some guy appointed by the CAO is going to direct Ed Miller [District Attorney] and John Duffy [County Sheriff] on how to do their job. It didn't work. . . . If you could streamline the operation, save a little money and increase accountability, and improve the quality of your managers. Some of them are hopeless. . . . most of them are either outstanding managers who aren't being allowed to manage or ones who, if you'd let them learn to manage, they would. (J. Duffy, personal communication, December 13, 1990)

We talked about intended changes. I asked Duffy if he was aware of any substantive change in the county since the 1984 articles in the San Diego Tribune.

No. It's still a county in chaos. It just isn't being reported in the daily newspapers. Because that's the nature of the news media. When they decide to focus on something they do it. And it's a conscious decision made, and I've studied the media. In fact, I'm a big fan of them, as you well know. . . .[The changes in the county are] cosmetic, and because the media doesn't focus now, I predict they will, because its all so cyclical that their attention span will come back to that at some point. And right now the media is looking, and Norm is absolutely right. He's not wrong about what he's saying. He goes around. I've heard him many times. I see what he says publicly. I watch the Board of Supervisors every Tuesday night, whether I want to or not. I sometimes think they ought not to show the public what they do, but they do. I used to have breakfast with Norm every couple of weeks. . . .We don't have the funds to do things we need to do. There's a tremendous amount of room for streamlining. Let me give you one big frustration and I hope you share it. This is my explanation why I divorced the Board of Supervisors. Divorced them. Because it's a natural feeling--I had to--it was out of survival. I went from frustration with the system, to disrespect with the Board as an institution--well, some individuals, but generally as an institution, to contempt. And that is not a healthy thing. That's why I should get out of here, it's not productive at all. And it's a gradual thing. . . .it was an evolving process over 20 years.

(J. Duffy, personal communication, December 13, 1990)

Three weeks after we talked, in January, 1991, he left the department whose people were his "other family." The department grew during his time with the county from 100 employees to over 2,000.

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Robert Griego began work in the county in May, 1989. We spoke in October, 1990. Our interview lasted approximately an hour. Of the people interviewed, Griego was the most recent arrival to San Diego County either as an employee or community stakeholder. His story of the county reflected his experiences over a period of 17 months. His perceptions and interpretations of the intended change process in the County of San Diego were influenced by his professional experience as assistant city manager in Whittier, California. There he had been in charge of a complex process of designed change which had been realized. He spoke as an experienced public administrator in city government; he was new to the county form of government.

The Chief Administrative Officer recruited him for his strong professional background in administration, organizational goal-setting and strategic planning. He described his reaction to his interview for the position.

I got a strong sense that the county wanted to plan for the future, that they [the administrators] wanted to be proactive, and that they wanted an executive management team that would advocate for that. . . . I've always been an advocate, because I've seen it work in local government, that planning and goal-setting and looking ahead, you avoid a lot of pitfalls. I was really

pleased. As time went on, I found that the process hasn't cascaded down the organization like maybe we thought it would. I think it's going to take time. I think it's going to take evolution, and I think it takes not only training. . . . people have to experience a better environment before they are convinced it works. . . . There are a lot of people who were in such a negative situation for such a long time, they have their doubts. (R. Griego, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

I talked with Griego about the articles and the concept of the county as one in chaos. I asked him how he perceived it from his vantage point of 17 months.

I don't perceive it as a county in chaos, because during the time I've been here, I've seen a lot of effort made by the Board of Supervisors and the CAO to avoid any of the conflicts or scandals that would give that perception to the public. I think in the administration when I came here, there was an obvious effort to get control of the county administrative process, to design the different systems. And the Board, I think, shows a lot of support for the administration and has taken some strong leadership in doing some positive legislation and legislating. (R. Greigo, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Griego's appointment reflects the county administration's commitment to the intended change process. He was brought into the county to help the executive staff further the design and realize a new way of administering the county government.

Griego is vital to the future of the county, while Duffy is one of the rare personages

who helped construct the past. We can learn from both.

The County in Chaos

Each of the 51 interviews began or at least involved in some specific way the articles which had appeared in San Diego Tribune (Schneider, 1984). These articles labeled the county government of San Diego as a "County in Chaos." I introduced the concept of change in the county by asking the participant if a series of articles were to appear in the San Diego Tribune today, would they be the same or different? Forty respondents suggested that a series of articles labeling the county as one in chaos would not be published today. The participants attributed this change in all but two cases to one or more of the following reasons: (1) "There's a better feeling in the past five years between the county government and the news media." (2) "The county is just no longer in chaos." (3) "The establishment feels comfortable. The elected officials of the county are enough in sync with what the establishment thinks they should be doing that they're [the people of the establishment] content."

During many interviews I asked the participants what title they would give a series of articles about the county today. I have included in the body of the text a partial list of responses from the three groups. It is important to note many of these persons quoted below felt that the county government was never in chaos. A perception common to these persons regarding the chaos headline is clearly articulated by the following participants. "I think it was an overstatement. There were problems, just as there are problems today. There were some people who were in positions of responsibility back then that abused the public trust, there's no doubt

about that. But I don't think the county was in chaos, not from my perspective" (S. Thunberg, personal communication, December 18, 1990). "I think there was more chaos outside than in the inside. Again, the essential services that the county government provides were being provided. I think where we were in the position with the new Board, the CAO did not have confidence in the new Board. There were some people who were out to, I think from that time to get the CAO and I think he was put into a no-win position at that time" (J. Jacobsen, personal communication, November 17, 1990).

The participants who had an historical sense of the county and/or who were working for the county in 1984 most often expressed the perceptions articulated in the previous quote. From their perspective, the county was not in chaos in 1984. On the other hand, persons who joined the county workforce after the articles were published in 1984 were the participants who tended to agree with the 1984 headline.

It is interesting to note, realizing the two contrasting interpretations, that when I asked these same persons to write or tell me how they would title a series of articles about the county government in 1990/91, all but a few of their headlines indicate that they think changes have occurred between 1984-1991. Several of these headlines reflect changes which were among those that the administration articulated in the Administrative Manual (1989). The headlines indicate a shared perception that changes have occurred. They implied that there was a difference between the county government in 1984 and the county government in 1990/91.

"There Is a Fresh Wind Blowing in the County of San Diego"

"From Chaos, to Concern, to Improvement"

"City in Chaos, County Working Well"

"Underfunded County Manages a Myriad of Programs--Well Run Programs

Somehow!"

"The Government Is Presently in Chaos"

**"It's Gone from Chaos to Accomplishment, From Insensitivity to a Respected
County"**

"County Finally on the Right Track"

"County Creates Cooperation"

"County Takes on Multi-Headed Monsters and Wrestles Them to the Ground"

"County in Control"

"In Case You Didn't Know the County's Back"

"County Government on a Healthy Keel"

"County Looks Ahead"

"County Government Continues to Attempt to Provide Necessary Services"

"Proactive, Big-Picture, Energetic, Collaborative"

"County Cleans Up Its Act and Its Environment Too"

"Fantasy Achieved"

"City in Chaos, Not County in Chaos"

"County Focus Is on Solution of Its Fiscal and Service-Providing Problems"

"Excellence With Competence"

"San Diego County Is the Most Important Level of Government in the United

States"

"The County Government Fulfills Its Partnership With the Citizens in the Region!"

"County Accomplishes Much With Scarce Resources"

"Took a Licking and Kept on Ticking"

The question and discussion about the San Diego Tribune articles proved to be a good way to begin the discovery process. Persons from groups one and two with three exceptions felt very deeply about these articles and recognized the influence of the media.

I hasten to say the media is an awesome device. It's a very powerful instrument and it can definitely, it does shape public opinion. And once it has started shaping it, once they have decided that this is their target, whatever this is, they very narrowly zero in on that target and they work hard at doing whatever it is they want with that target. So I would say a lot of it was manufactured and some of it was real. (J. Hatcher, personal communication, November, 1990)

Participants in group three were more often the persons who expressed this sentiment: "In 1984, it truly was chaos. I think 'Chaos in the County' was an accurate description."

There were participants who said that a series of articles entitled "County in Chaos" would not be written in 1990/91 because, according to them, "there has been a complete turn-around [in the county government]." Others agreed, but for different

reasons. The reason such articles would not be published in 1990/91 was due not to substantive changes within the county government but rather because the media and the county "have come to an understanding." These were the same persons who most often denied that chaos existed in the county seven years before. They thought, as this participant did, "It was a bum story in 1984."

Six of the participants had not read the articles. Four of these persons were familiar with the articles, however, while the other two persons had not heard of the articles. In these six interviews I described the attitude and content of the articles to the satisfaction of the participant before we began the discussion. After I did so, five of these persons said that they did not perceive the county in 1990/91 as a county in chaos.

Intended Changes

The list that follows includes the intended changes the researcher discovered through archival research, observation, and interaction with the participants. The changes were corroborated by Norman Hickey in conversation and through documents which were issued from his office, e.g. Administrative Manual.

1. To create a government that earns the respect and the support of the people.
2. To change the perception of the county government expressed by the news media and community spokespersons from a negative one to a positive one.
3. To build the community of San Diego County, by raising the consciousness of stakeholders to the value of interconnectedness. To have the county convene and engage the various enclaves within the community in an atmosphere which invites a

dialogue in which mutual purposes are explored and realized, e.g. clergy, military, educational institutions, community-based organizations, and private business.

4. To create a mission statement and infuse its principles into the day-to-day operation of the county government.

5. To change the culture of the county to one which is collaborative and engages systems thinking, proactive behavior, organizational learning, and a formalized goal-setting process. All of these elements were included as means to establish long-and short-range planning and guide behaviors within the institution.

6. To develop a different, more organized structure for the organization reflecting functional responsibilities.

7. To change the budget process so that executive decisions would be policy driven and not budget driven.

8. To foster a better relationship between the Board of Supervisors and the Executive Team.

The researcher selected quotations which recapitulate the various perceptions of the articulated changes. Captions identify the intended changes. The reader will embark on a journey in the quotations to follow. I have chosen not to abort the flow of the journey by introducing detailed explanations or analysis which interrupt one's envelopment in the variety of impressions, thoughts, and feelings.

Through the vessel of these perceptions the researcher hopes that the reader will actually share the process of the dialogue and know what it is like to travel within these continuously flowing, twisting, turning, sometimes turbulent waters and along

tangled shorelines. The reader will emerge with a greater appreciation of the living meaning of a complex political context which is the reality of a massive regional government such as San Diego County. This experience can also give the reader a greater understanding of the enormous challenge which exists in an intended change process among participants who share in this environment.

County Earns Respect

The story obviously is much different now, and I think it's basically accepted that the county, rather than being basically the weakest component in local government in the region, now it is the strongest! (R. Calvao, Auditor and Controller, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

In 1984, it truly was chaos. I think "Chaos in the County" was an accurate description. . . . But how would it be different today? In virtually every fundamental way. . . . So public perception could not be more different. Yes, it [the change] is in the structure and the texture and the richness of the organization. People at all levels of the county understand it. (L. Grissom, President, San Diego Chamber of Commerce, personal communication, January 29, 1991)

I think if I had to say is it loved? Is it hated? I'd put plain vanilla neutral that people say, yes, we have to have county government, but they don't really have strong feelings one way or other. (J. Adams, Rear Admiral, Ret., personal communication, January 24, 1991)

From the private sector we recognize the change tremendously. The

county is seen as a, if not a model of efficiency, it's a model of getting along and trying to work with the community and doing some things that are felt across the private sector. . . . They see the county as trying to get things done, having the right attitude. (F. Panarisi, CEO/President, Construction Industrial Federation, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

It would be quite different. Quite different. There's been an astonishing change in the perception, if you will, of how the county is being run by the citizens, by the media and, I think, by all of us externally, and, I suspicion, by those internally. And I recall back in about 1984, it was 1984, being in Sacramento and a major state-side organization had just completed a study under a grant program of municipalities. And the chap who was confiding to two or three of us was a part of the study team. He said: "I have to ask you all a question." He said, "You have the best run city and the worst run county by our analysis. How can that possibly be that you would have that kind of makeup within your geographic area?" And the answer we gave at that point in time was personalities, the nature of elected officials. That seemed to be the first thing that came to mind. Here we are seven years later, I guess I would say we have, possibly, one of the best run counties in the state and, maybe, one of the worst run cities in the state. And isn't that ironic that we have that change in a matter of seven years. (B. Moore, Retired Executive Partner, Barney & Barney, personal communication, January 29, 1991)

Yes, they [the community] recognize that there's an improvement. . . .

I think what's happened is that they recognize the individuals [the members of the Board of Supervisors] are making an effort to be responsive to the needs of their constituents, that is they have a genuine concern. I think the fact that they've got a CAO now who is more visible. (A. Madrid, Mayor, La Mesa, California, personal communication, January 14, 1991)

News Media

I think it's different in that there's not as much attention paid to the county now. For several years, beginning probably about 1979 through probably 1985-86, there was a lot of attention paid to the county because of some obvious problems that reporters like to write about, that needed to be written about in order to call public attention to them. The media doesn't pay much attention to the county now because those problems, if they exist, they are not visible, and I personally don't think they exist. Of course, there are things that do come up, but most of them are handled very quickly and very efficiently. (C. Walbert, Staff Reporter, San Diego Tribune, January 28, 1991)

Well, I think Mr. Hickey's relationships with the press and the editorial boards are all positive. [The media representatives are] supporting the county, where in the past, I think we never noticed what was going to happen in the paper until, all of a sudden, we opened the newspaper and there was a big blast. We may have been doing a marvelous job, but nobody paid any attention to it. Nobody followed through on it, so as a consequence, when

they unleashed criticism, when they wrote their articles, they were totally against the county. It was that perception they had, because there was no relationship, because there was no communication with them, because we did not do anything to remove the erroneous perception that was there. (M. Lopez, Director, Office of Financial Management, October, 26, 1990)

I think it was an accurate description of the county. . . . It was not exaggerated. The county was in a state of chaos and that was manifest by a scandal almost every month, sometimes more frequently. There was a scandal a month of abuse, mismanagement, neglect, poor judgment, just something every month. . . . But memories are short and now things are marching along well in county government. The attention is focused on the mess over in City Hall. So, I think the populace, distracted as it is by the war and other things, may not appreciate how well the county is going just because county problems are no longer up front. . . . I think the relationship between the county and the media is much better than it was, simply because things are much better. And when things are much better, that's the way it is. (E. Fike, Recently Retired Editor, Editorial Board San Diego Union, personal communication, February 8, 1991)

I tell people, see when we came, we were there when the press had this county in chaos, you had people who were highly visible in the community. I mean the State Senator and the Assemblyman and everybody here used to say, God, Eckert, we can't get any space because of you. You're all over

everything. We were. Roger Hedgecock, Jim Bates, and myself, we were media events in ourselves. I mean we were out doing things, we were making things happen. . . . I don't think that there are too many people since we left the board that really think about the county anymore. (P. Eckert, Former Supervisor, personal communication, February 6, 1991)

I think the last couple of years the press has been very positive toward the county and coincidentally, unfortunately, the city of San Diego and their city counsel have taken over the chaotic arena. (J. MacDonald, Chairperson, Board of Supervisors, personal communication, December 21, 1990)

In the early Eighties, there were a lot of people in the county government who simply were uncomfortable with the media and were unfriendly with them. They were not returning calls. . . He [Hickey] has worked in a very dedicated way with the editorial boards, with everyone in the media, to make sure that things are on a proper keel. And he's made sure that departments are properly responsive to the news media, and that's a different attitude than we had before. . . . Things are radically different today.

Department heads and people throughout the county are a lot more comfortable and a lot more friendly with the media and in interacting with them. The key, though, is what Norm [Hickey] has done in being able to open things up.

Norm is very unusual, a very interesting person. Someone who is unique in my 25 years of working for government. And what he has done for the press is, I think, just absolutely marvelous. (R. Copper, Director, Parks and

Recreation, personal communication, December, 1990).

In the first place, this Board of Supervisors does not air our problems in the papers, and we have a CAO who is very good on public relations also. With the local papers, we also have the distraction of some stupid things going on in other local governments which gives them something which sells papers better than our problems. But I think we have them fairly well convinced locally and even more than locally, that our basic problems boil down to equity and funding from the state and federal governments, mostly state. (G. Bailey, Supervisor, personal communication, December 20, 1990)

Build the Community

The several meetings that have occurred in the last year focusing on issues related to youth and children, and how we can collaborate and work together--I think that, by and large, have been very positive. It's very difficult when you get 40-some school districts and a county Board of Supervisors, lots of different staff people together. Just the logistics of how to arrange the table and who gets how much air time--all of those things. But the direction is positive, the intent is good, and I think fits with a pattern of trying to find ways to be more collaborative and to reduce duplication and overlapping, and to support each other when we can. We still run into buzz saws once in a while, but I don't think it led to animosity on the local level, in terms of the players. (T. Payzant, Superintendent, San Diego Public Schools, personal communication, January 30, 1991)

The organization would never have evolved in this direction if Norm [Hickey] had not been who he is and what he wanted to accomplish. The opening of the organization to the outside, to the community, to the world would not have evolved. It was not inevitable by any stretch of the imagination. (D. Janssen, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, November 15, 1990)

What we needed was someone who had the ability to be proactive and actually go out into the community because we knew we were so deficient in resources, and that we were so isolated from the community. This is one of the greatest problems the county had. The total isolation and feeling of isolation and detachment, that we needed a CAO who not only could manage the structure, see the big picture, be proactive with the big picture in mind, but also could see that an important part of the big picture was interrelationship with the local community and the interrelationship with state and federal communities, and that is basically where Norm fits into this package. (B. Bilbray, Supervisor, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

I think the series of articles today would be very different because a number of articles written came from the fact that the county had isolated itself from the community, and the community and the county did not understand one another's needs and one another's problems. Back then, the crisis was identified as a leadership crisis and ethics crisis. Today there is no doubt that the community and the county see each other as partners, and when Norm

[Hickey] came to the county he made it clear that we were not going to be an isolated government, that we were going to be one that involves itself with all aspects of people living in this region: the military, the education community, the religious community, city governments, and the press. There is a tremendous difference in this arena. (R. Calvao, Auditor and Controller, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

At the time those articles were written, I would say there was an overstatement, but not grossly overstated. . . . It was very hard to do business [with the county government]. . . . You got set up, and they [county officials] didn't behave in an honorable way. . . . Though domain guarding has gone down appreciably, a spirit of cooperation, not only among services [has developed] There was the patina of cooperativeness [in the past], but the underlying reality was still people guarding their own [interests]. In my mind, that has changed substantially, and not only is there recognition there, but it has been addressed. I can say from my own experience, there is a new opportunity for a cooperative spirit. It still isn't here fully, but we are certainly making substantial progress and I am feeling that at least. . . . So I'm feeling optimistic. It is, however, with a kind of benign skepticism that you know. . . . It isn't cleared up yet, and we still do have some of those things, but I can tell you it is light-years away from where it was, and the county government is better for it. (G. Allison, Chief Administrative Officer, Episcopal Community Services, personal communication, January 16, 1991)

I think that we have done tremendously well, especially because of what Mr. Hickey has done in the inter-jurisdictional relationships. I mean, for me to think that one day the city of Chula Vista would be giving us 3 million to help us fund the South Bay courtrooms, or that the city of San Diego would be working with us on the jail facilities would not seem possible.

Norm [Hickey] understands that . . . this [the county government] is a public service institution. . . that we were servants [not dictators] and that when a member of the public asked for help, they had a right to ask for help, and they weren't imposing and they weren't intruding and they weren't creating a hassle; in fact it would be viewed as exactly the opposite, as I'm here to serve. And that attitude, believe me, wasn't here. I don't mean no one on the county staff had it, but an institution, it definitely did not have it. That problem has not been totally solved yet, but Norm [Hickey] understands it. Norm himself believes it, and we've got a long way to go still, because the departments are large, and we've got to get that policy to trickle down to a lower level. (S. Golding, Supervisor, personal communication, February 4, 1991)

I think you have to set policy and objectives at the beginning when you come into the area, you need to pull community people in to help you set those objectives because the county alone cannot do everything. They need the support of the community-based agencies, and all this talk about volunteers is a bunch of crap. No one is going to volunteer, who's going to volunteer? Everybody has to make a living and especially bilingual people who are poor.

They just throw up their hands when the county says, "Oh, we'll get volunteers to do this." Those in the trenches know you can't use volunteers in direct delivery services. (B. Yip, Founding Director, Union of Pan Asian Communities, February 5, 1991)

If they don't serve Norm's [Hickey's] interest out here in the broader community, they're useless to him. You see, and I want him [Hickey] to get that message. What are you [the administrative staff] doing out here to beef up and to show up county government, to interpret county government, not just sit around getting a paycheck. . . . I think that somehow Norm [Hickey] needs to communicate to his professional staff. All of them. . . . Somehow, Norm needs to take them all, especially his top ones who have subordinates under them, he needs to take them away so that he can say to them, "Listen, I'm going to bring folks here to tell you how they feel or perceive you. And how they [the community] feel you have failed the county government." There are some of us who would tell them how we feel, so that they get off their butts. . . . and they get out there and try to listen to the people. . . . county government is the most powerful political entity we have. (G. Walker Smith, Pastor, Christ United Presbyterian Church, personal communication, February, 1991)

Mission Statement

I don't really think the mission is clearly understood. (J. Komar, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, November 9,

1990)

You know you have the CAO mission statement that I think is very difficult to rally around it. Not that I think the vision statement we put in this department is so much better, but at least I can explain it in one sense. We're talking about empowerment, about fixing up the visual environment: we're talking about prevention: we're talking about the relationship period and everything that evolves around it. That same kind of simplicity does not exist in the CAO mission statement. (J. Jacobsen, Director, Social Services, personal communication, November 17, 1990)

I think there is resistance because they [the department heads] don't understand where they are going. Nobody explains the vision. . . . It comes back to communication. If you can communicate to people that this is a desired future state, and you can explain to them the benefits, and you can explain to them why we need to move to that desired future state, they will buy in. And it's like the goal thing--they will get behind it and do it themselves, and basically what they will say is, "Oh, is that what you want to do? Well, gee, I can go along with that. I don't have a problem with that." But not if you just let it drop on them and say, "This is what we are going to do now." . . . They have to be a part of helping to develop it. (M. Lopez, Director, Office of Financial Services, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Culture of County

Being an elected official under the old CAO, we [the elected officials]

were never really included as part of the team, and I think that is the biggest thing Norm [Hickey] did. The first thing Norm did--and this is one thing that is magnificent about Norm--he said, "We're here to help our elected officials do a good job." Once again subordinating his ego, if you will--his importance, to the organization. Because--let's face it--the Board of Supervisors and the other elected officials, they're the ones who are responsible to set policy, etc. Norm, the first thing he did was to bring the elected officials under his umbrella. . . . He is very solicitous to the department heads, as well as elected officials, recognizing--let's face it--the department heads are the ones that do the battle really, and that run the organization. The CAO is there to help us, to guide us, to give us direction, but to also support us. And I think that is what Norm has done. (G. Smith, Assessor, personal communication, December 11, 1990)

I think [the Administrative Councils] are a useful organizational element. I don't think we have figured out how best to use it. I think it is a failure on our part. Conceptually it is a good idea having these councils meet and function. I don't think we have figured out how best to use them. . . . We're starting to see the value of collaboration, so I can see the value of community relationships, starting to see the value of not fighting in public, seeing the value of supporting the board, seeing the value of different orientations. Now, we probably would need another five years anyway to get the organization as a whole behaving in the way we are. . . . A new board and

a new chief administrative officer could undo it. (D. Janssen, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, January 31, 1991)

The environment is much more positive than it was nine or ten years ago. There is a mutual respect among colleagues, a remarkable amount of collaboration. The turf wars are no longer acceptable. The varying missions can be and at sometimes are, but people work together with respect. One concern I have in the intended change process is the formation of the Administrative Councils. They rarely meet. They are consistently canceled. We can only interpret that they are not valued. No explanation has been given. They exist in the Administrative Manuel, not in practice. (L. O'Rourke Bride, Deputy Director, Department of Human Resources, personal communication, March 1, 1991)

He [Hickey] has done a great deal of it through creating the environment for the county employees to get their jobs done in an environment that's positive instead of negative. I think his own personal style and the way of being a very active participant in the community and joining all the groups he does, taking on responsibilities, being a leader. He subtly meets with the Editorial Boards and all the things he does as far as community relations. I think he did a very aggressive campaign to hire new executive-level people from the outside. He had a very rigorous screening and recruiting process. I think that [Hickey wanted] to change, to bring a new culture in, to upset the status quo, and to bring in people who he considered [valuable]. I think it [the

institution] was very ingrown. I think it was very defensive, and I think it was very hunkered-down. My feeling is that he made a deliberate campaign to do a complete change-over. [The previous culture] was a result of the chaos. It was the result of poor management, favoritism, bad appointments, everybody being fearful of non-ethical behavior, of all the things that caused the good employees to leave or hunker-down, become defensive, and not get involved. They wanted to avoid criticism, avoid taking risks, it was a very down environment. (J. Huston, Director, General Services, personal communication, November 16, 1990)

Under the prior CAO, the way the county ran was internal war, and this was quite acknowledged by Graves. It was a very common model, I assume out of Washington, D.C. Under the former model, if a department head wanted to get approval on something, it didn't matter what he did to get it, he could manipulate, lie, cheat, attack his opponent, go directly to the CAO or the board--use political influence, use any kind of pressure necessary. If it ended up succeeding and got what he wanted, then he won and that was rewarded. That led to a lot of chaos, as you can imagine. It was very difficult to manage rewarding that kind of behavior. It led to certain department heads who were adept and had a big power base--in whatever community, constituent, or internal team that they put together--to say, "You scratch my back, I'll scratch your back." Now this is something that the Board was definitely aware of and wanted to change. The press became a little

aware of it in some of those articles. Mr. Hickey obviously wanted to change that, among other things, but it's very difficult, because you still have departments that have built on and have built up an enormous power base, because of what they had coming their way. And if you try to say, "Well, now you are part of one team, and you are going to play by the same rules everybody else will."--It sounds good, but when the rule comes to being enforced, the enforcement is perceived as too restrictive, too rigid, "you've got to bend a little bit, I can't quite do it now." That power model still succeeds. The culture struggles with whether it wants consistency or whether it wants autonomy among the various departmental entities, particularly the ones that have power. So that is a desired goal that has changed to some extent, but not, I don't think, as much as Mr. Hickey wants, and certainly not as much as the department heads without power would like to see. (Internal Participant, personal communication, January 18, 1991)

The problem is, even in my three-year perspective, the department heads don't realize how much better it is, because they are allowed to fail. We work together. We listen to them. They have much more freedom. They don't get shot every time they walk up to the board meeting on Tuesday. We're moving things ahead. The county is respected. They are all part of that, yet, we are dragging our feet. It is very reflective, in fact sometimes it drives me crazy. We reflect until our navels fall out as we look at it, you know. But it's okay to do that because we are moving a system over which

we have little or no control. We are only dealing with the margin. The center, the hot radioactive core of this institution, we're not controlling it. Besides that, there is a finite amount of knowledge that we have about the system. We don't even have as much knowledge about this system and how it operates as I had on many other things. We don't have the intelligence available to us or anything else. We're not working a close collaborative arrangement with the judges, calling us up every minute saying, "Here's what I'm planning on doing," and you know he's telling the truth. We're not into that. There are all these hidden agendas or the sub rosa organization--It is not clear where the executive staff is at the top and [how] Norm [Hickey] runs it. Here are two more analogies for you--Norm [Hickey] stands at the front of the organization, nominally the head, he really isn't because of all the politicians and everything else, but he's given a wet sack to hold in his right hand and in his left hand he has a hammer, but it doesn't have any handle on it. There's no handle on the hammer, he can't pound everyone he wants to pound. (B. Boland, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, October 25, 1990)

Collaboration is going to be institutionalized, there's no question about it. I think it is somewhat fragile, and I think it needs to be nurtured. I think it needs constant attention. . . . In the area of the support departments as opposed to the direct service departments, and I notice this within my own institution. . . . They stick all the pockets on the books, they order the books

and so on, but they don't have the pleasure of giving that book to a person knowing that [they have] a satisfied customer. . . . [In the county government] the technical services people who provide the support backup always [feel] a certain amount of animosity, rivalry, competitiveness, and so on between those folks and the [people involved in] public service. . . . [The support departments] go around patching up buildings and plumbing, they order supplies, and they recruit your people, but. . . . the support groups so often do not see the end result. . . . They don't see it when you have an outstanding employee who they had a part in [creating]. (C. Lucas, County Librarian, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

A new culture has been introduced. . . . Norm [Hickey] had a very clear sense of the culture he wanted, and it has been our job to implement it. He wants a culture that is collaborative, that looks at systems of services, knowing that problems that folks who receive services experience don't follow departmental bounding or organizational lines. So when we solve problems and design services, we have to look at the system that is involved in the service. The notion of one department grabbing an issue and running forward solving the problem is not appropriate executive behavior. . . . I think the importance of collaboration, team-work, working together as departments is institutionalized. I think that's set. I think the notion of systems thinking and the systems approach is a little hazier. And I'm not sure if people would talk so much about future oriented, but I see a lot of that behavior. (J. Komar,

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

Probably the most dramatic change organizationally from then [1983] until now is that now departments look at a whole. And they see a relationship between what they do and other departments. They are working together deliberately to try to solve issues that are cross-departmental. They are working with the community. . . . the courts, the sheriff, the district attorney. [Before] they weren't in the organization. Those are the kinds of things that were deliberate changes on Norm's part, and it was simply the whole idea that we are in this together. We have to work together, and then sit down to make that happen. (Internal Participant, personal communication, November, 1990)

Although there is a stated change, and it's probably real tough to do, and that's why it hasn't come down. The culture was an intended change, it was announced, and that's the Condition A to Condition B thing, and that is probably more process than real accomplishment, and it may be that you never finally get there, that you're always somehow or other traveling the road toward it. But prior to at least acknowledging that we want a county with a culture that's more collaborative and less dependent on personal power models, more in a planned systems approach, than in chaos and crisis. At least that is stated, but the rewards of the organization, where the money actually goes, where instant credibility is given, where decisions are made expeditiously, has not rewarded that in general; the county is aware of that. So it's still very

much struggling with old connections and are aware that they are still being rewarded. (E. Chastain, Director, Department of Human Resources, personal communication, October 25, 1990)

Now, we had those meetings that were held in the county medical office and that I found to be the worst possible case I have ever been to. They were usually "Now hear this meetings"--the big round table, the big discovery table of Kearny Mesa--those to me were like "captain from the bridge meetings." They depersonalized you, although they were attempts to give people strokes. The problem with doing that in a meeting level, I think, is that you don't know what other people are doing, and those who blow their own horn get the biggest strokes and a lot of people are poor at that. So, they went away with feeling, at least my feeling and I heard these from other people, very unappreciated. The effect of those meetings is the exact opposite of what was tried to be effected. (K. Thuner, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer Weights, and Measures, personal communication, November 16, 1990)

He [Hickey] has offered a very important ingredient, and that is, he looks at the individual, takes time to see the individual for what the individual is, not for what he would like that individual [to be], or what somebody else sees the individual as. As an example, somebody sees me as a barrier to whatever it is they want to do. Somebody else sees me as a protector. Norm sees me as a person. (V. Nieto, Director, Equal Opportunity Management Office, personal communication, December, 1990)

I think there has been a real change in the sense that Mr. Hickey wants to take the hostility out of the organization and he works at it, he really works at it. I think people can start by kind of saying, "Well, it's not going to work. What can one person do?" I think that one of the changes I have noticed is that people have picked up on it and are getting behind it. You notice that people are changing their attitudes, and that they are really trying to be more collaborative, to deal with problems the way Mr. Hickey would like to deal with them, not in a hostile, confrontational way. (M. Lopez, Director, Office of Financial Management, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Restructuring County Administration

I never supported the agency concept, on the other hand, it would be nice if you had the CAO and the department heads reporting directly, but in all feasibility, with 30 or 40 departments heads you can't do that. So you have to have some intermediate level, like a DCAO. But I think the important thing is, you cannot give the DCAO, like all that staff or whatever, so you usurp the power of the department heads. I think the DCAO's job is to coordinate various activities. An example, the problem we always had before was, the Board gives something to public works, it was done. Give something to planning, it was done. If it did not get done, then, of course, the CAO could handle that by getting a new director. The problem was when something went across a jurisdictional line. Let's say there was a project that required parks, planning, and public works. Those were the things that got all messed up.

Those were the things that never got carried through. They fell through the cracks or there was inter-departmental jealousy or rivalry, or just the question, who handled these things? So I think that's where the DCAO are most important. Not telling the department head what to do. They are coordinators. That to me is the role they have. . . . And I think you have got to give the department heads responsibility, as well as authority, to handle their case, to handle their division. And if you don't have faith in them, fine. Get someone else you do have faith in. So to me, the DCAO's job, and basically only major job, is to carry out the board's direction through the CAO, on an intra-departmental basis. (G. Smith, Assessor, personal communication, December 11, 1990)

We were not part of the process that decided where we fit in the institution. . . . The departments were never invited in for that process. . . . There was one particular time, I remember sitting in for a budget meeting for my department. I spent most of the time trying to figure out where I was [on the organizational chart] because I could not find myself at that particular time. It was like, "Oh my God, they've just eliminated me, and while I am here defending my budget, let me find myself." Every time David [Janssen] would look at something, I would think, I've got to find myself on one of those pieces of paper. It was like "Can he get distracted again so I can find myself." I remember being particularly intimidated, fearful, and very anxious as to what was going on. (K. Thuner, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer Weights, and

Measures, personal communication, November, 1990)

Norm sees the big picture. He is a manager, and David handles the micro. The two of them working together really have developed a team that is able to address a short-term crisis but not at the price of long-term proactive strategy. It really broke the cycle of the crisis from the management point of view, you no longer just had a team that was responding every day to another crisis. You had part of the team responding to the short-term, while the rest of the team is working on the long-term strategies. So the whole mode from the management point of view changed. (B. Bilbray, Supervisor, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

There is nothing close to what there was in 1984 here today. It's a totally different organization. Where that was black, and painted as a county which was out of control, which wasn't being led, which had villains in it, we are now in control. We know where we are going. . . . [We are] in control to the extent that we control everything that's within our power. We know what our weaknesses are. We address them. (L. Sheehan, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

I think the significant difference is the personality and the behavior of the individual. Let me give you an example. I understand during the rotten period of the early Eighties when Hedgecock and Bates were going after department heads in public board meetings that Cliff never stepped in and intervened to protect or defend the departments, never. They were on their

own, literally on their own. Norm doesn't operate this way. The different department heads know that if they are in trouble or they need assistance or support, that he will be there for them, a huge difference. So you are giving somebody not just the freedom to succeed, you're giving someone the freedom to fail, which I think may be much more important than the freedom to succeed. The second difference has to do with approachability. People were afraid of Cliff. He did not understand this. He thought he was the most open, warm-hearted person in the county, and he was if you could get inside of him, but you couldn't get to him because he was so standoffish, his behavior and expressions weren't open and warm, encouraging people to come in and talk to him. Norm's behavior is just the opposite, he likes to talk with people. (D. Janssen, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, January 31, 1991)

I think that Proposition A was a very important thing. We've structured the organization so that no longer can we "give me the head of the guy" because when you go for somebody's head, you are going after the CAO. You've got to fire the boss and none of those politicians want to fire Norm, in fact they've been courting him to stay on because they don't want to be the downfall of the Norm Hickey everybody loved. They love him at the Rotary, they love him all over. They'd turn on those politicians in a minute, because Norm took this county out of chaos, so they imagine. . . . The Chief of Naval Operations does not run the Navy. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations runs

the Navy--the most powerful guy in the Navy. He never leaves Washington, D.C. He sits in the Pentagon from five in the morning until nine at night seven days a week running the United States Navy. The Chief is out there making speeches, stroking the troops, and appearing over on the Hill with Congress and going to cocktail parties to make sure the budget isn't going to get destroyed over a cocktail, while in reality it can be, he's Mr. Outside and Norm is Mr. Outside [for San Diego County government] and he plays that very, very well, and he has a trusted lieutenant and hopefully some junior lieutenants who he trusts to work for him on the staff, who will make sure that we won't screw him or us and sandbag him. (B. Boland, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, October 25, 1990)

Budget Process

Probably the only thing that hasn't happened that did have quite a bit of discussion early on, was reordering the whole budget process. That was part of what Darryl [Pugh] was working on, he was very critical of the information systems that existed in the county. . . . As an example, Financial Management produced a trend analysis, or a trend report, of county expenditures. Pugh felt it didn't meet the academic standards for what a financial statement should be. It didn't--the conclusions that were drawn from it were too simplistic, but not enough high-level analysis and thinking went into it. In retrospect, I think he was absolutely wrong. I mean, he was right about the fact it was not an academic document. He was wrong about the fact that producing such a

document would be meaningless in this environment. It simply is not needed. He also came at it with the thinking that you really have total control over everything. To do what he wanted, you would really have to be a city. You've got to be able to control your resources, your expenditure, and your revenues. The strategic plan again, you need a strategic budget item--that is great if you have something you can control, but it's a waste of time if you control nothing. People get frustrated about spending all their time and effort into something like that, that you throw out every two weeks, because it is not relevant--the idea of getting the county away from the net county-cost-driven to a policy-driven document has not been very successful, and that was a key element early on of the organizational design. (D. Janssen, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, December 19, 1990)

Well, we are in kind of a financial quagmire right now, and I think one of the weaknesses that we are dealing with right now--staff is dealing with--is the Board itself. We haven't really given staff clear direction about what we want. . . . As the Chairman [of the Board of Supervisors], I am going to see if we can't get the Board to begin to establish goals, at least maybe two-year goals starting in the summer (1991), after the budget is put together, and begin to try to get some firm priorities down on paper so the staff know. Their complaint is that we haven't done that. Again, none of the chairpersons or Norm has really insisted that it happen, so the budgetary process is the thing that really has been causing the county to go in one direction or the other. It's

been driving policy. Now in the environment we are in, where the State of California provides about 85% of the money that we spend, and where they are in a state of shambles, and they don't have any goals either. They don't have a clear direction, and they don't have any certain income because of the initiatives that pop up all the time. . . . We are always reacting, primarily because people who elect us won't allow us to be proactive. People won't support school issues until their kids are on triple sessions. They won't support bond issues for jails until they are so overcrowded that murderers are being put out on the street. So we are always reacting to crisis. (J. MacDonald, Chairperson, Board of Supervisors, personal communication, December 21, 1990)

Let's just deal with the line item budget. Let's just throw everything out the door and just kind of do it the way we used to in 1937. That is, in my view, very myopic, even if we run into more change than we can anticipate, or the events or opportunities happen differently. We are far better off going through the process of looking at things in a three-year, six-year, or ten-year approach than if we shut everything down. That has been one of the biggest changes that I have had to look at in the county budget, a multi-year perspective. (M. Lopez, Director, Office of Financial Management, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Improved Relations with the Board of Supervisors and Executive Team (1990/91)

Institutionally, we changed the relationships between the Board of

Supervisors and the bureaucracy in two major ways. First of all, we took a lot of time setting up the lines and demarcation of whom, where is the appropriate location for each department or each segment of the government structure, and we made sure that the lines were made very clear to where no one felt that anyone is stepping on their toes or stepping beyond the bounce. That is something that has not been done before. There was a lot of feeling that the elected officials were stepping on bureaucratic toes and bureaucrats were stepping on elected officials. And there was never really the time taken to make sure the lines were drawn very clearly, so everybody knew as much as possible. And the passage of Proposition A gave the chief administrative officer the same authority as the city manager. It made it much easier for us to feel comfortable with what power roles were on his team effort. Because every one of us [the 1990/91 Board members] came from a city, that had a city form of government. So that is the structure we are all comfortable with. Proposition A evolved out of a feeling the county in chaos had institutional problems. Politicians had the ability to step in the administrative positions and start directing department heads to do things with or without the rest of the board having built a consensus on it or have the CAO agree. So it ended up developing a feeling that the other guy is playing by this rule, which is really paranoia between the elected officials among themselves and between the bureaucracy and the elected officials, so there end up being a lot of back-room maneuvers going on. Proposition A was proposed as a way of making sure

everything was as up front as possible and went through the administrative structure--the chief administrative officer, to the department heads, to the operational side. There was real role clarification. . . . I know previous to Prop A there was a feeling that something was going on, that you were kept from knowing about and cut off. I think the real damage there was that just the feeling that somebody was just cutting you out will develop paranoia or a confrontational attitude. (B. Bilbray, Supervisor, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

The Board of Supervisors that we have now [1990/91] is about as good as you could ever hope for. They are thoughtful. They work together as a team. They take a regional perspective. They are interested in policy issues. They are supportive of staff. . . . They understand, even though there are daily transgressions, they understand the difference between policy and administration. (J. Komar, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

The story would be totally different from an absolute or factual standpoint and totally different from a perceptive standpoint. The reason for it is complex, in my opinion, but can be broken down into several notions. First of all, there is the notion of the environment that has been created. Since the Board developed stability and after that brought in Norm Hickey, the stability of the Board and the nature of the synergistic collective activity [are] extremely important. . . . I think Norm came with a reputation of being an outstanding and

straightforward honest administrator of high-level capability with the confidence of the board. . . . They [the Board of Supervisors] were able to get off the micro-management kick and back into a regional orientation on a collaborative and synergistic mode of interchange. . . . Each member has his or her own idiosyncracies. They are regular individuals. They come from different backgrounds, but the chemistry is such that when they come together--with rare exception--they are gentle persons with each other. Their orientation is truly regional. Their motivations are clear and in the best interests of the public, and their outcomes generally reflect that. (W. Cox, Director, Department of Health Services, personal communication, December 21, 1990)

Proposition A passed. Which is really frustrating sometimes because we can't go to a department head and suggest a change. It has to go through the CAO. That becomes frustrating if we really abide by that, and I think there is sometimes a little bit of squeezing of that by some of the other offices, but they are always reminded by the County Counsel that Prop A exists, and it draws us back, so we stay on the policy side. But in those days, they [the Board members] were killing the staff and the CAO pulled in his horns, protected his rear all the time, and was afraid to take a risk, so nothing was happening except negative energy and chaos. (J. MacDonald, Chairperson, Board of Supervisors, personal communication, December 11, 1990)

There isn't the same scenario. . . .I think that the change that was

brought about primarily with the new Board of Supervisors and then the supervisors selecting some new leadership within the county and wanting to be certain that there was strong connection with the community at large, where the concern was really absent before, or if it was there, there wasn't follow-through on it. The major change is that since the new Board [of Supervisors] and the new leadership, the perception of the county and its role in the region is just 180 degrees different. The county is well respected. It is looked to as having expertise, as being able to make tough decisions. . . . The county is seen as being progressive and speaking with one voice, and taking a leadership role. (E. Chastain, Director, Department of Human Resources, personal communication, October 25, 1990).

I think the relationship that comes across between the Board and the employees, the CAO and the department heads is that it is a working team. They're working together. You don't read in the paper about a department head getting decapitated in front of the board. There isn't that. There's a good relationship going there internally, one that's reflected. (F. Panarisi, CAO/President, Construction Industrial Federation, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

When those new board members were elected they took a great deal of care to come and talk to the executives as a group. The County Executive Association invited the board members in, and basically they [the Board members] said, "We're not here to burn the building down around us, we're

here to try to fix problems, and you've got to help us, we've got to help each other." They [the Board members] were all very conciliatory and they were all very approachable, and that's very, very good. They [the people of the county] have an excellent Board. (R. Copper, Director, Parks and Recreation, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

I think the major two pivotal points were a new CAO and, equally as important, new Board members coming in. For example, Mr. Bailey, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Williams--very mature, very stable people--once again they are not looking. . . .They're there to serve. You had a good balance with Susan [Golding] and Brian [Bilbray], I think, an excellent balance there. And I think with Norm [Hickey] and those new Board members coming, everything really came to be. (G. Smith, Assessor, personal communication, December 11, 1990)

Additional Observations and Analysis

There were additional observations I chose to include in the study which shed even more light on this complex change process. In this section along with the quotations, I incorporated analysis.

The participants from the Executive Staff demonstrated a clear understanding of what the intended changes were. Among them there were varying interpretations on how they came to be defined and how some had or had not been realized. Each agreed changes had been intended and that there had been a lengthy process involved in the design of how they would be realized. Their opinions differed, however, as to

how the changes should have been realized by the administration, the degree of change that could have been expected, and the interpretation of why certain changes had and had not occurred. The Executive Staff perceived Doshier as its guide and a teacher throughout the process. She was, according to the various participants, the source of their language and understanding of systems.

Three of the six members of the Executive Staff have an historical perspective of the county government because they had been with the county government for over seven years. They had worked in the county government with at least one other Chief Administrative Officer [Graves] and various supervisors. These three, Janssen, Sheehan, and Hatcher, were most familiar with the early process, when the direction of the county under the Hickey administration was being established. They clearly recognized the significance of Hickey's insight and Doshier's presence to the change process. They remembered the long discussions, the white board in the small conference room, the grappling with a new way of thinking about an institution and its ability to change. Lari Sheehan described it this way:

Norm saw in Anne [Doshier] a belief system, a value system of organizational ability, a leadership ability, an understanding of where this organization needed to go that paralleled, if not duplicated, where Norm wanted it to go, and he saw in Anne [Doshier] the capability to get it there. . . .His [Hickey's] judgment of other people [is] incredible. He has the ability to bring people in that add dimension and viewpoint that haven't been here before. They're not your normal bureaucratic types of folks, but they take a look at things and they

start questioning them and they think about different ways to do things. And it's provided a dynamic to this organization that we never had before, because everything has been predicated on "we've been doing it this way for 50 years for God's sakes, you know, why in hell would we change now?" He [Hickey] saw in Anne a person who had a vision for the organization, had the credentials in terms of understanding the organizational development and understanding how you go about putting those things in place, and what needed to be in place. And so it was like "That's my person! She's going to get us there." That started the whole process, a very deliberate process of looking at who we are, what we are, why we are, where do we want to be, how can we get there, how do we articulate and define that what we are, what we want to be, and so we started the whole planning process with that. (L. Sheehan, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

David Janssen said a great deal about the process. When he was talking about Hickey in the process, he said that although the words associated with the planned change which were adopted by the county administration "came out of literature, and came out of books, they are totally consistent with the attitudes thinking behaviors of Norm." (D. Janssen, personal communication, November 15, 1990).

Three deputy chief administrative officers were recruited during Hickey's administration between 1986 and 1991. They were recruited for very specific reasons. Each was given a function which would assist him to realize the administrative design for change.

The first one, Bruce Boland, a retired rear admiral of the United States Navy, was recruited from the San Diego military community for the purpose of expanding the external affairs of the county. When I asked Boland, "What is your unique participation in this process?" he responded: "I bring a perspective to the organization at the executive level. . . . Yes, a global perspective, broad base, very experiential. . . .I bring a very important anchor point to Norm." (B. Boland, personal communication, November, 1990).

The second one, June Komar, was brought into the San Diego County government from Ann Arbor, Michigan, where she served as the acting chief administrative officer. Her initial responsibility in San Diego was to oversee the institutional design and change process for the Chief Administrative Officer. She worked closely with Doshier and Janssen on this project. She presented the new administrative plan to the Executive Team during a two-day workshop in January, 1988. When I asked her to describe her participation in the process of intended change, she said:

Well, I think, again it's part of the Executive Staff's primary responsibility to be the change agent for the whole organization. Not because we are smarter than anybody else, but because we are in the position to see the whole organization. And so I think that no matter how we think that we are on the right path, we have to continually course-correct, and we still have to try to figure it out whether the target we are moving toward is the same place that it was or whether it or not it has moved. I think that is the responsibility of the

DCAOs, Norm [Hickey], and David [Janssen]. And so I expect that will continue to be a primary part of my role, for as long as I am in this position.

(J. Komar, personal communication, November, 19, 1990)

The third member, Robert Griego, was brought into the county to fill the position vacated by Randall Bacon, who was responsible for all county support services. I asked Griego how he perceived his participation in this process of change. He responded in this way:

I am trying to contribute all I can to it. I believe in it. That is my way of doing business, or my management style. I've always felt it was important to involve as many people as possible when making a decision. I've always felt it necessary when you have a crisis, to involve as many people as you can, particularly those that are being affected, to evaluate what you need to do to resolve the crisis. I've always believed in doing everything I can to keep the employees of the organization as satisfied as much as possible.

(R. Griego, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Participants who had close access to the administration perceived the members of the Executive Staff as the principal actors in the implementation of changes. Hickey, sometimes coupled with Janssen, was thought to be the sole author of the changes. The less access the participants had to the administrative office, the more they attributed the authorship solely to Hickey. Some did not know where the idea came from and/or if there was a plan of intended change. The closer the person was to the Chief Administrative Office, the greater their understanding of the formal

process of intended change. Those participants who were removed, with less communication with the group referred to "the inner circle," the Executive Staff, had less knowledge of the intended change process. Participants indicated that changes are still occurring in the county government. Persons perceived substantive changes which were both internal and external to the county. The participants attributed the difference to a combination of changes.

Repeatedly, Hickey and the Board of Supervisors were applauded for their work. The participants talked of Hickey's "uncanny way of seeing the truth" and his ability to relate to all kinds of persons. The participants talked of the Board members' honesty and dedication to a common good. "This is a Board that wants to be very certain that it has brought in expertise before it makes a decision. It is a Board that doesn't try to paint itself into popular political corners that the members can't get out of. It's also a Board that doesn't blame the very staff that is following its own instructions" (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990).

Most often Hickey was seen as a partner with the Board. Several participants noted that Hickey was the first Chief Administrative Officer in their recollection to sit "out of the pit," the pit being a chair on a lower level than the Board in public sessions. This new position was very significant to the few who mentioned it. It was the perception of many that it was the combination of the present board 1990/91 and Hickey as Chief Administrative Officer that made changes possible.

There were those in the community that had no perception of an intended change process within the county government, but they consistently spoke of Hickey's

humanity and "decency." They referred to Hickey's consistent effort to reach out to the community, "be where no other county executive bothers to go." Others participants spoke of the Board of Supervisors (1990/91). They considered the members to be professional, acting as if they were "accountable to those who elected them."

Participants described structural and cultural changes within the county government. Many suggested the changes were interconnected, noticeable and sometimes dramatic. Others differentiated between the changes. They perceived some changes as more or less important than others. Participants discussed a variety of changes they wished would occur. There were two principal matters which were of shared concern among 32 of the participants. Both concerns emanate from the same source, the dichotomy between theory and practice. The reaction varied according to how deeply the discrepancy affected their own sense of well being and that of their constituencies. This dichotomy was interpreted by the participants in a range of reactions which included that of an expression of concern, disappointment, betrayal, and anger.

Others based this lack of real communication on what they considered to be an official jargon, which they perceive as meaningless. One person described the communication in this way. "The terminology is too academic. People don't talk that way. People among themselves don't talk about future-oriented, systems-based, bla de bla de bla. It is a turn-off, and there's been some communications that have come out from the CAO using this stuff, and people just stifle their laughter because, again,

it's pretentious" (Internal Participant, personal communication, November 19, 1990).

The importance of language came up in 30 of the interviews. one representative example is this: "Yes, I've heard the language. What bothers me, though. . .you can't keep talking the talk. I'm using the facilitator's words. You have to walk the talk. And if you keep talking to talk, nobody is going to listen. . . and that's why we are struggling" (Internal Participant, personal communication, November 30, 1990) Another participant talked of the new language and said "I think there is one thing concerning an idea. There is another thing concerning practice and that is the issue. I've told David [Janssen] and Norm [Hickey] this, if you are going to say it, then practice it" (Internal Participant, personal communication, November 17, 1990).

Some looked to the past in an attempt to explain to me the difference they felt in the present. "You had lots of communications. You knew what was on his [Grave's] mind. You knew he wanted your input. You knew what the strategy was." Several talked about the new configuration and players in the government. "The perception in the organization is that you have a number of new individuals in key roles who don't know the county." Other individuals felt they were only spectators of a remote process. They said that they were "no longer in the information loop, now everything comes through an interpreter. [The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer] hears what I used to hear. The real stuff gets filtered, if you know what I mean" (Internal Participant, personal communication, December, 1990).

Some persons internal to the county described what they perceived as

"cosmetic" differences in the county. They were aware that there was a new administrative language of change, e.g. "systems thinking, collaboration, Condition A, and Condition B." They felt, however, that "they [the administrators] don't walk the talk." What they described, I suggest, is a perceived dichotomy between an espoused theory and the theories-in-use as identified by Argyris and Schon (1978). Lastly, some persons did not perceive either intended or designed change but rather changes brought about solely by the county's reaction to different political and fiscal pressures.

The majority of respondents suggested that the county in 1991 was perceived very differently by the media and the community than it had been in 1984. This difference of the community's attitude was not perceived, however, by three of the community stakeholders. Those who saw change attributed this change in perception to two major influences. The most frequently noted influence was that of Norman Hickey and his way of relating to people within the county government, in the news media, and in the community. His influence was mentioned in 58 interviews. The second factor, which influenced changes in perception, according to the participants, was the demonstrated values and behavior of the Board of Supervisors after 1984.

There were other voices that expressed different perspectives. An example of another perception was expressed by an internal spokesperson in these words: "Well, I doubt seriously whether the articles, if printed today, would be a great deal different from the articles presented in 1984. I'm not sure that improvement fiscally or efficiency-wise has been that great. At least in so far as my perception" (E. Miller, personal communication, December 13, 1990).

The following two participants from the San Diego community articulated a different perception of what has changed in the county government during the past seven years. Their voices expressed disappointment, impatience, and concern because of the changes they observed.

They [the county officials] are not in chaos, but I think they're chicken. . .

They've sort of lost their soul, I see it, you know, passion. . . . [Change occurs] if the people have the gumption and are more passionate about what they are doing. . . . They need to break out of their paradigms because they do not have enough money to do everything and they really need to look at this and approach it differently. . . . [In 1991] It's a lot more cut and dried and a lot more bureaucratic. Well maybe it's because I am a throwback to the time of revenue sharing days when communal organization had a lot of clout. The Board listened to the community. . . . I think the CAO was more accessible. Graves was more accessible. . . . Speer [a former Chief Administrative Officer] was accessible. You could go in there and set up a meeting and talk to him. Where it's not that easy with Hickey. . . He pushes you on to his deputies [Deputy Chief Administrative Officers]. . . . I think there was more outreach on the part of Graves to know community leaders, especially since maybe there was an affinity there. He was a minority person, we were a minority, and we felt he heard us. (B. Yip, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

I don't think the county over the years, including now, has done much of a job

trying to educate the public as to its function, as to its goals, etc., and that has been part of the major problem. . . . There is a lack of communication. I think that it is the major problem--the right doesn't know what the left hand is doing in the county. . . . The public develops bad attitudes toward its governmental entities, because, first of all, the people think that none of them [county officials] care, and secondly, even if they care, they only try to protect themselves. (G. Walker-Smith, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

Participants from both inside the county office and outside in the community often interjected their perceptions regarding the fairness and validity of the articles. They questioned if the articles represented what actually existed in the county in the late winter of 1983. There was no common agreement on this issue. The diversity became apparent in the course of the interviews.

The interview participants who were in the county government at the time of the articles expressed a view which was different from that of the participants who had joined the system after the articles were written. There was still a different perception expressed by those who were not part of the county government.

The respondents from within the government often shared the idea that their work went unappreciated by the public and that the articles were the result of "a misunderstood government." One person described the articles as "a low level of back-biting" and using "unnamed sources."

Another participant displayed a stronger reaction. He labeled the articles, as an example, the all-too-common "beat-up-the bureaucracy" mentality and explained

the rationale behind the articles in this way: "It was time for the establishment of San Diego to reassert its power over the Board of Supervisors--and the easy target was the CAO, because, one: I was never a part of the establishment, I was an outsider from Washington, D.C., and I was black. I had a reputation for being aloof and I had, for some reason, the ability to mesmerize the Board of Supervisors so they wouldn't do anything that I didn't want them to do. . . . The articles were designed to undercut my authority and to return it to the Board of Supervisors. (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991) (see Appendix I)

One participant said that the articles represented only "isolated and random things that had been selected for investigation and in no way reflected the totality of the services as provided by the county government." The reporters who wrote the articles were encouraged by a conservative editorial board that was simply seeking a "Pulitzer Prize" (R. Lerner, personal communication, January 30, 1991).

Yet in the midst of this defense, a voice from the community said, "The various county departments charged with dealing with the human services were turf-guarding in extreme ways that were frustrating, and it was just very hard to do business. They were not, in my view, a very reliable partner in any enterprise. You got set up, and they didn't behave in an honorable way. . . they normally intimidated." (G. Allison, personal communication, January 16, 1990)

There were two participants who worked for the county government at the time the articles were published who thought otherwise. One expressed it in this way: "Generally they [the articles] were justified, because the county really was in bad

condition" (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990). Another county official said, "It's still a county in chaos. It just isn't being reported in the daily newspapers. Because that's the nature of the news media. When they decide to focus in on something, they do it. It's a conscious decision that is made" (J. Duffy, personal communication, December 13, 1990).

When I asked another elected official if the articles would be different today, he said, "Well, I doubt seriously whether the articles, if printed today, would be a great deal different from the articles presented in 1984. I'm not sure that improvement fiscally or efficiency-wise has been that great. . . . circumstances that existed then exist today" (E. Miller, personal communication, December 13, 1990).

After so much discussion about the articles in the Copley Press, I decided it was only appropriate to talk with one more person, a principal San Diego Tribune reporter who was assigned to write several of the 13 articles about the county. I think his perceptions of what has happened in the county in the last years are valuable to this story and strengthen the effort to make it inclusive. I went to the San Diego Tribune offices and talked with the Claude Walbert, one of the reporters who had authored several of the articles in 1984. He expressed himself this way:

I thought it was somewhat of a scattered approach, but you know, it had its advantages in being done that way. It enabled. . . a very wide range of issues [to be discussed] and reminded people of a lot of things that happened in the past and the kind of things that perhaps could continue to take place if some changes weren't made. The articles themselves, who knows where the initial

idea for anything like that comes from? Certainly the question had been raised in many circles for many years about the quality and direction of county government. The Chamber of Commerce had frequently mentioned this. Someone who had a particular interest in this and certainly Lee Grissom [President of the Chamber of Commerce] played a role, particularly in the Charter Commission. How much influence came from that direction to some person on the newspaper, and how much a role that might have played in filtering down into the newsroom, it's almost impossible to track. I don't believe that it's something that you could ever describe as having been instigated by any one person or group outside the newspaper. There are too many decisions to be made, I know of any number of suggestions for stories that were made by editors because they picked up certain feelings within groups or levels of society in San Diego, and they think they should be dealt with. By the time it gets down to the newsroom level, so many people have looked at those things, sometimes they are totally rejected, sometimes it might result in a 12 inch story that means nothing to anyone, you wonder why it is there. Someone did it to get some editor off his back. Almost never could a suggestion even from the highest editor result in that sort of series of stories. There are too many other people that played too much of a role. (C. Walbert, personal communication, January 28, 1991)

At the close of our interview, I asked Walbert the same question I had asked so many other participants: "If a series of article were written today, how would the

headline read?" His answer was immediate and simply stated: "The title would probably be very much like the title that you're going to have on your dissertation. Instead of 'County in Chaos,' it would be 'Leadership and Change'" (C. Walbert, personal communication, January 28, 1991).

Conclusions

As the reader has just experienced, the narrative of change includes an enormous complexity. The researcher intended to include the many voices in this study in order to convey to the reader this complexity and in turn allow the reader to enter into a dialogue which before this study was not possible. The extraordinary finding of this study was that within this diversity there is a consistency, a directional movement which is focused on the future good of the San Diego County government and the community. After analyzing the full transcripts, notes, and listening to the audio-tapes, I discerned a pattern of meanings that addresses the research question posed at the beginning of this chapter: Within a complex political context, how did the persons, acting in decision-making positions internal and external to the county government of San Diego, perceive and interpret the intended changes during the process? The persons who act in decision-making positions in the community or in the county government of San Diego today (1991) share a basic perception about the county between 1983-1990. The common perceptions, shared by the plurality of participants from the three groups, is that the county government of San Diego has undergone significant changes during the past seven years. The participants in all three groups attributed and identified changes in the following seven major areas.

1. Quality of Elected Officials The election of five new members to the Board of Supervisors, beginning with that of Leon Williams's election in 1982 until the election of Chairperson MacDonald in 1986, was cited as a significant change. The members were seen as different, individually and collectively, for the following reasons: quality of governmental experience prior to election, intelligence, willingness to work as a member of a group, elected on a change platform, board membership was not used simply as a means to higher office, and a conciliatory attitude toward others resulting in nonabusive behavior.

2. Norman Hickey The appointment of Hickey as the Chief Administrative Officer was perceived as a significant change. Participants spoke repeatedly of his warmth, caring, fearlessness, approachability, honesty, sense of community, intelligence, long-standing and meaningful relationships, and an ability to influence others in a nonthreatening way.

(3) Charter Amendment The passage of Proposition A and the statutory effect it had on the Board's relationship with the Chief Administrative Officer was interpreted as a significant change. There was a clarification of roles, a strengthening of the Chief Administrative Officer's authority.

(4) Organizational Changes Hickey recruited new persons for key positions in the county government from outside the organization because of their outstanding qualifications and new way of seeing long-standing problems. William Cox, M.D., Director of Health Services, and Areta Crowell, Ph.D., Deputy Director of Mental Health, were mentioned repeatedly in the interviews. There were also references to

the addition of the Medical Examiner, Public Defender, a new Registrar of Voters and Director of General Services. The return of Lari Sheehan to the county in the position of Deputy Chief Administrative Officer was considered significant to many participants within the institution. David Janssen was considered by most participants within the institution as the internal administrator who controlled the budget and fiscal decision-making, unlike the administrations of the past when the budget was the primary concern of the former Chief Administrative Officers.

5. Change in Relations with State and Federal Governments Participants attributed this change to Hickey's political acumen. He recognized the significance of close relationship building and consistent interchange of information. He brought in people who were respected by the legislators who could assist in this change. A participant cited by persons inside and outside of the institution as having a critical role in this change was Dr. J. William Cox, Director of the Department of Health. Hickey was given credit for facilitating and encouraging frequent access in this change process to David Janssen, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, and the Board of Supervisors.

6. News Media With few exceptions, the participants thought the relations between the media and the county had changed dramatically. Credit for this change was given to Hickey and his ability to communicate openly, establish meaningful relationships, and his fearlessness.

7. Evolutionary Difference The participants considered that over the years there were different cultural, economic, and political changes that had a natural impact

on the county. The county government was not better or worse, just not the same.

Participants outside of the county government itself were not generally aware of a formal process of designed change in the county. They told me they assumed Hickey did things intentionally, but they were not aware of any strategic plan for change. The participants inside the county government understood and interpreted the formal process of change, but with a wide range of interpretations. Only 11 participants within the county government indicated a clear sense of how changes were decided upon, e.g. mission statement, goal process, systems thinking.

Generally, there were three types of participants. There was the participant who had devoted hours to understanding the process, who had a clear understanding of what was intended and how it was to be realized. There was another group of participants who felt disenfranchised because the design occurred without their knowledge or input. Finally, there was a group of participants who accepted what was handed down from the top and never questioned how or why it came to be. The three views represent the range of responses.

This perception of top-down direction is interesting to contemplate. In my 17 months of being within and studying the county government, I became increasingly aware of how uneven a playing field it really is and how ephemeral the boundaries were. In the true sense there is no top down in a county government as there is the privately owned corporation or in some municipal governments. What I saw was an interplay of elected and appointed officials, funding sources from the state and federal governments, and a dynamic interaction among diverse groups. All of this time there

was a plan for these participants, who struggle daily to survive in a fiscal crisis, to gain an awareness that they are interconnected and part of a collaborative whole. In a top-down organization the source of power and the reporting relationships are clear. The source of revenue is intimately connected with top-down authority. Not so in the county government, where there are both budgetary and programmatic oversight. The complexity is more apparent if you consider that in 1991 the county has a \$1.7 billion budget, and out of the total budget outlay, only 2% of it is discretionary in nature.

Within the county government there is movement in all directions. Influence is felt sideways, backward, underneath and around. Department heads obtain their positions in one of four ways: appointment by the Chief Administrative Officer, by the Board of Supervisors, by both the Chief Administrative Officer and Board of Supervisors, and by election. Out of those department heads appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer, certain ones have statutory authority and responsibilities which are binding upon the Chief Administrative Officer and, in some cases, the Board of Supervisors and other elected officials. The concept of a reporting relationship takes on a new meaning in this kind of structure. Outside of a small group of individuals at the top of the hierarchy the rationale of change process was remote to the participants. It was accepted by most because it was expected behavior by the top management. Those who were left out of the creation of meaning and language felt separated, most especially if they had experienced closer communication in former administrations.

The final Chapter in this study takes the knowledge of the complexity and diversity in the San Diego County government discussed in Chapters Four and Five

and considers what implications they have on the nature of leadership in and of itself and as it relates to the study and practice of public administration in a regional government in the United States.

CHAPTER SIX

THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP

Introduction

This final chapter is devoted to the nature of leadership. It addresses the fourth research question: While exploring the process of intended changes in a multifarious political context, what implications can be drawn about the nature of leadership in public administration? The chapter is divided into five parts. The first part is the introduction, which includes a general outline of the chapter and a discussion of Research Question Four. The second part returns to the perceptions of the participants of this study. The researcher discusses their definitions of the nature of leadership, common themes in their definitions and examples of leadership they have experienced or observed. The third part is devoted to the researcher's definition of the nature of leadership. The fourth section analyzes what implications can be drawn about the nature of the leadership relationship while studying the process of intended changes in a multifarious political context. The fifth part is the conclusion of the research study.

Analysis of the data collected through the research clearly indicates that the county government of San Diego began in 1983 a specific process, influenced by Supervisor Williams and others, which involved intentional changes. In this document

the process was followed through 1990 and into the present, 1991. In 1983, Supervisor Williams knew the county government needed to be analyzed, to be better understood. Many people perceived that the county government was faltering. He brought together the Issues Task Force in 1983. When the new administrator, Hickey, assumed his position in 1986, Williams brought about a meeting of the some members of the Issues Task Force and Hickey. The purpose of the meeting was to inform Hickey of the findings. Janssen also attended that meeting. A few months later, in 1986, the county administrators, including Hickey, Janssen and Sheehan, all of whom were now familiar with the findings of the Issues Task Force, convened to continue the process of intended change.

The administrators struggled with the difficult task of articulating what they saw the county to be. They analyzed the purposes of county government and looked to the desired future of the institution. This year-long process was informed by the organizational systems theory which Doshier brought to the discussions. According to Kraft (1975), a system has four elements: (1) interacting components, (2) a boundary, (3) input from the environment, and (4) outputs to the environment. Doshier interpreted this theory to the administrators and later to the Executive Staff. She taught the administrators the principal concepts and language included in the systems literature. This language remains in 1991 in the county executives' lexicon of change. Systems theory and its applications have influenced thinking and processes in the county government for the past five years.

Doshier drew key concepts from Breed (1971). One such concept was

controlling guidance: "That which prevents drift and inaction by establishing a policy and working to implement it can be informed by consensus-formation, which works to insure the responsiveness of the controlling elites to the members. . . and as it moves toward its goals it is active, but not tyrannical" (Breed, 1971, p. 4). Doshier also taught the concept that the county government as a self-guiding society "that knows itself, is committed to moving toward a fuller realization of its values, commands the levers such transformation requires, and is able to set limits on these changes. That would be the active, self-guiding society" (p. 11). She taught the administrators that the county government was an inquiring system which should be goal-seeking. Doshier considered both inquiring and goal-seeking to be essential in the change process. "Design enables us to create systems which will perform tasks better than a single person does alone (Churchman, 1971, p. 3). The inquiring system is a processor, specifically a symbol processor" (p. 20). Churchman referred to the actor, in this case the administrator, as a designer, one who discovers and inquires. The desired end of the administrative inquiry was to better understand what the most beneficial teleological system would be to realize short-and long-term goals for the county administration. The aim of the inquiry, according to Churchman (1971), is to show the relationship of the parts to the whole system. This was exactly the message Doshier attempted to impart to an institution that had been perceived by the media and others in 1984 as a place of chaos driven by various self-serving factions.

For the administration to even consider such an undertaking in a large, bureaucratic, and political institution such as the County of San Diego was

extraordinary. Traditionally county governments react, readjust and struggle to maintain equilibrium in the face of increasing societal demands in an often hostile environment. They do not enter into a self-reflective study of purposes. County government in the United States is ill defined and consequently a misunderstood and often forgotten form of government. It is forgotten, however, only until the public perceives what they interpret to be the mismanagement of public funds or a failure to unobtrusively meet the responsibilities that the federal, state, and municipal governments have placed on the county government.

Each day the county executives and board face problems that seem to be insoluble and self-perpetuating. The most painful and challenging problems are those that very often involve the "throw-away people" in our society. The county's ability to fulfill its hundreds of mandates to serve these people is often only a remote concern to the societal power brokers, many of whom are not even aware of what the county government does. These more fortunate and influential members of society can seek alternative help in the private sector and not depend on the county to care for their children who are addicted, spouses who are dying or parents who need care. The county serves those with no other alternatives. The county's clients are most often persons who have nowhere else to go for help. Seldom do persons announce how proud they are to have been helped by the county. The need for the welfare check is not applauded in our society. It has a negative connotation. The county serves the whole community, including those who are powerless in our society. The list includes the mentally ill, pregnant children, juvenile offenders, substance abusers, rape victims,

battered children, addicted infants, homeless families, and the elderly, injured, indigent, and abandoned people dying alone. Hickey accepted the challenge in 1986 for the county administrators to somehow make a difference in this regional government and the people it serves.

After studying the county government for six months, I learned that it operated in a multifarious political context, an environment made up of interrelated conditions which are at the same time diverse, eclectic, many-sided, polycentric, and multifaceted.

The county government is also a political environment in which an interactive process takes place continually. Within this context there are positional players engaged in a game for whom the rules are of great significance. These players compromise and bargain according to their individual stands on certain issues. Within this political context each player's stand is often determined by parochial priorities and perceptions, goals, interests, deadlines, and faces of issues. The formal actions of the institution come from central players while other actions come from subsets of actors. The political process is one in which competing individuals and/or groups use the power resources available to them. They use these resources in order to influence the allocation of the limited benefits, real or symbolic, that the organization has to distribute toward outcomes that favor their own self-interests or stands. This political context is in and of itself bipartisan, factional and bureaucratic. While the public is often contemptuous of bureaucracies, it is even more intolerant of chaos, of public institutions without tight reins and rigid boundaries. The public says to the county as

an institution: "Make all the messy problems go away, but stay trim and tidy while you are doing it."

Hickey knew this and much more from 35 years of public service. He quietly went about to change the culture which many participants felt to be punitive and hostile to one based on the premises of care and honor of all persons. A document submitted on April 23, 1991, to the Board for review and acceptance by the Executive Staff (see Appendix I) defined the five-year strategic directions, the San Diego County government, vision, purpose, culture, and mission. It was reviewed and accepted by the Board on that date.

This 1991 document was a milestone in the change process begun in 1983. It clearly states the official desire for a collaborative, systems-thinking, proactive learning organization which is goal oriented. The mission statement has been written and the five-year strategic directions defined. The Hickey administration began the formal process of intended institutional change with three persons: Hickey, Janssen and Doshier. Gradually the group expanded to include Sheehan, Boland, and Komar. In 1987 the Executive Staff was formed and became a forum for discussion and a vehicle for change. Griego joined the Executive Staff. Very gradually the process included more participants. The 1991 document calls for an institution which is collaborative, open to learning, dedicated to the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of life in the community, and which is both respectful and respected. The challenge to implement these desired conditions creating real changes in the county's culture and valued meanings, I suggest, indicates a need to understand the nature of leadership.

Participants' Thoughts on the Nature of Leadership

Before I began this study I knew the importance of exploring the perceptions of the participants in regard to the nature of leadership. The participants in this study were a rare and unique gathering of individuals. I chose the word gathering because in a very real way they have come together and interacted in a gathering, although some individuals in the study have never met one another. Through our discussions, they shared their thoughts with me. I, in turn, through my analysis and writing, have attempted to bring their perceptions together to interact and, through this interaction, construct a sense of common and disparate meanings that would be useful to a student of leadership. It would not have been enough to assume what their perceptions were through nonreactive observation or through a data-driven survey about popular notions of leadership. I wanted to hear their words and listen to them as they reasoned. I questioned and challenged them to define a concept which many found illusive and throughout this process we engaged in a discussion.

All of the participants in this study are in governmental and community service. They are considered by their peers to be decision makers. Their decisions affect societal issues and in many cases governmental policy making and implementation. The majority of the participants reside in San Diego County. Seven participants in the study live in other areas of the United States, including: Northern California, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia. Each one has been at one time or another a key participant and/or observer who influenced the process of intended change.

I felt that it was important to see how these persons defined the nature of leadership, a construct that most persons hesitate to define even though they live in a society that struggles to understand the same construct. Before leadership can be recognized and emulated, it needs to be understood. As humans we seek to express ourselves through metaphorical language and establish understandable definitions for our constructs. This process brings clarity to thinking and pursuant action. Leadership is an action. Within this study, the participant's meanings were important to consider and analyze if this document would be, as its title states, a study of leadership.

I began the interviews not knowing how the questions regarding leadership would be received. As the weeks went on in the interview process, the interview took on the form of a dialogue. I had much to learn. It was an exchange of thoughts which evolved throughout the interchange. I learned to let the interchange have a life of its own. With each interview, I sought to control it less. The participants were filled with ideas. They were articulate and wanted to be heard. The pages of transcripts testify to their interest in the subject and their generous sharing of perceptions. The responses were of such quality that there is material for this as well as for future studies.

In every dialogue we devoted time to the discussion of the nature of leadership. Selected responses from the four groups of participants are included in this portion of the research. I found no need to separate them for purposes of analysis. It would have been artificial division to analyze them in relation to group membership; the

gathering would have been disrupted. The thoughts of one complement and enrich the other's. The compilation creates the whole.

The participants represent a diverse cross-section of people. They differ in professional experience, ethnic origins, sex, age, educational backgrounds, and positions. With this diversity, they share a common concern for society and its future. Their decisions influence society's future, whether they be a county chief administrator, city manager, director of a community-based organization, public administrator, a pastor, or the executive director of an international association.

Many of the discussions were lengthy. They involved a great deal of thought on the part of the participant and the researcher. Questions evolved out of questions. Answers led to more discussion. Very often the participant became noticeably more interested in trying to define leadership the more she/he spoke about a concept. Many became aware of how difficult the nature of leadership is to define, to differentiate and make distinct from other processes. I did not offer my definition of leadership during any interview. It is interesting to note that out of the many conversations I had, there was only one person who asked me to explain my definition of leadership.

The researcher asked the participants two basic questions and, depending on the participant's answers, made one request. The questions were: (1) What is your definition of the nature of leadership? and (2) Does leadership exist in the county government of San Diego/ or have you experienced leadership in your institution? If they answered "yes" to the second question, I asked them to give an example. It was significant for a study of leadership to know the thoughts of the key decision makers

in a complex process of change. The researcher thought it was important to listen to the persons who had been involved in the intended change process in San Diego County as well as in other regional governments.

The researcher talked with 60 persons about the nature of leadership. I did not limit the discussion of leadership to any one context, e.g. public administration. Through the research process the participants indicated a real interest in the subject of leadership. The researcher asked questions regarding the leadership process, the way it is recognized, whether change was always an element in leadership, could it be known in the present, and finally I asked them to give me an example of a time they experienced leadership.

Participants approached their definition of leadership differently. There were those who talked of the nature of leadership and others who approached the subject through a focus on the leader, sometimes referencing the relationship between the leader and follower. After the participants explained their concept of leadership, I asked each participant to give an example of leadership. The people in San Diego were asked if they have observed it within the county government of San Diego. For the purposes of presentation and analysis, I selected sample quotations from the interviews and put them in one of four categories: leadership, leader, examples of leadership, and leadership and management. A reading of these quotations will give a glimpse at the variety of answers as well as certain commonalities. There are instances in each category when the content of the quotation overlaps with another category, and that overlapping in and of itself gives evidence to the complexity and

need for the study of leadership.

Leadership

I think, first of all, leadership is not fixed. I think one of the great difficulties people have in understanding it is that they want it to hold still. People want it to be a pyramid that they can always look to and say, "That's leadership." But I think the one great thing about leadership is that it is very evolving and very adapting to what is needed at the time, because I really believe an intermediate clerk typist or a baker or anybody can be a leader in a moment, in the involvement, in the process that is going on. By that I mean people can bring together a group in a moving direction or involving or understanding. (E. Chastain, personal communication, October 25, 1990)

Leadership has to include being able to sell yourself and your ideas in a pleasant manner so that people understand what you are requiring them to do. It's not a question. You are not asking them to do it, you are selling them what you are requiring that they will do. . . . Certainly a leader has got to listen to the constructive criticism to those he tries to lead and when you find a guy who is either a recalcitrant, or an idiot, you fire him. . . . You give them the message and see that the order is followed. . . . If they buck you, they get the hell off the ship. (J. Adams, Executive Vice President, Pacific Ship Repair & Fabrication, Inc., personal communication, January 24, 1991).

Responsible leadership means that you can rally forces beyond yourself to get involved with the cause. Leadership is something that has to be used

judiciously. (G. Walker Smith, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

The nature of leadership is the process of an individual or individuals conveying to an organization the road map to follow within the organization. It's a process of verbal and written communication. It's a process of leading by example, a process of communicating. (L. Cook, personal communication, October, 1990)

Leadership is the thing that we have been talking about [the process of intended change]. I think that it's vision, I think it's communication, I think it's positioning, and I think it's self-mastery. I see it differently in a lot of cases from being a hands-on manager. And what it [leadership] does is that it sets a tone for an organization, whether it is large or small, and then allows that function in getting something done that is future oriented, the place that we want to be. I think it's that kind of leadership that makes for success, especially in a big organization. And the job becomes more difficult the bigger the organization, or the more diverse it is, and that's why I think it's so difficult for the county because we're so diverse. (M. Lopez, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Leadership is providing the qualities, techniques, strategies, tactics and instruments to move something. (L. Grissom, personal communication, January 29, 1991)

The nature of leadership is who you are and what you do to cause change or results in big bodies of people or large arenas. . . . I don't know

that it's change per se from one culture to another, but it is movement. It is action. It's not maintenance. Lots of energy. (J. Huston, personal communication, November 16, 1990)

I think leadership is an historic fact. . . . There are people who may be perceived as leaders, or who may perceive themselves as leaders at the present, but I think only time tells that they are leaders. . . . History will show if a person made a difference or not. . . . At the end of a person's term, look at what the person did and the changes brought about, and you will usually see almost an inverse correlation between the loudness of the rhetoric and what the person did. (C. Graves, personal communication, February 1, 1991)

You have to break your old paradigm and create new paradigms. You don't want to get yourself locked in a box doing the same thing over and over again. . . . There may be limits in terms of what you can do, you know, budget wise but you work within those parameters and try to find a new paradigm to reach whatever you are trying to do and I don't see that happening in a lot of bureaucracies. (B. Yip, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

Leadership is not manipulating people. It is not manipulating things. It is not developing schedules. It is not conceiving and devising new boxes and hierarchical, pyramidal designed structures. It is the ability to recognize that you accomplish things through other people, and in order to accomplish what is clearly needed that you have to recognize the dignity and the worth of the individuals through whom you hope to accomplish some end. (W. Cox,

personal communication, November, 1990)

The ten preceding quotations give a glimpse at the variety of answers and ideas the participants had about the nature of leadership. One participant identified a commonly expressed difficulty with the concept of leadership. People are uncomfortable with it because leadership is not an objective reality that can be sensed and generally agreed upon, such as the massive stone "pyramid" is. The pyramid has a solid broad base and comes to a single point at the top, hierarchical by design. The highest point is indisputable, can be seen from a great distance, and is singular. From the point at the top, the pyramid gradually broadens to the solid foundation. The choice of the pyramid metaphor offers an interesting insight into the quandary which surrounds the study of leadership. People are looking for a stable or acceptable understanding of leadership defined in a structure or form that is easily recognizable. The participant explains people's need for this solid structure and at the same time recognizes what she perceives as the innate fluidity of leadership.

One participant describes leadership as the act of "taking charge" of the group. The relationship between the message giver and the hearer is clear. One person acts and the other responds to the actor's wishes. The relationship is not a reciprocal one. Mandates come forth and are to be followed. Choice resides only with the message giver. Dispute is not admissible in the interaction. Impediments are removed for the sake of order. Confined to this linear, rational, and one-right-answer approach leadership would be incompatible with a multifarious political context. This definition would be restricted to a nonnegotiable organizational chart.

Leadership as a process is introduced. One participant perceived leadership as a process which should only be "used judiciously" with a sense of responsibility to people and a cause. The process is circular. It is gathering around of people who intend a greater purpose. The process is taken a little further and described by another participant as a process based on communication. This perception admits the opportunity for multiple actors within an organization to create and convey a way for the organization to proceed through the leadership process, "a road map." Process is then connected with communication for the purpose of intended change within an organization. The focus of the communication is the vision. According to the participant, the leader's vision is what allows the organization to be "future oriented." Diversity is recognized as a challenge to leadership. Leadership is then perceived as an instrument "to move something." The person is not described, but the process is seen as a provider. Leadership represents energy to the organization, the source of movement. The eighth quotation articulates the most commonly shared perception held by the participants. Graves clearly stated that leadership can only be known in retrospect, through an historical perspective. The results, judged over time, are the only admissible proof that leadership has in fact occurred.

The words will serve as the bridge between the discussion of leadership and the leader. These are some of the thoughts expressed in a dialogue which explored a participant's perception of the essence of leadership.

It [leadership] is the willingness to be accountable if you are someone who is in charge. It is the willingness to be accountable if you are someone who is on

the other side of it and being given direction. You get some sense of mutuality about the success of that enterprise in which we are mutually engaged. But it is a process. It is a process which has a life and it has growth and it has death. And there comes a time when you start out with a group of people and all of a sudden it has outgrown its functionality. They are all well and gone their separate ways. I had faith in the process that if you will engage people in a trusting relationship, you will work on things which are a common concern to them and use their imagination, their creativity and your ability to make things occur out of that, that would initiate a process which would lead to places which I hoped had certain outcomes. . . . It is a difficult process. It means a lot of things you have to give up for yourself. You have to not want to have your thumb on the scale, and have it come out a certain way. If your outcome measures, you just forget about it. I'm simply saying that is not what it's all about. I promise you, you'll have an outcome, and I promise you can measure it. The temptation is so great along the way to be able to just dent the process a little here, just give a little spin there, until it finally comes out where you want it to come out, and that isn't what the process is about. It's not about manipulation. It's that kind of vulnerability to the process, to open yourself to it, to experience it, to celebrate it, to have trust in it, and be able to use the experience you have gathered, to be able, again, to model it. (G.

Allison, personal communication, January 16, 1991)

The Leader

A true leader has a clear vision of where he or she wants to go and is able to express in reasonably simple terms what the vision is and is able to work with people who are the followers, I mean with a capital F. You can't be a leader if no one is following. (S. Golding, personal communication, February, 1991).

It [leadership] is something that I think everyone in management struggles with, as we are in our leadership roles to come up with what is or what makes that person a leader. What makes that person able to change an organization? . . . If you stay the same, you are stagnant. If you have a great organization and you bring a leader in to maintain that organization, in my mind that organization is dead. The leader should always be making the organization better and something different than what it is, because society, government, people are constantly changing. So if the organization isn't flexible and can't change, and the leader doesn't see. . .change, they really don't have a leader. (R. Calvao, personal communication, November 19, 1990)

[The leader is] a take-charge person, task oriented, and not afraid. No fear gets things done. The leader is resourceful, has good self-esteem, is secure without deep-rooted insecurities. A leader is helpful, supportive and serves as a guide to the followers who, as sheep with little bells, need to be given an objective to carry out. (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990)

Well, leadership, I think, is the ability to teach others and it's the ability to establish credibility with others. . . . The other attribute that I've seen is one that is willing to go out front and take risks. And I think willingness to take risks, willing to go out front, willing to allow others to participate, willing to share the responsibility of leadership rather than to keep it and control it--those are the people that I define as leaders. . . . I respect anyone that is willing to involve me and others, that is willing to go out front and willing to support and is willing to listen to both the positive and negative circumstances around any particular issue. I think that's very important, and there are people [who] get into leadership positions and you really never know what they really want, what they really want to accomplish. They get into an organization and they are there more to control, so you never get any leadership out of that. And in government I see it a lot. (R. Griego, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

Well, I think leadership is a very difficult thing to define. A person who might be a great leader, we'll say a president. A great leader at one time will be completely hemmed in at another. . . . [The leader is] the person who cuts through the fog to the meat of the coconut. . . . A good leader can recognize, brush all the other things aside, and recognize what really counts. (E. Fike, personal communication, February 8, 1991)

It [leadership] has an awful lot to do with the person. Forget about what it is they want to do for a minute. The individuals themselves, their

ability to generate in other people a willingness to work with them, and that goes to issues like integrity, honesty, valuing other people, communications--talking to people. I don't think you can be a successful leader without having those kinds of qualities you can be out charging, but that doesn't necessarily make you a leader. The second piece of that is knowing where you want to go, and once you get people that are willing to go with you, then you've got to know where you want to go. (D. Janssen, personal communication, December 19, 1990)

Well, a leader always has, doesn't always, but often has this charismatic character because they can relate to people. They are open to input, to hearing what people have to say. They get people to set goals and objectives--how we achieve those things. (B. Yip, personal communication, February 5, 1991)

I think leadership, obviously, is the ability and the quality of an individual to make others respond to him or to her (we have to include the women). . . and to get those people that he or she is affecting to follow him/her to achieve the goal that he or she has identified. It is both an ability, because I think a person has to develop into this, and you have skills of leadership, and it's also a process that sometimes occurs when a group--be it a social group, a church group, a community or a nation--is searching for some kind of solution. I think that you find, at least in my intellectual experience and my career, that leadership rises in times of greatest need for community,

country, or organization. And sometimes leadership is dormant. . . Boy, this is a very difficult question. . . . The man. The individual. I guess what I'm getting at is that I believe leadership is something that just--that really comes with a person. I think it's embodied. Tony, the leader, goes from situation to situation--or the situation allows for Tony, or Sheila, to become a leader in a particular moment. I also believe in leaders, rather than a leader. I think the very nature of American society, thank God, prevents a leader, because we have seen in history what a leader can do: Mussolini, Hitler, and in my own country of Cuba, Castro. . . . I do not believe that leadership can be structurally developed. I think leadership can be aided by structure, but unless there is substance, the form won't do it. (J.A. Ojeda, personal communication, January, 1991)

It's connected to some position. You've got to have some legitimate position within the organization, you've either been appointed to it or you create it. You can create it by winning the street fight and you kill the guy and you take over the leadership of the gang. You can create it that way, then you create it by fear So, what's happened is, you can kill off figuratively the people around you. Somehow as the leader you've got to get to the top of the pack. You've got to get there. (B. Boland, personal communication, November, 1990)

Now, once you [the leader] sell them that [you are] trying to develop good things for us as a team to do, if a person can't be sold, he's got to be

given his day in court to tell you, boss, you're all screwed up. Certainly a leader's got to listen to constructive criticism to those he tries to lead. And when you find a guy who's either a recalcitrant or an idiot, you fire him. (J. Adams, personal communication, January, 1991)

One very important part of leadership is the ability, I think, to provide an example to people who work for you, ethics, integrity, and just sheer hard work. Another part is the ability to motivate people, to want to look at you, so that they will emulate the good characteristics of the model that the leader has set. (C. Walbert, personal communication, January 28, 1991)

I think leadership is somehow getting the task accomplished with whatever resources you have. It's getting it done that way. I go back to my Navy background and I had at one point two different admirals. One was the fellow I would describe as a good listener. He would discuss the pros and cons of any kind of problem that would come up, would listen to your input, and then make a decision. He did an outstanding job. He was replaced by another one who led with a totally different approach. He didn't listen to staff's input, he made up his own mind, and we carried out his decisions. Again, the job got done in a very good manner. Both approaches worked. (P. Boland, personal communication, October 29, 1990)

I think leaders are the people who can see change or see a need for change, and they have to be out in front but not too far out in front to be able to have the intermediate steps that will bring the whole organization along with

them. Change is something that has to be nurtured and engendered, preparation has to be made for it. (C. Lucas, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

I think leadership is being able to make positive things happen regardless of how you do it, whether you are out front waving a flag or working behind the scenes to make it happen without looking for individual praise for the accomplishment of what happens. If you can make a reasonable percent--you can take two steps forward to one back--you're a leader in what is accomplished. (G. Bailey, personal communication, December 20, 1990)

Well, [that] is pretty simple. Some people, by position, are leaders whether they want to be leaders or not. If you are a member of the Board of Supervisors, you are a leader. You have to vote and when you vote, you are exhibiting some leadership because people are observing how you vote and that, then, modifies their behavior At the executive level, I think, again, if you are the Chief Administrative Officer of the county, your role by definition, it's almost impossible not to be a leader, because you've signed reports and you talk. You make judgments that affect the behavior of people within the organization. That's leadership. You can be a good leader or a bad leader, but your judgments affect their behavior. . . . At the Chief Administrative Office level, Norm reorganized his office, changed the boxes, if you will, persuaded the Board of Supervisors to go along with the reorganization, went out and hired people to fill those boxes and those people

day-by-day direct that county government--the administrative side of county government--and as a result Hickey demonstrated leadership. He could have inherited, had just gone along with the same organization, the same people for as long as he and the Board could get along with one other, but when you change your organizational structure, that's leadership, and to persuade somebody to do it is [leadership]. Half of it is having the idea, the second the presenting of it. (J. Lockwood, personal communication, February 6, 1991)

How do you know it? You know it by result. The result is either more successful or less successful. Whatever it was you were trying to do, you've accomplished. I think you know it is happening because you can see an action of initiative being taken. It's not one of delay and one of putting it off. . . . I don't consider it leadership if you don't take an initiative to respond to or resolve a need or a problem. I would call a person taking a leadership action when they act to do something that will resolve a problem or need. (G. Rodriguez, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

This selection of 16 perceptions represent many of the views expressed by the participants. Together, the quotations can be interpreted as a composite of the most commonly expressed meanings heard in the dialogues. The participants discussed the concept of the leader more readily than the nature of leadership. Most participants answered the question about the nature of leadership by describing the traits of the individual leader rather than the concept of leadership. This choice, to single out the leader as the focus of leadership, is a common one. Much of the literature which

discusses leadership focuses on the leader and his/her traits including: behaviors, attributes, appearance, skills, and inborn qualities, rather than what leadership is, in and of itself. The leader appears to be more tangible, perhaps more like the pyramid. Generally speaking, the participants in the study seemed to think they could easily recognize a leader in action, but at the same time they hesitated to identify or describe the leadership process when it is happening. The leader was identifiable in the present. Leadership could only be known in retrospect.

The participants on the whole perceived the leader as a single individual who acts from a position of accepted authority within an institution or organization. When I discussed this subject with the Chief Administrative Officer, I heard a different voice, one that was in the mainstream of the thought presented above. When I asked Hickey if leadership involved the single actor he said,

No, it's enormous. . . If it were a single actor, why are they not following my mandates?. . .I don't mandate these people often, so maybe sometimes they want to know where the leadership is, but it lies within them to conduct themselves. So when I disappear, the institutionalization here should be within them. They are going to have to do that. . . . Authority is only the ability and power to direct. The great things were done by a lot of people who had no apparent authority. So I would hope that out of this, I have made people aware that they have it within them. (N. Hickey, personal communication, November 30, 1990)

The leader has those followers which he/she needs to be a leader. "You can't

charge up the hill alone, you'll get blasted," Hickey said. According to the perceptions of most of the participants, leaders interact with others in the organization in order to realize the goals of the organization and further their own idea of what is best for the institution. The leader was described as having certain "gifts of knowing." The leader, in their opinion, has a pre-planned goal, and it is through interaction with people in the organization that it is actualized. The plan or idea was referred to most often as "a vision." Some of the other descriptors used by the participants for this concept include: ideal, agenda, dream, goal, plan, objective, and alternative. All but three of the participants believed that the vision originated and resided in the leader. For most, the vision should necessarily be fixed and clearly defined. The participants who expressed this idea felt a clearly stated vision would enable people in the organization, the followers, to understand what the leader wanted for the organization. There were those, however, who described the vision as an essentially dynamic concept.

It's not a fixed vision, it frequently shifts, it frequently broadens, sometimes it narrows in a sense of focusing on what has to be changed and what has to be accomplished, or what direction does the organization have to go. You've got to have communication skills to communicate that vision through the use of metaphors and language and creating a rhythm in language, and then using life as theater, to excite, to motivate. (W. Hansell, January 24, 1991)

The leader was described as "having a gift for seeing in the future," "knowing what was best," and being the "lighthouse for the organization." Vision was

considered a necessary component and actually, by many, a prerequisite to the leader's leading "effectively." According to these people, if there were no clearly defined vision, there would be no way to judge the success of the leader. It was very important to most of the participants to determine success. The leader was accountable for the actualization of a vision, set of goals, or planned-for change. Leadership, for most, could only be defined by results. Results do not seem to determine if a leader is a leader, however, position does that. Results do, however, determine whether he/she is effective or ineffective as a leader. The participants determined the goodness of a leader by the content of leadership, e.g. designing a new child-care center. Two persons expressed a concern that a defined vision, predetermined before interaction with others, might preclude creativity.

One participant described origins of the vision in this way. "The vision, I think, comes from his or her own perception, and from listening to others, from looking around, from knowing about the past, knowing about the present, and estimating the future, and I think it really gets down to a matter of judgment. I think in order to be a good visionary, a good leader, you have to be able to follow" (L. Williams, personal communication, November 15, 1990).

I asked Hickey in one of our conversations if he had a fixed vision, when he assumed his position as Chief Administrative Officer in 1986, which delineated what he planned for the county government. "No, I'm not bright enough to do that, or egotistical enough to do that" (N. Hickey, personal communication, November, 1990). He explained to me that the intended changes for the county came rather as a

result of interaction which included listening, observing, talking, and moving in and about the County of San Diego. The process of deciding on the intended changes, according to Hickey, took time, time to reflect, to call on the wisdom and knowledge gained through 40 years of public service. Lastly and most importantly, the process was enlightened by intuition.

The participants discussed the interaction between the leader and follower and how the interaction between them is precipitated by the leader through some of the following methods: good communication skills, the formation of relationships based on trust, the ability to motivate, reasoning, clear directives, incentives, and through persuasion. The leader was often described as the one who empowers the followers through the interaction. Empowerment was perceived to be a way for the follower to "feel good about themselves" and consequently work harder to fulfill the vision of the leader. The participants had many perceptions of communication. Two perceptions of communication are expressed in the following quotations.

One of the things that I learned when I was in county government was to make absolutely certain I listened to the diversity of all the opinions because it is amazing how much my thought would change. (P. Eckert, personal communication, February 6, 1991)

It's communication, it is through their eyes and feelings, and if you listen without hostility, they may be telling you their perceptions, they may be telling you about their culture and community, and they can be indicating to you, even subtly, about what it is and who is pressuring them. . . . Build up a

communication of understandability. Everybody has different languages. (N. Hickey, personal communication, November 30, 1990)

Both participants were discussing communication in the process of leadership. Both focused on listening and hearing. The implications of their thoughts are far reaching when considering mutuality in the leadership relationship.

The designation of a follower was most often defined by her/his position in the hierarchy of the organization in a clearly delineated line of authority. The followers assume they are followers unless they are in a particular position. The participants described followers in several ways: team members, part of a flock, the troops, and the staff. The role of the follower was perceived to be that of respondent, a recipient of the vision and the instrument used to realize organizational goals and objectives. There were few references to an active follower, although they were consistently considered by the participants to be necessary to the leader. The followers' function is to be reactive to the leader's ideas.

Well, followers, in a good organization, are going to follow the leader. And followers have the duty, just like the leaders have a duty, and that is to be good followers, and to communicate their feelings, their needs, their knowledge, if you will, communicate that upward to the leaders, so that the leaders, then, can have the information and lead by having that information. Followers need to be dutiful, they need to respect their leader or leaders, they need to be loyal, they need to be part of the team, they need to be duty-bound to do the best for the organization under the leader, and not work outside the

leader's guideline, spectrum. (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990)

I asked some participants what followers had to do with leadership. Most replied that without followers there is no leadership. Again, position determined if one was a follower. Leaders and followers were perceived by most participants as very different. Leaders had leader-like qualities they used from situation to situation to situation, e.g. courage, intelligence, and a commanding presence. There were other thoughts, too.

I think in order to be a good visionary, a good leader, you have to be able to follow. Now when I say that, you are going to ask me how. My definition. I don't think it means following necessarily a specific individual. I think it means following what makes sense. Follow people's dreams and hopes. Generally perceive where people are and perceive where we have been and what is likely to be acceptable and accepted. (L. Williams, personal communication, November 15, 1990)

Very few persons perceived the follower making an active contribution to leadership. Williams dignifies the follower and sees her/him with the active responsibility to think, assess and choose. He also said that the leader must be able to follow before he/she can be a leader.

There is a mutuality and there is a clear understanding of whose problem it is. It is not their [follower's] problem for which we [the leaders] have a solution. It is our problem for which, collectively, you may have an outside chance of

having a little solution for a little while. . . . We begin that sharing kind of process and that kind of collective wisdom, the building of community and the sharing of that information. (G. Allison, personal communication, January 16, 1991)

Allison sees the mutuality in leadership, a sense of community rather than individualism.

A classic example of the top-down relationship in leadership is described succinctly in the following words: "He's a special guy, he sits on the pedestal, because he knows all, sees all, and he reinforces this" (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990).

The participants perceived leaders to be visionaries who must be willing to take risks. "You may be risking a job, you may be risking the friendship of others, you may be risking your life under some of the worst circumstances" (W. Hansell, personal communication, January 24, 1991). Some described the courageous leader in a way which was reminiscent of a hero of legendary proportions, e.g. Gandhi or Churchill. The leader's position was fixed, regardless of action or inaction, by the structure of the organization for as long as she/he occupied the "position of leadership." Most often the position of leader was limited to the person "on the top." Most of the participants assumed that the leader was either over others "on top of the hill" or "out in front of the pack," leading the way to a better place.

Examples of Leadership

I'm amazed at some of the things Mr. Hickey has done. I think of his relationships with the press, the editorial boards and the way the editorials [now] are all positive, supporting the county; whereas in the past, I think we never noticed what was going to happen in the paper until all of a sudden, we opened the newspaper and there was a big blast. We may have been doing a marvelous job but nobody paid any attention to it. Nobody followed through on it, so, as a consequence, when the news media unleashed criticism, when they wrote those articles [Schneider, (1984)], they were totally against the county. And it was that perception that they had, because there was no relationship, because there was no communication with them, because we didn't do anything to remove the erroneous perception that was there. (M. Lopez, personal communication, October 26, 1990)

I mean I experience [leadership] in Mr. Hickey all the time. Because he is so good at reaching all levels, in and out of the organization, bringing people together and almost invisible in the process, and before you know it, there's change and we're doing something we didn't do before. . . . Lari Sheehan [Deputy Chief Administrative Officer] brings about [leadership] by encouraging people to go back to the community, meet with the community, and meet with the community again. She provides endless opportunity for all the divergent viewpoints, no matter how long it takes. And people are not cut off or put down, or told "I'm sitting up here and I'm in a higher status than you, so your voice doesn't matter." (E. Chastain, personal communication,

October 25, 1990)

Jake Jacobson [Director, Department of Social Services] would be my example. I don't think "New Beginnings" would have gotten off the ground without Jake Jacobson. [He] is the catalyst that got this thing started and kept it moving. He is willing to take risks. My sense is, from where I sit, within his own institution he does not always receive the great support or favor of others and yet he had a sense of mission about this, that systemic change is necessary. By working together with all of these agencies we can make a difference in the lives of children or even families. He's been tenacious in his commitment to do everything possible to try to get people to work together and make it happen. (T. Payzant, personal communication, January 30, 1991)

I think the Chief Administrative Officer's commitment to county personnel, his willingness to meet with people. . . his compassion for others and the kind of determination to make both the United Way and County Employees' Charitable Organization (CECO) work and give people the feeling that by contributing to them you are contributing to the organization as well, the health of the organization. I think the health of the organization judges the effectiveness of leadership. (C. Lucas, personal communication, November 28, 1990)

I think leadership has been demonstrated by the board as a whole, they have agreed to focus on major issues that in the past were giving the county some tremendous negative reactions and marks from the press, the public, etc.

I think they have said: "We're going to deal with some pretty tough issues. We're going to have to do and say things that are not what everybody may want to hear, and we're going to deal with them." And they have. They agree and disagree, and their feelings show and everything else. But I think overall you can sense, in spite of what they may agree and disagree on, that these people are there with a super concern with what is going on in the county. (G. Rodriguez, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

Let me pick a good one. I think this may seem trivial, but I think its implication is much bigger, and that is when Norm [Hickey] brought in Bob Reverend Robert Kleinschmidt [a local Protestant minister], what it showed is (1) he [Hickey] had a vision, where he wanted to go; and (2) he was willing to step out of the county logic box and say, "We've got a big group out here that ought to be able to help us, namely the churches. They need to be partners with us, not necessarily followers, per se, but they need to partner up with us." And I think that took courage, because I do not think a lot of people shared initially what the power of that decision was and the leadership role in bringing together hundreds of churches. . . . He's been there when we needed him, and that has been extremely important. (J. Jacobsen, personal communication, November 17, 1990)

I've often felt there's an awful lot of Zen in what he [Norman Hickey] does and that people don't realize what is happening to them until it is too late. It sneaks up behind them and grabs them and then they understand, appreciate

why it's better than it was before. The process of making that happen is very different under Norm [Hickey] than it was under Cliff [Graves, former Chief Administrative Officer]. And again going back to the services, they were still being performed under both, the checks are getting paid to the welfare recipients, the animal control people are out picking up the dogs, and the sheriff is arresting people. Those kind of base-line services, they're going to be pretty standard more or less, as the bureaucracy is going to insist that they be accomplished. It is the nuances, the behavior, and the attitude that will change. There is tremendously more communication between departments, absolutely. . . . What Norm [Hickey] did was just come in from left field, if you will, just came in from a completely different spectrum, and one, I think, that for quite some time people couldn't quite figure out. It wasn't strong or directive, which they were used to. [People] felt that no leadership was being provided, that you didn't know what the CAO wanted them to do. The CAO wasn't leading the organization because we were used to this model here [county government of San Diego], and he had a model that people didn't have in their brain. They couldn't figure it out, couldn't understand it. (D. Janssen, personal communication, November, 1990)

I think the county can really claim for itself, in a very legitimate way, that there has been leadership on a number of major issues. [The county] is attempting to be a leader in some new areas that we have not been before. (G. Rodriguez, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

The participants from San Diego repeatedly used Hickey as an example of leadership. It is interesting to note that over and over again what they saw in him was often not how they saw the "generic" leader. Sometimes they attributed his leadership to position alone while more frequently they described his leadership as an influence relationship brought about through communication which elicits trust. Others referred to his ability to think in alternate ways and risk the criticism of others. There are some to this day who do not understand how he does what he does. His way of relating is disarming to the people who want the stereotypical leader with all the appearances of the "man at the top."

Leadership and Management

It's [management is] the accomplishment of goals through others. . .

But leadership to me, I guess, has a number of different elements. One, it has an awful lot to do with the person [who is the leader]. Forget about what it is that they want to do for a minute. The individuals themselves, their ability to generate in other people a willingness to work with them, and that goes to issues like integrity, honesty, valuing other people, communications, talking to people. I don't think you can be a successful leader without those kinds of qualities you can be charging, but that doesn't necessarily make you a leader. The second piece of that, then, is knowing where you want to go, and once you get people who are willing to go with you, then you're where you want to go. So I guess those are two elements of leadership. (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990)

Leadership is not management. To me leadership is the visionary, the person that sits back and knows where you're going and guides the ultimate result. Management is the person that leads the rest of the troops. . . .I think Mr. Hickey knows where he's going, and knows what he wants to accomplish, yes. I don't think that there's any leadership on the Board of Supervisors now. They are reacting. There is no long-term vision vis a vis the courthouse. . . . Maybe this is a period of reaction. But we don't seem to have any. Nobody seems to sit down and say, "Look, we've got to worry about 20 years from now." Nobody's looking. They're just trying to survive on a day-to-day basis. (Participant, personal communication, November, 1990)

I think that the thing that leadership is most often confused with is management. Managers have to deal with outcomes and bottom lines in a predictable manner. I think that when a manager is good, [he/she] is also a good leader, but the two things are not synonymous. . . . Leadership isn't being a manager. (W. Cox, personal communication, December, 1990)

Oh, I would never use the words interchangeably. Well, if you're a very good manager you may be a very good leader at different times for different things, but not necessarily a leader. I don't buy the notion that you can be a leader in everything at all times. (G. Rodriguez, personal communication, December 12, 1990)

Many times in the interviews, the participants used the words manager and leader interchangeably. A good manager was often considered to be a good leader.

The reverse was not true. The leader did not have to be a manager, although the participants usually wanted the leader to be aware of what it was to be a manager. The leader seemed to have a higher position than the manager and a greater prestige. While some participants indicated a clear distinction between management and leadership, others said that a good manager had "leadership skills."

Researcher's Definition of The Nature of Leadership

My definition of leadership is: Leadership is a dialectical, influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes which reflect their mutual and evolving purposes. I base my definition on Rost's. The initial credit belongs to him and his scholarship. After years of study, experience and increasing wonderment about this often-used word, I read his definition in the summer of 1990 in a copy of the prepublication manuscript: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (1991, p. 102).

Rost succinctly stated that there are four elements which are essential to the leadership relationship. If all are not present, according to Rost, the relationship is something other than leadership. The four elements are listed below:

1. The relationship is based on influence.
2. Leaders and followers are the people in this relationship.
3. Leaders and followers intend real changes.
4. Leaders and followers develop mutual purposes. (1991, p. 104)

When I read Rost's definition for the first time I was delighted. It was thought

provoking. I reflected on the definition and my own experiences in the past, and based on that analysis, I decided that, for me, it was necessary to extend two of the elements of his definition to include the concepts of "dialectical" and "evolving." I know the relationship among leaders and followers as a dialectical one as well as one of influences. I also know that the real changes which the leaders and followers intend reflect evolving as well as mutual purposes.

I suggest that the definition states a concept which for years has eluded clear, meaningful phraseology to the practitioner. Leadership has been written about extensively, sometimes very beautifully in descriptive prose, but when the definition is analyzed, the definition sidesteps the central issue, the nature of leadership. The descriptions focus, instead, on characteristics of leadership, not unlike the trait theory described in Chapter Two. There are other descriptions which are not thoughtfully written, rather they are quick fixes for the harried manager. The formula for generic excellence is often Xeroxed, presented and forgotten in minutes.

In its simplicity I saw Rost's definition as hopeful, believable and teachable. It was what I had been looking for in my leadership studies. It gave me hope because it was a definition of leadership which looked toward the future. It allows people to go beyond the limits imposed by the industrial paradigm, to an approach that embraces the complexity of the future in that the problems are yet unfathomable, the questions not formulated, and the answers unknown. The freedom comes from the inclusion of diversity. Wisdom does not reside in one person but in many as they actively participate. No influence is discounted. Leaders sometimes are followers and

followers are sometime leaders. There are no fixed positions. It is only with inclusion, not hampered by a rigid construct, that the future can be enlightened by all the possibilities that are imaginable.

When thinking about the nature of leadership and what I had experienced in the past months, I perused through some of my favorite books. I came across a quotation which adds to the understanding of the nature of leadership in a multifarious political context. There are people working within county government who perceive a rational order that predetermines the one right way to do things. Then there are the others who step outside the expected in order to fill the environment with new ways of understanding.

Success in life depends on amplitude of possibilities. Every blow we receive must serve as another impulse towards, new attempts. My reader will forgive me. I never conceive of this idea without its bringing back to memory the triumphant scene which the circus clowns of my childhood used to perform. A clown would stroll in with its livid, floured face, seat himself on the railing, and produce from his bulky pocket a flute which he began to play, the ringmaster appeared and intimated to him that here one could not play. The clown, unperturbed, stalked over to another place and started again. But now the ringmaster walked up angrily and snatched his melodious toy from him. The clown remained unshaken in face of such misfortune. He waited till the ringmaster was gone, and plunging his hand into his fathomless pocket produced another flute and from it another melody. But alas, inexorably, here

came the ringmaster again, and again despoiled him of his flute. Now the clown's pocket turned into an inexhaustible magic box from which proceeded, one after another, new musical instruments of all kinds, clear and gay or sweet and melancholy. The music overruled the veto of destiny and filled the entire space, imparting to all of us its impetuous, invincible bounty of feeling of exultation, as though a torrent of strange energies had sprung from the dauntless melody the clown blew on his flute as he sat on the railing of the circus. . . . Let us say without further ado, then, that life is an affair of flutes. It is overflow that it needs most. He [/She] who rests content with barely meeting necessity as it arises will be washed away. Life has triumphed on this planet because it has, instead of clinging to necessities, deluged it with overwhelming possibilities, so that the failure of one may serve as a bridge for the victory of another. . . . Poor life, that lacks the elasticity to dart off in prancing enterprises! Sad life, that lets the hours pass in lassitude, the hours which should flash like quivering foils. (Ortega y Gasset, 1941, pp. 20-21)

Too often the ringmaster disavows the sound of the flute and the right of the clown to play. The ringmaster looks to traditional dogma, what has always been, to inform the present. He embraces a system which restricts and prevents freedom. The clown plays again only to have his flute taken away by the angry ringmaster, but then our clown reaches deep within and brings forth a variety of ways to create various melodious sounds. The music "overruled the veto of destiny and filled the entire space" (Ortega y Gasset, 1941, p. 20). If the clown had been daunted by the

ringmaster, there would be no melody, no changes.

The effort to intend real changes denies the right of destiny to control thinking, but rather gives the option of choice to all involved. With a silent and passive clown, traditional order would have been restored by the ringmaster, a closed and unforgiving system. So it is, I suggest, with the leadership thoughts prevalent today. Possibilities are thwarted and the unknown cast out because of a need in an industrial society to think in terms of cause-and-effect outcome, easily quantified to determine cost benefit. Many decision makers are only comfortable with predictability. They do not delight in the clown who has seemingly endless ways to create newness, when he/she, like the ringmaster, has nothing but the need to keep a familiar sense of order. Mutuality is a threat to the accumulation of power based on control.

For many, it is necessary for the leader to know what lies at the end of the journey before it ever begins. Many scholars and practitioners refer to the journey's end as vision. The desired state is known by the person who is perceived as the leader. It is this way of perceiving leadership which assures measurable outcomes. Leadership can be determined as effective, excellent, or failed depending on whether the "charge up the hill" ended in the right place. This gives a familiar flavor to the process. There is the right way and the wrong way.

The future of society is threatened to be without music if this way of thinking persists. There are no simple answers. In the leadership relation of the future, there is no room for the passive participants who look to the single actor for guidance. There is also no place for the person, with or without position, who thinks he/she will

know enough to guide alone. The guidance cannot rest in a single actor who has the one right answer. Guidance will reside rather in the evolving purposes which reflect the mutuality among the leaders and followers. It will not be passed down to willing receptors but rather have the properties of holism.

Rost's definition gives a way for persons to understand and do leadership while not being bound to a particular context, position, content, or trait. One would be free to teach this definition because it can address the heretofore self-generating problems that face society today and in the next century. Rost's definition is thoroughly discussed in his 1991 text titled Leadership for the Twenty-First Century.

My definition had to be clearly stated and easily understood. As an educator and a learner, such a definition seemed essential to me. If one cannot readily explain and remember one's definition, how can it be taught? This definition can be simply explained.

Leadership is a relationship among people who are doing leadership. The relationship is brought about and fostered through influence and the dialectical process of communication. Influence implies activity while it implies freedom. Influence is created and felt by all involved. There is no passive partner in this relationship. There is the freedom to influence or the freedom not to influence. If one chooses not to influence, one may then choose not to be in the leadership relationship. Coercion is the antithesis of mutuality. In its place there is the freedom to choose whether to be influenced or not be influenced. One is free to leave the relationship. It is not bound to authority. Authority by its nature would change the nature of the interchange. The

relationship itself involves choice. The relationship maintains and grows only through influence and dialogue. People in the relationship have the freedom to choose to influence and the freedom to decide whether to be or not to be in the relationship. This definition is not based on positional roles. It is not linear, e.g. top-down, but rather multidirectional, dynamic, and poly-ocular.

The relationship is a dialectical one. It is a reflective dialogue exchanging thoughts, feelings, and questions among equals. It is an exchange, not a one-sided granting of wisdom or vision. The wisdom and vision belong to the relationship. They evolve out of the composition of dialogues. They do not precede them. The vision of one individual does not control the dialogue. It may influence but only if it is freely accepted by the others, and even then it will probably be changed. The dialogue establishes equanimity and respect for all sides. Dialogue is not limited to two persons. On the contrary, a dialectical relationship is a composition of all the persons who choose to intend real changes which reflect their mutual and evolving purposes.

It is difficult in this definition to distinguish between leaders and followers. For the lack of a better explanation I can say that the leaders at some point in time are the first among equals. Followers are actively engaged in the leadership relationship. For the time they are followers, they freely exchange influence with the leaders in a way that will help realize the mutual and evolving purposes. Within the relationship one can be a leader and follower at different times. Leadership can be known in the present. If persons intend changes which reflect mutual and evolving purposes in a

free relationship based on influence and participatory interchange, leadership is happening. It was not defined by outcomes.

I was able, as a participant researcher, to take my definition and go into the field. I observed, listened, and engaged more than 60 people in dialogue. I asked over and over again the same two questions in many different ways. "How do intended changes occur?" and "What is the nature of leadership?" I wanted to learn from the participants as well as stimulate them to think about the need to define this concept which is so lightly bantered about and yet admittedly important to contemplate with clarity, if we are to address societal purposes in the next century.

Implications

What implications can be drawn about the nature of leadership while studying the process of intended changes in a multifarious political context? There were two fundamental implications drawn from this study. The first was that the participants in an intended change process, who work within a political context, have high expectations of leadership and the leader. They look to leadership as an answer to present and future problems. The second is that while the participants look to leadership they do not have a working definition of the concept. They want to do leadership but for various reasons feel that they cannot do so because of their positional roles in the institution. They are not active participants. The action is seen to be limited to a few positions at the top of the hierarchy. Most of the people described their involvement in the change process and leadership as one of a spectator on the periphery not an active participant.

The participants intermingled change and leadership throughout their discussions. Change and leadership were not seen as separate entities by most. "In my opinion, change is inevitable. Change is something that is constantly in process, and the degree of change in any situation depends upon the effectiveness of leadership and the concerns of those people affected" (J. Dullea, personal communication, January, 1991). The participants in the study attributed realized change to good leadership. If change did not go as planned, the blame for this failure was placed on the leader who somehow did not do his/her job. Most participants equated change with output and/or results. They expressed the opinion that change depended on leadership and leadership did not exist without measurable change or outcome. "It is incumbent upon active leadership then to trigger a method or approach to producing results" (J. Dullea, personal communication, January, 1991).

In most cases the leader was seen as a single actor surrounded by loyal people who saw to it that the leader's wishes were realized. Little mention was made of the leaders' responsibility to the followers other than to make them feel apart of the plan. The followers' responsibility was to the leaders in the relationship. Followers reacted. They did not initiate. Leadership was portrayed as a way to control outcomes. The importance of the followers to feel a part of the process was referred to by several participants. At the same time they do not have a commonly understood idea of what the nature of leadership is nor what leaders and followers actually do when they do leadership. The participants in the study equated leadership with intended change and attributed great importance to it.

During the study, leadership was described in many different ways.

Participants often began the discussion of leadership with several definite ideas about leadership only to question their original thoughts by the end of the interview. They wanted to have more time to think about the subject. Several mentioned that they felt a responsibility for both professional and intellectual reasons to do so. Others knew how they viewed the concept of leadership and assumed their perception was the generally accepted one. Other participants felt that there were as many definitions as there were people and did not see the importance of deciding on a common definition.

Most often people wanted to discuss the leader rather than leadership per se. There were participants who acknowledged the need for multiple actors to realize results, however, "in terms of the driving force, yes, you've got to have one leader. The whole thing wouldn't get going without him or her. . . . I think there are a lot of collisions. I think it's best left, by and large, for them [the individual leaders] to do their thing within what's set down, and occasional sort of meetings" (R. Tranter, personal communication, January, 1991). Later in the same interview Tranter described Churchill as a leader. The metaphor used to describe Churchill was "the journey. . . his ability to embody the journey, if you like, that the nation had to make the process" (R. Tranter, personal communication, January , 1991).

People perceived leadership in different ways, influenced by their own experiences and background assumptions. Vocabulary differed, examples varied, but there was evidence of some shared meanings. There were commonalities among the participants which were articulated through repeated references to certain concepts.

The participants suggested the presence of leadership depends on certain pre- or co-conditions. The same descriptors for these conditions were often heard in the interviews. According to most participants the aspects which allowed for or affected leadership were the following: vision, results, position, personality, communication, persuasion, risk-taking, trust, and focus on the future. Some discussions emphasized one of these over another, but with few exceptions the participants incorporated one or more in their perception of leadership.

A discrepancy existed among the participants about what leadership is. There is no agreement among the practitioners to the following questions: How does leadership occur? How is it recognized? How do you know it is occurring? What does a leader do? What does a follower do? Ensuing questions arise from this dilemma. If there is no agreement among practitioners involved in the process of intended change on what the nature of leadership is, how can leadership be taught? Pursuant to this question, there is another consideration. How can the practitioner learn to be an active participant in leadership, a process that she/he does not understand clearly? Is it feasible for the practitioner to act without a generally agreed upon working definition of leadership, a definition which is not bound to a particular context or content, but rather one that serves as a definitive statement which clarifies the way to meeting the challenges of the future?

Limitations of the Study

Two limitations of this study as it was designed and executed come to mind.

1. This study is limited not by spirit but by practicality to an elite group of

participants. The fact that there was one researcher and a limited time span of 17 months, a choice had to be made. The selection of participants was limited to a group of participants who served in what are generally considered to be key positions within the hierarchy of county government or community organizations. These persons were chosen because they would have a familiarity with the process by virtue of their positions. That was a valid reason to choose them to participate. However, by doing so the study was limited to the responses of 62 participants who are predominately white males between the ages of 40 and 60.

I think, for this reason, the study lacks a richness available from a greater diversity and heterogeneity among the participants. The perceptions of a more inclusive group may have shed valuable insight on the study of the process of intended changes which could not surface with the selection of key decision makers in 1990/91.

If the researcher had interviewed deeper within the institution and other community organizations, the study would have had access to the perceptions of persons of various ages, the disabled, and a proportionate number of women, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Latin-Americans reflected in the county workforce and community of San Diego. The study would reflect balance brought about by inclusion.

This is a weakness in the study which I acknowledge. It offers an exciting challenge for future research. I suggest an appropriate solution would be to have a longitudinal, collaborative process among researchers and participants who share a basic commitment to the intrinsic value of discovery through dialogue and analysis of

perception. It would add significant insight into the process of intended changes within a multifarious political context and the implications such a process has on the understanding of the nature of leadership.

2. This study is a motion picture with a basic story line of a dynamic process which consists of quotations which are cut and pasted into a plot which was interpreted and analyzed. It is a description with a beginning, middle and no clear-cut finish. The dynamic process is still occurring and has not ended. Many of the intended changes have not been realized as yet. They still need to be translated to the greater part of the institution. Those who felt alienated from the initial process need to be brought into the relationship if the changes are to be institutionalized and not abandoned when a new administration or board replaces the present actors (1991). The document by necessity had to cut off the description of changes at a given point in time, but, by doing so, the researcher in no way implies that the story is complete. The process goes on as the intended changes which have been articulated and realized, re-evaluated, and undergo changes in and of themselves.

Conclusion

The purposes of this study have been to study the process of intended changes in the county government of San Diego from 1983-1991 and demonstrate how by studying such a process, insights could be gained regarding change and the nature of leadership relevant to the study and practice of public administration in a regional government in the United States. This research occurred within the context of a public institution which encouraged a discovery of meanings and an honest

examination of a complex process. The qualitative case study included a 17 month field research of the fourth largest county in the United States. The study included the compilation of a limited chronological history of the process, a study of shared meanings extrapolated from the data compiled through the use of observation and dialogue, and a review of the literature focused on leadership, change and leadership and change in public administration of county government.

The history began with the election of Supervisor Williams in November, 1982, and concluded in spring of 1991. The history included the February 1, 1991, planning meeting of the extended Executive Team which brought to fruition one of the intended changes: the writing of county administrative goals, through a collaborative effort among the key participants of the County of San Diego administration. These ideas were considered by the Executive Staff, and on April 23, 1991, the result of this collaborative effort, in the form of a letter to the Board, was submitted by the Executive Staff to the Board of Supervisors for review and acceptance. (See Appendix D)

Through this study the researcher found that there was a deliberate plan between 1986-1991 to design change. When he became the Chief Administrative Officer in February, 1986, Hickey immediately began to work externally with the news media and the public to change perceptions and create a sense of community. The internal plan, spearheaded by Hickey and Doshier, was further developed through the interaction of a small group of individuals later to be known as the Executive Staff. This group worked closely over a five-year period under Janssen, with Doshier

as a special consultant, to design the change and plan a way to institutionalize it. The plan called for internal structural and attitudinal changes.

The changes perceived in 1990/91 most often described by the participants include the following: (1) The county was perceived in a more positive light by the news media. (2) The county is no longer considered to be a county in chaos but rather one that is in control. (3) The county government has formed a closer bond with the community it serves by initiating interactions; for example, with the military, the United Way, community-based service organizations, the clergy, and the educational community. (4) The relationship between the Board of Supervisors and the executive team was described by the participants as markedly improved.

Changes that did not occur according to the participants: (1) The budget process was not perceptively different. (2) Certain structural changes did not occur in the way they were originally planned. According to representative participants there were functional groupings that occurred at one time but had been somehow altered or omitted without explanation, e.g. Administrative Councils, Deputy Chief Administrative Officers original assignments. It was related that changes were determined by personal preferences rather than functional purposes.

The most discussed changes were those related to the culture, e.g. the planned approach, interactive/proactive, future-oriented, systems-based design and collaboration. Although the participants were aware of these intended changes they did not agree on whether they were as yet institutionalized but rather simply temporary and primarily due to the personality of the chief administrative officer.

Participants often questioned whether these changes would endure in the institution if there were to be a different administration and/or Board that exhibited different styles of behavior. The change in culture was most often tied to Hickey's personality and his ability to relate rather than a substantive change in the culture.

The recurring question was brought up that if there was a change in the individual or the various Board members could the change survive, or would the institution slip back into the old culture which was dominated by the personal power model in an atmosphere of isolated departmental planning and decision making?

With these findings in mind the researcher concluded that for the institution to realize the desired cultural change to maintain the change of attitude that would last and not be subject to the change in personalities, there needs to be a working definition of the nature of leadership, a definition which includes the active participation and understanding of the wide spectrum of people that exists within the county government. If leadership were understood as an influence relationship of inclusion, I suggest the county would grow beyond the dependency of a single source and its collaborative creative culture, which actively reflects the leaders' and followers' purposes, would be substantively changed. The institutional culture would override any personality changes and the county's people could confidently face the challenges of the next decades knowing that control emanates from a mutual relationship rather than a mandate.

The definition I propose for consideration to the field of public administration is the following: Leadership is a dialectical, influence relationship among leaders and

followers who intend real changes which reflect their mutual and evolving purposes.

This definition would enlighten the participants who are active in the complex processes of intended changes as the changes are designed, articulated, and realized. The definition would serve as a guide to public administrators who work among people within an institution who are calling for substantive changes. I suggest that this definition could open up a way to meet the demands of the present and the future. The day of the single actor with innate solutions is gone. This is demonstrated by the diversity in our communities and society today. No one person can have the one right answer for all the persons with diverse purposes in an organization or society.

If public administrators approached changes through leadership, and the changes reflect the mutual and evolving purposes of the persons active in the relationship, implementation of substantive changes within complex institutions would be realized in a timely manner. Substantive changes can occur. Cultures would not be imposed, they would evolve and be a part of the whole relationship.

With this definition leadership can be viewed in the present; it would not be dependent on the quantitative measures of success. The limits of creativity would not be hampered by the encapsulation of thought. If the changes are allowed to evolve, they can benefit from re-evaluation and growth from new understandings which result from interaction. The temptation for the few to decide for the rest would be set aside. The few would benefit by the mutuality of inclusion. New questions could be asked. The leaders and followers would be responsible, active participants in a relationship that has a greater purpose than a singular vision; it would celebrate differences of

thought because it is through the composition of the whole that the narrative can have meaning for all.

Leadership is a dynamic relationship between leaders and followers in which they explore each other's meanings and purposes. It is, however, a greater and a simpler one than I had imagined before this study. Each day as I am learning, I see it more as a conscious evolving into an unending active participation. It cannot recognize elitism or privatization. By existing, we affect all other existence and in turn it affects us. The nature of leadership must be understood as a relationship that is entered in freely. It is a way for an institution to realize substantive change. It is then that the leadership relationship can guide people of society in a creative dance choreographed with appreciation and respect for the whole.

References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1982). Problems of changing white males' behavior and beliefs concerning race relations. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds.) Change in organizations (pp. 122-166). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Argyris, C. (1982). How learning and reasoning processes In P. Goodman & Associates (Eds.), Change in organizations (pp. 47-87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Bates, R. J. (1984). Toward the critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 260-274). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bollens, J. C. (1969). American county government. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Typton, S. M. (1985) Habits of the heart. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W. G. (1966). Changing organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berkeley, G. E. (1975). The craft of public administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berry, T. (1988). The dream of the earth. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Breed, W. (1971). The self-guiding society. New York: Free Press.
- Brydolf, L. (1985, December 3). Hickey hired to head county. San Diego

Transcript, pp. 1A, 2A.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

CAO Academic Team, (1986) [CAO academic team institutional design]. Unpublished document, County of San Diego.

Cape, W. H., (1967). The emerging patterns of county executives. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Governmental Research Center.

Carrier, L., & Turegano, P. (1985, December 2). County picks chief executive. San Diego Tribune, pp. A-1, A12.

Chief Administrative Officer. (1989, August). CAO administrative manual. Unpublished manuscript, County of San Diego.

Chief Administrative Officer. (1990, February). CAO administrative manual. Unpublished manuscript, County of San Diego.

Childs, R. S. (1925). Ramshackle county government: the plague spot of American politics. New York: National Municipal League.

Churchman, C. W. (1971). The design of inquiring systems. New York: Basic Books.

Cohen, M. D. & March, J.G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw-Hill.

County Counsel. (1984) [Law relating to counties]. Unpublished document, San Diego County.

de Tocqueville, A. (1956). Democracy in America. New York: Mentor Books.

Dror, Y. (1971). Design for policy sciences. New York: American Elsevier.

Fayol, H. (1919). General and industrial management (C. Stours, Trans.) London: Pitman. (Original work published 1919)

Fiedler, E. F. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Foster, W. F. (1986a). Paradigms and promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Foster, W. F. (1986b). Reconstruction of leadership. Victoria, Australia: Deaken University Press.
- Foster, W. F. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 39-62) New York: Falmer Press.
- Gilbertson, H. S. (1917). The county: The "dark continent" of American politics. New York: National Short Ballot Organization.
- Giles, W. A., Gabris, G. T., Krane, D. A. (1980). Dynamics in rural policy development: The uniqueness of county government. Public Administration Review, 40(1), 24-28.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership Frontiers. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Grob, L. (1984). Leadership: The socratic model. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives (pp. 263-280). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Havelock, R. G. (1973). The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1972). Management of organizational behavior (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holmblad, H. H. (1985, December 6). County's new chief says he's ready. Times-Advocate. pp. B-1, B-2.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- Hunt, J. G. (1984). Leadership and managerial behavior. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

- Hunt, S. M. (1984). The role of leadership in the construction of reality. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 157-178). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Issues Task Force. (1985). [General conclusions]. Unpublished raw data, County of San Diego.
- Kellerman, B. (Ed.). (1986). Political leadership: A source book. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Kellerman, B. (Ed.). (1984). Leadership multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). The leadership challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kraft, R. W. (1975). Retracking America: A theory of transactive planning. New York: Basic Books.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawler, E. E. (1982). Increasing workers' involvement to enhance organizational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman and associates (Eds.), Change in organizations (pp. 280-316). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, A. M., Mohrman, 1 A., Ledford, G. E., Cummings, T. G. and Associates. (1985). Doing research that is useful for theory and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leshan, L., & Margenau, H. (1982). Einstein's space and Van Gogh's sky: Physical reality and beyond. New York: Macmillan.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row.
- Luke, J. S., & Carden, G. E. (1989). Coping with global interdependence. In J. L. Perry (Ed.), Handbook of public administration (pp. 83-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lundberg, C. C. (1985). Response and commentary. In E. E. Lawler, A. M. Mohrman, S. A. Mohrman, G. E. Ledford, T. G. Cummings & Associates, Doing research that is useful for theory and practice (pp. 60-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- MacIntyre, A. (1984). After virtue. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marando, V., & Thomas, R. (1977). The forgotten governments. Gainesville: University Presses of Florida.
- Menzel, D. C. (1991, March). Setting a research agenda for the study of the American county. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society of Public Administrators, Washington, DC
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. (1984). A comprehensive description of managerial work. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), Contemporary issues in leadership (pp. 78-85). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mitchell, T. R., & Scott, W. G. (1989). Leadership failures, the distrusting public and the prospects of the administrative state. Public Administration Review, 47(6), 445-453.
- Morgan, G. (1988). Riding the waves of change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, N. (1985, December 4). Leading county out of chaos. San Diego Tribune, p. A-10.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1941). History as a system and other essays toward a philosophy of history (H. Weyl, Trans.). London: W. W. Norton. (Original work published in 1940)
- Ott, J. S. (1989). The organizational culture perspective. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks Cole Publishing.
- Peacock, J. L. (1986). The anthropological lens: Harsh light, soft focus. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Perry, J. L. (Ed.). (1989). Handbook of public administration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1985). Contextualist research: A natural way to link theory and practice. In E. E. Lawler, A. M. Mohrman, S. A. Mohrman, G. E. Ledford,

- T. G. Cummings and Associates, Doing research that is useful for theory and practice (pp. 222-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Porter, K. H. (1922). County and township government in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Putman, L. (1982). Paradigm for organization communication research: an overview and synthesis. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 192-206.
- [Recommendations: Issue Task Force]. Unpublished document. County of San Diego.
- Rost, J. C. (1985a, October). Distinguishing leadership and management: A new consensus. Paper delivered at the annual conference of the Organizational Development Network, San Francisco
- Rost, J. C. (1985b). Generative leadership (an outline).
- Rost, J. C. (1985c, November). Transforming leadership: Shaping the school culture for educational excellence. Paper presented at the California Principals Conference, Anaheim, CA.
- Rost, J. C. (1986a). Leadership theory of policy making. Unpublished manuscript. University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Rost, J. C. (1986b). The political model. Unpublished manuscript. University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Rost, J. C. (1989a, July). Leadership and ethics in the 1990s. Paper presented at the meeting of the World Future Society, Washington, DC
- Rost, J. C. (1989b). The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era. Unpublished document. University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, M., & Park, K. O. (1989). Metropolitan counties as service delivery agents: The still forgotten governments. Public Administration Review, 49(4), 345-352.

- Schneider, R. (1984, February 27). County in chaos: Board sits at center of storm. San Diego Tribune, pp. A1, A6, A7.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Doubleday.
- Smircich, L. (1985). Is the concept of culture a paradigm for understanding organizations and ourselves? In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), Organizational culture (pp. 55-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, K. (1982). Philosophical problems in thinking about organizational change. In P. S. Goodman and Associates (Eds.), Change in organizations (pp. 316-374). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Staw, B. M. (1982). Counterforces to change. In Paul S. Goodman and Associates (Eds.), Change in organizations (pp. 87-122). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.
- Sullivan, W. M. (1986). Reconstructing public philosophy. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.
- Tushman, M. L., Newman, W. H., & Romanelli, E. (1986). Convergence and upheaval: Managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution. California Management Review, 29(1), 29-44.
- Ventriss, C. (1987). Two critical issues of American public administration, reflections of a sympathetic participant. Administration and Society, 19(1), 25-47.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, T. (1973). Leadership and decision making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Walbert, C. (1984, August 9). Voters will decide charter issue. San Diego Tribune, p. 1.
- Warren, G. L. (1984, April 24). Time for change. San Diego Union, p. B-6.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organizations (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

- Weick, K. E. (1976). Enactment processes in organizations. In B. M. Staw & G. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior (pp. 267-300). Chicago: St. Clair Press.
- Weintraub, D. M. (1985, December 3). A "squeaky clean" Florida man new county chief. Los Angeles Times, pp. 1, 5.
- Williams, W. (1987). Policy leadership for organizational competence: Britain and the United States. Parliamentary Affairs, A Journal of Comparative Politics, 40(2), 188-202.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

University of San Diego
School of Education
Consent Form

Sheila Quinlan Williams, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of San Diego, is conducting a study of leadership and the change process in the government of the County of San Diego from 1983 to the present. The intent of this research is to gain insight into the nature of leadership and the change process in the San Diego County government during this time frame. This understanding could benefit the County government of San Diego and enable it to better serve the community and the persons who work within the institution. This research also answers a need in the field of public administration to better understand leadership and the change process. If you agree, you are asked to take part in an interview at this time with Sheila Quinlan Williams about this subject. The interview will not exceed one hour.

Your name and this consent form will be attached to your responses from the interview. This interview will be taped and later transcribed for the purposes of study. You may request a copy of the transcription. No person other than Sheila Quinlan Williams and yourself will read the transcript of the interview. You may clarify any statement in the transcript. Any portion of the interview that you wish to have deleted will be deleted from the transcript. After the tapes have been transcribed, they will be erased. Any portion of the written transcript that you wish to delete will be removed from the written text and immediately destroyed. The product of the research will be public property and available to the public. The research, after acceptance by the University of San Diego, will be housed in the Government Research Library at the County Administration Center.

Little risk or discomfort is expected as a result of participating in the study. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. There is no agreement, written or verbal, beyond that which is expressed in this consent form. You may refuse to participate or may withdraw from the study at any time without risk or penalty. Please ask any questions you may have at any time during your participation.

You may contact Sheila Williams at the County Administration Center (619-531-5250) or at home (619-573-0411) if you have any further questions.

I, the undersigned, understand the above information and agree to participate in this interview. I understand that this interview is on the record and that the information gained from the interview is on the record and that the information gained from the interview will be used in the writing of the study.

Signature of the Participant date:-----
location

Signature of the Researcher date:-----

Signature of the Witness date:-----

Done at -----, -----
City State
10/15/90

APPENDIX B

Appendix B
University of San Diego
School of Education
Consent Form

Norman W. Hickey
Chief Administrative Officer
County of San Diego

The following will serve as an agreement for the protection of the rights and welfare of Norman W. Hickey as the principle subject of a dissertation research project by Sheila Quinlan Williams:

1. The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the nature of leadership and the change process in the government of the County of San Diego from 1983 to the present. A major focus of the study will be Norman W. Hickey, Chief Administrative Officer of the County of San Diego.

2. The method of the research will be a qualitative case study which will be a descriptive and exploratory study of intended institutional changes. Instrumentation will include interviewing, observing, reviewing available documents and records, informal interaction, participation in selected institutional activities, and interpreting unobtrusive measures. Interviews will be held with members of the County Board of Supervisors, the executive staff and team, County Commissions, Employees serving in line functions, and community stakeholders including members of the news media, military, clergy, private business, civic organizations, and officials of local government other than the County. The interviews will take place after Mr. Hickey and the researcher have discussed the list of participants, the participant understands the purpose of the research, and an individual consent form has been read and signed. Observations and other methods of gathering data used in this study will take place on County premises and during outreach activities having to do with the County. The researcher will be accompanying Mr. Hickey to various internal and external activities which could add data to the project. Requests for additional periods of data gathering will be made to Mr. Hickey as required.

3. All requests for attendance and observations at county-wide activities and meetings will be made to the Chairperson of that activity or meeting and approved by Mr. Hickey. All participants at these meetings will be informed of the nature and subject of the study.

4. The participation of Norman W. Hickey in this study is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time.

5. Mr. Hickey has had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the procedures of this study and answers have been provided.

6. The duration of the participation by Mr. Hickey in this study will be from January, 1990 through May, 1991.

7. There is no agreement between Hickey and Williams, either written or oral, beyond that expressed in this consent form.

8. The data collected from the study concerning Hickey will not be confidential unless expressly requested by Hickey when he reviews the data. In that case, the material he chooses to delete will be destroyed by the researcher.

9. Mr. Hickey is aware of the potential for negative findings to occur and be reported as data.

10. The process and the product of the research, embodied in the doctoral dissertation, will be public property. The research, after acceptance by the University of San Diego, will be housed in the Government Research Library at the County Administration Center.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

Norman W. Hickey, subject

date: OCT 12th 1990

Sheila Quinlan Williams, researcher

date: Oct. 1, 1990

Signature of witness

date: Oct 1, 1990

Done at San Diego, CA
city state

APPENDIX C

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

Appendix C, 262-274

University Microfilms International

APPENDIX D

COUNTY ORGANIZATION CHART

1107891

APPENDIX E

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Subject: Chief Administrative Officer Administrative Plan	Item Number	Page Number
Effective Date: August 1989	0010-6	1 of 8

Purpose

To establish the structure, process and principles guiding the overall administration of the County.

Background

This administrative policy is to provide an understanding to County staff of the authorities and responsibilities of County officials, a profile of County executives and the goal structure for County government.

Policy

A. AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

As authorized by general law and County Charter, the Board of Supervisors is the elected governing and policy body for San Diego County. The Board adopts the County budget and provides for the overall delivery of County services and programs through the appointment of County officers and the enactment of Board policies, Regulatory Ordinances and Administrative Code.

2. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (CAO)

As authorized by the County Charter and directed by the Board of Supervisors, the Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for the effective and efficient administration of County government. The CAO provides policy-based support to the deliberations of the Board of Supervisors and provides the administrative framework and mechanisms to guide the activities of individual departments in the achievement of County goals. The CAO is responsible for managing the allocation of County personnel, capital and budgetary resources to the maximum advantage of the organization. CAO directives are effected through administrative policies (Administrative Manual) and functions of the Executive Staff.

3. ASSISTANT CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (ACAO)

As the principal subordinate of the Chief Administrative Officer, the ACAO shares the CAO's authority in the administration of County government. The ACAO heads the CAO's Executive Staff and represents the CAO on the Administrative Councils.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Subject: Chief Administrative Officer	Item	Page
Administrative Plan	Number	Number
Effective Date: August 1989	0010-6	2 of 8

4. DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS (DCAOs)

The DCAOs are responsible for carrying out the policies and procedures of the Board of Supervisors and CAO with their respective County departments and offices. They oversee daily County operations, including budgetary and personnel matters and service delivery. DCAOs review departmental goal development, monitor goal attainment and conduct executive performance evaluations.

5. CAO's EXECUTIVE STAFF

The CAO's Executive Staff is comprised of the ACAO and the DCAOs. The Executive Staff plans and designs the administrative systems, structures and standards for the operation of County government. It formulates and recommends administrative and public policy to the CAO and implements the goal establishment process for the organization.

6. DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS, ELECTED COUNTY OFFICIALS, COURT ADMINISTRATORS

Department Directors are responsible for the administration of County services and programs under their direction in accordance with general law, the County Charter, Federal and State regulations and the policies of the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer. They ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the services under their authority. Department Directors participate on Administrative Councils and issue-specific task forces and working groups, to advise on public and administrative policy and ensure a systems approach to planning, service delivery and problem solving.

These some responsibilities pertain to Elected County Officials and Court Administrators, in their roles as managers of County resources.

7. EXECUTIVE TEAM

The Chief Administrative Officer, the CAO's Executive Staff and the Department Directors constitute the County's Executive Team. The CAO invites the full participation of Elected County Officials and Court Administrators on this Team.

The Executive Team is the leadership unit of County government. Team members have a shared responsibility for the exemplary administration of San Diego County government and the attainment of County goals.

Executive Team members carry out their administrative and leadership responsibilities in accordance with the Executive Profile established by the Chief Administrative Officer, as attached and made a part of this plan.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Subject: Chief Administrative Officer	Item	Page
Administrative Plan	Number	Number
Effective Date: August 1989	0010-6	3 of 8

8. ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCILS

The Administrative Councils provide a mechanism for systems-based, future-oriented thinking for San Diego County government. The Administrative Councils design strategies and implementation plans to address major issues facing County government. The CAO directs issues to be considered by the Administrative Councils based on organizational goals and priorities. Issues are also recommended by the Administrative Council members.

The Administrative Councils' deliberations are enhanced by the inclusion of Elected Officials and Court Administrators, and the CAO invites their full participation on the Councils.

B. EXECUTIVE PROFILE

To successfully fulfill these responsibilities requires dedicated County executives. Taken collectively, the following statements create a profile of the type of behavior that will be required at all times of all executives in order to achieve the CAO's mission. These behaviors are expected of all executives and executive support personnel in the daily conduct of the business of the County of San Diego.

- o The executive is fully committed to a representative political and governmental process; s/he respects those persons holding political office at all times and in all public statements.
- o The executive understands and carries out the mission of the CAO as expressed in the CAO's mission statement and administrative policies. S/he actively participates in and contributes to the success of the Executive Team as the leadership unit of the organization.
- o The executive fully complies with County policies and procedures and assures departmental and program staff compliance at all times.
- o The executive is responsible for managing departmental resources efficiently and effectively, within approved appropriations and guidelines, and in consultation with other responsible executives potentially impacted by the resource decisions of the executive.
- o The executive fully supports and is actively involved in taking affirmative action in the recruitment, training, development, career guidance and promotion of minorities, women and persons with disabilities. The executive supports reasonable accommodation for qualified employees or applicants and is known to be personally supportive of removing artificial barriers to career success for members of these underutilized groups.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Subject: Chief Administrative Officer Administrative Plan	Item Number 0010-6	Page Number 4 of 8
Effective Date: August 1989		

- o The executive designs and implements departmental responsibilities consistent with CAO's values of systems thinking, future-orientated participative management and the value of the employee. S/he provides for professional growth and development of employees regarding these organizational values.
- o A County executive is informed at all times regarding the key issues of strategic importance in meeting the CAO's mission. Although these issues may cross departmental boundaries, County executives seek to view these issues from the common perspective of the CAO's administrative goals.
- o The executive effectively monitors community conditions and takes the initiative to propose appropriate actions. In meeting with community boards, committees and commissions, the executive carries the County's portfolio and keeps the administrative goals in focus and at all times expresses the values, principles and philosophies necessary to achieve the CAO's mission.
- o The executive displays vision, creativity and understanding and participates in collaborative decision making as an Executive Team member. The executive freely assumes a responsibility to all members of the Executive Team, in providing for overall organizational success by not only managing departmental resources but also through full participation in systems solutions.
- o The executive exercises and exhibits leadership consistent with the values expressed in the CAO's mission statement and conducts all responsibilities in a professional style and manner, exercising the highest professional ethics and functioning with honesty and integrity at all times.

C. GOAL STRUCTURE

Goal: A statement of the results or conditions to be attained. Goals are specific and achievable targets, usually within a two or three-year time frame. Goals move an organization or program toward a desired state while realistically reflecting present and future needs and obstacles.

Objective: A shorter range condition to be attained in pursuit of the goal. Objectives are concrete, measurable and expressed within a specific time limit (frequently a year).

Quality of Life Goals: Goals which express the preferred community standards for public health and safety; for the environment, natural resources preservation, and physical development of the community; and for the social, health and economic well being of individual residents.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

Subject: Chief Administrative Officer Administrative Plan	Item Number 0010-6	Page Number 5 of 8
Effective Date: August 1989		

Administrative Goal: Goal for the design or implementation of administrative support components of an organization, department or program.

System Goal: Goal which recognizes and addresses the interdependencies of services, programs or operational units for the advancement of the organization as a whole.

Service Goal: Goal for the improved effectiveness or efficiency of services to clients, internal or external to the organization.

For San Diego County government to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of County residents, it is essential that priorities be explicitly identified, that these priorities be shared by all parts of the organization and that coordinated action be undertaken for their achievement. These priorities must be regularly re-assessed, given the changing political, economic and social environment of the County. The goal establishment process is described in Attachment B.

Approved:

Chief Administrative Officer

Responsible Department

Chief Administrative Officer

GOALS ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS

GOALS ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS

Goal setting is an annual process. Goals will be established on a multi-year basis.

Step 1
(Ongoing)

Establishment of Board Goals

The Board of Supervisors, with the support of the CAO, establishes County goals which set the overall priorities and values for the provision of services to County residents. These are expressed as Quality of Life Goals, State of the County priorities, Board Policy initiatives and budget priorities.

Step 2
(August)

Establishment of CAO Goals

The Executive Staff conducts an assessment (scan) of the external and internal environment affecting the County. This assessment includes a review of economic, social, political, demographic and environmental conditions and trends, as well as the County's fiscal condition, achievement of previously established goals, and Federal/State government actions. Based on the Board's goals, the CAO's mission, the environmental scan and input from Department Directors and Administrative Councils, the Executive Staff recommends, and the CAO approves, goals for the organization.

Step 3
(September)

Transmittal of CAO Goals

The CAO's goals are delegated through the Executive Staff to the Department Directors and Administrative Councils and, with the Board's goals, serve as the basis for departmental goal development.

Step 4
(October)

Development of Departmental Goals

Department Directors develop goals for their departments. These goals are designed to support the Board's and CAO's goals and to advance the effective, efficient and innovative provision of departmental programs and services. These goals are reviewed by the department's DCAO and are then submitted to the Executive Staff.

**Step 5
(November)****Adoption of Departmental Goals**

The Executive Staff reviews proposed departmental goals to ensure consistency with CAO goals, the organizational appropriateness and the administrative and fiscal capacity of the organization to support goal achievement. The Executive Staff recommends the departmental goals to the CAO for adoption. Once adopted, the goals are delegated to the department and are incorporated into the CAO's goals system. These goals are a major component of each Director's executive compensation evaluation and provide the frame-work for intra-departmental program goals and objectives. They also provide input into the annual budget process.

**Step 6
(Ongoing)****Establishment of Administrative Council Goals**

The Administrative Councils develop goals in support of the Board's and CAO's goals. These are recommended to the Executive Staff for CAO approval. Upon approval, they are incorporated into Council activity. In addition, they may provide input to departmental goal setting and the annual budget process.

LB#6 - 0010-6.CK

APPENDIX F

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
MISSION STATEMENT

Maintain and enhance the quality of life in San Diego County by ensuring that county employees endeavor to fulfill, in a superior manner, the social, health, and safety needs of the region.

Create a government that earns and deserves the support and respect of its citizenry by being responsive and responsible.

Establish local public and private cooperative programs as well as new international initiatives for economic development.

Provide program and financial decision-making support to the Board of Supervisors which is policy-based and advances the goals and visions of the Board.

Maximize the capacity of County government to deliver the highest quality service through the use of administrative and management techniques that foster an integrated, systems-oriented county operation.

APPENDIX G

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

SUBJECT: Administrative Councils	Item Number	Page
EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1989	0010-4	1 of 4

Purpose:

To provide a mechanism for systems-based, future-oriented decision-making for San Diego County government.

Background:

The substantial fiscal and programmatic challenges facing County government require an improved approach to administration and service delivery. The County needs to move from a crisis-oriented, reactive and incremental decision process to one that is future-oriented, planned and utilizes an interactive and collaborative method for conducting County business. The Administrative Councils are one mechanism for achieving this preferred administrative approach.

Scope:

The primary function of the Administrative Councils is the design of County government strategies and implementation plans to address major issues facing County government. These issues are characterized as follows:

- . Their solution impacts and requires the input of multiple County departments;
- . Their solution requires the identification of a multi-year strategy;
- . They are significant regional or community issues; and
- . Their solutions require the identification of the appropriate role of County government relative to other organizations and entities in the region.

The CAO's Executive staff will direct issues to be considered by the Administrative Councils based on organizational goals and priorities. Issues will also be recommended by individual departmental members of the Councils. The Councils work may include recommendations to the CAO's Executive Staff on administrative policy and State or Federal legislative initiatives that enable and encourage a systems-based approach to the delivery of County services.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

SUBJECT: Administrative Councils	Item Number	Page
EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1989	0010-4	2 of 4

It is further recognized that emergent issues or issues with major budgetary or service impact may be best resolved in the Administrative Council forum. These issues will be approved by the CAO's Executive Team for inclusion as part of the Administrative Councils' activities.

Composition:

The composition of the Administrative Councils will be as follows:

1. Physical and Environmental Services

Public Works
Planning and Land Use
Parks and Recreation
Housing and Community Development
Library
Air Pollution Control District
Agriculture, Weights and Measures
Animal Control
Farm and Home Advisor
Health Services, Environmental Health Services Division

2. Human Services

Health Services
Social Services
Area Agency on Aging
Commission on Children and Youth

3. Justice Services

Sheriff
District Attorney
Probation
Superior Courts
Municipal Courts
Public Defender
Alternate Defense Counsel
Marshal
County Clerk
Coroner

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

SUBJECT: Administrative Councils	Item Number	Page
EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1989	0010-4	3 of 4

4. Economic Resources

Financial Management
Assessor
Auditor and Controller
Treasurer/Tax Collector
Revenue and Recovery

5. Internal Support

Financial Management
Human Resources
Information Services
General Services
Auditor and Controller
EOMO
Purchasing and Contracting
Revenue and Recovery
County Counsel
Civil Service Commission
Clerk of the Board

Note:

- . It is recognized that each Council's composition reflects the core departments for the respective system. Other departments and offices will join in the Council's deliberations/design as the issues under consideration require.
- . The CAO may modify the number and composition of the membership of the Administrative Councils based on his/her perception of County needs.

Procedures:

- A. All proposed policy changes, issues with major budgetary or service impact and workplans designed by the Council to address the issues will be approved by the CAO's Executive Staff.
- B. The Councils will be composed of department heads and members of the CAO Executive Staff.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL

SUBJECT: Administrative Councils	Item Number	Page
EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1989	0010-4	4 of 4

- C. The CAO/ACAO will participate as an active member of all Administrative Councils.
- D. The Council meetings will be chaired by a DCAO.
- E. Attendance at Council meetings by other than department heads shall be arranged on a case-by-case basis. Department heads that are unable to attend the Council meeting should advise the DCAO chairing the meeting ahead of the meeting date.
- F. Departments will be responsible for issue development and follow-up work on assignments/agreements. Councils may form subcommittees, composed of department heads, or task forces, composed of departmental staff to do follow-up work.
- G. The Office of the DCAO chairing the meeting will be responsible for the preparation of agendas and agreements, on follow-up actions, and tracking the progress of the Councils' work.

APPROVED

Chief Administrative Officer

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT

Chief Administrative Officer

Revised February 1990

APPENDIX H

THE PRESENT : THE FUTURE

CONDITION A → CONDITION B

(Current Condition)

(Desired Condition)

Incremental
Decision Making

Planned Approach

Reactive

Interactive/Proactive

Crisis-Oriented

Future-Oriented

Isolated Departmental
Planning & Decision-Making

Systems-Based Design

Personal Power Model

Collaborative Model

Doing Things Right

Doing the Right Thing

APPENDIX I

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
AGENDA ITEM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BRIAN P. BILBRAY
FIRST DISTRICT
GEORGE F. BAILEY
SECOND DISTRICT
SUSAN GOLDING
THIRD DISTRICT
LEON L. WILLIAMS
FOURTH DISTRICT
JOHN MACDONALD
FIFTH DISTRICT

DATE: April 23, 1991
TO: Board of Supervisors
SUBJECT: Chief Administrative Officer's Five-Year Strategic Directions

SUMMARY:

REFERENCE

Over the past six months, County executives have participated in a strategic planning process designed to set a future course for County administration. The result of this cooperative effort is the establishment of "Five-Year Strategic Directions" which are submitted for your Board's review and acceptance.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER:

Receive and file this report.

Fiscal Impact

The recommended action has no fiscal impact.

APR 23 1991

SUBJECT: Chief Administrative Officer's Five-Year Strategic Directions

BACKGROUND

Planning for a large, complex organization like the County of San Diego requires input from all levels of the organization. This philosophy guided the process of cooperatively developing the County's "Five-Year Strategic Directions" by seeking participation from elected department heads, CAO executive staff, court administrators, appointed department heads and their principal assistants.

County executives have participated in half-day "goal-setting workshops" designed to assist CAO executive staff in developing a future-oriented plan for the County. Participants were asked to contribute significant issues, from their department's perspective, which were likely to play an important role in the County's fiscal and administrative planning. During the workshops, staff developed a listing of priorities which reflected input from all County departments.

County executives had an opportunity to further discuss and refine this listing of County priorities during an executive staff retreat held in February. During this working session, participants revised the list of priorities into statements which describe the County's intended administrative focus over the next five years. Consistent with your Board's policies on a number of critical issues, these Five-Year Strategic Directions will serve as the basis of long-range planning for County administration.

The CAO's Administrative Councils, comprised of appointed and elected department heads, will begin the next step in this strategic planning process by developing an implementation plan designed to put the "Strategic Directions" into motion. An action plan with specific objectives will be developed to address the various conditions County administration hopes to achieve in the next five years. When finalized, this "Strategic Plan" will be distributed to all departments for use in developing their departmental goals and objectives.

Each department and program plays an integral role in the County's strategic planning. Departments are encouraged to work in a collaborative fashion and maintain a systemic approach to problem solving in order to accomplish the CAO's and your Board's mission. The Five-Year Strategic Directions document will serve to articulate the CAO's administrative focus over the next five years and help to clarify each department's role in an overall Strategic Plan for the administration of the County of San Diego. When complete, this planning document will also help executive staff measure on an on-going basis the effectiveness of the County's administrative planning.

Respectfully submitted,

NORMAN W. HICKEY
Chief Administrative Officer

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA ITEM
INFORMATION SHEET

SUBJECT: Chief Administrative Officer's Five-Year Strategic
Directions

SUPV. DIST.: All

COUNTY COUNSEL APPROVAL: Form and Legality ☐ Yes ☒ N/A
() Standard Form () Ordinance () Resolution

AUDITOR APPROVAL: (X) N/A () Yes 4 VOTES: () Yes (X) No

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW: () Yes (X) No

CONTRACT REVIEW PANEL: () Approved _____ (X) N/A

CONTRACT NUMBER(S):

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTION: None

BOARD POLICIES APPLICABLE: None

CITIZEN COMMITTEE STATEMENT: N/A

CONCURRENCE(S):

CONTACT PERSON: Robert Griego, DCAO 531-6282 MS A-6

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Chief Administrative Officer

DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE April 23, 1991
MEETING DATE

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS**

- O STRENGTHEN COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND PROMOTE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.**
- O PROVIDE AN ENVIRONMENT THAT PROMOTES, DEVELOPS AND MAINTAINS AN OUTSTANDING COUNTY WORK FORCE.**
- O PURSUE AND OBTAIN RELIABLE AND EQUITABLE FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL COUNTY SERVICES.**
- O ESTABLISH PREVENTION STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE.**
- O ENHANCE THE COUNTY'S COLLABORATIVE ROLE ON ISSUES OF REGIONAL IMPORTANCE.**
- O ENCOURAGE COALITIONS AND COLLABORATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGES OF THE 90'S.**
- O MAXIMIZE ACQUIRABLE RESOURCES TO DELIVER SERVICES CONSISTENT WITH ESTABLISHED PRIORITIES AND CHANGING NEEDS.**

**ADOPTED 1991
COUNTY EXECUTIVE TEAM**

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Strengthen community relations and promote public-private partnerships.

Desired Condition:

The County has established an effective vehicle for information sharing among County, public and private agencies. The County's awareness of and concern for community issues is heightened through interaction with neighborhood groups and community leaders. Community sources assist County government by contributing solutions to problems concerning delivery of needed public services.

As a result of inter-agency cooperation, the County is able to provide innovative programs aimed at community needs. Public confidence in County programs has increased due to the County's commitment to community concerns. Likewise, the County has bolstered community relations through its presence in community activities.

The County and the private sector share a common view that no single agency is solely responsible for the well-being of the community. Accordingly, they work together to determine when public-private partnerships are the most effective means of addressing community needs. These cooperative efforts and partnerships result in efficient implementation of programs and reduced County costs.

Provide an environment that promotes, develops and maintains an outstanding County work force.

Desired Condition:

The County has achieved an outstanding work force as a result of superior employee training programs at all occupational levels, opportunities for advancement, recognition systems and career enhancement programs. A positive work environment has led to a stable work force with a reduced rate of job turnover.

The County is known for attracting and maintaining an ethnically diverse work force. It recognizes each employee on the basis of their unique characteristics, contributions and achievements. County employees show dedication to their work and express pride in working for the County of San Diego.

Pursue and obtain reliable and equitable funding for essential County services.

Desired Condition:

The County has achieved a stable fiscal environment that is conducive to long term planning of goals and programs. The County has the capacity to deal with anticipated and unanticipated problems and can adequately meet the needs of County departments and programs for essential public services.

The County has moved away from crisis management brought on by fiscal constraints to management policies which focus on operating services and programs as efficiently and effectively as resources allow. Management emphasis has shifted from solving problems on a temporary basis to thorough, long term solutions.

Establish prevention strategies to promote the well-being of people.

Desired Condition:

The County's emphasis on prevention has fostered the development of communities that promote the well-being of citizens. The ability to move away from "after the fact" intervention has placed a new focus on providing a range of prevention services for individuals and families. Likewise, the County and community service agencies have experienced a resultant cost savings associated with the reduced need for intense treatment and intervention services. Prevention initiatives, such as the County's Prevention Policy, have directed the public's attention toward the root causes of social problems. These initiatives ensure integration of prevention concepts throughout all County programs and guide program development. They have also led to the development of a cost-effective, long-term approach for government which emphasizes strengthening families and communities to improve the quality of life in the region.

Enhance the County's collaborative role on issues of regional importance.

Desired Condition:

Through the use of effective communication, local agencies, jurisdictions and the County determine where they have common issues and problems. The County assumes a key position in inter-jurisdictional information sharing. It plays a strong leadership role, when appropriate, and accepts a support role in issues where other agencies may be more effective in taking the lead.

Agency and jurisdictional functions and lines of authority are clarified to avoid duplication of work or services, resulting in cost savings for all agencies involved.

Encourage coalitions and collaboration to meet the challenges of the 90's.

Desired Condition:

The County has identified the challenges it is likely to face during the 90's and has developed system-based approaches to meet these challenges. Where issues extend beyond County authority, the County attempts to establish support from coalitions. Coordination and collaboration is achieved through the effective distribution and sharing of information among involved organizations and through the establishment of shared goals.

Internally, the County's systems approach encourages resource sharing among departments, as well as fiscal coordination for programs and projects. County departments regularly exchange information, seek concurrence and share available resources on joint projects having a County-wide impact.

Maximize acquirable resources to deliver services consistent with established priorities and changing needs.

Desired Condition:

The County has developed standardized procedures to obtain maximum funding from all potential sources. County priorities and minimum service level requirements are established which are consistent with available resources. These resources are responsibly managed in order to maximize the services and programs provided by the County.

The County's dual focus on securing adequate funding sources and monitoring community needs allows administrators the foresight and flexibility to adjust service and funding levels when appropriate.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

"The Noblest Motive is the Public Good"

303

VISION

Create a government that earns the respect and support of the people.

PURPOSE

To provide for the needs of the people.

COUNTY CULTURE

- Collaboration
- Systems thinking
- Pro-Active
- Learning organization
- Goal Oriented

MISSION

Maintain and enhance the quality of life in San Diego County by ensuring that County employees endeavor to fulfill, in a superior manner, the social, health, and safety needs of the region.

Create a government that earns and deserves the support and respect of its citizenry by being responsive and responsible.

Establish local public and private cooperative programs as well as new international initiatives for economic development.

Provide program and financial decision-making support to the Board of Supervisors which is policy-based and advances the goals and visions of the Board.

Maximize the capacity of County government to deliver the highest quality service through the use of administrative and management techniques that foster an integrated, systems-oriented County operation.

FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

- Strengthen community relations and promote public-private partnerships.
- Provide an environment that promotes, develops and maintains an outstanding County work force.
- Pursue and obtain reliable and equitable funding for essential County services.
- Establish prevention strategies to promote the well-being of people.
- Enhance the County's collaborative role on issues of regional importance.
- Encourage coalitions and collaboration to meet the challenges of the 90's.
- Maximize acquirable resources to deliver services consistent with established priorities and changing needs.

Adopted 1991, County Executive Team

APPENDIX J

Our county is a corporation

By Tom Hamilton
Chairman, Board of Supervisors
San Diego County

THE RECENT series of articles on county government prepared by The Tribune was as broad-ranging and thought-provoking as any piece on local government that I have seen. My colleagues on the board and I know better than most that the county, as an organization, is vast and complex. But the series in The Tribune prompted us to reflect on a more fundamental question, "What is the county?"

The county is a corporation — a large municipal corporation. It has a budget approaching \$1 billion and a work force of more than 10,000 persons. Like a private corporation, it has a board of directors, a chief executive officer and many operating departments. Like a private corporation, it is ultimately governed by its shareholders — the taxpayers of the county.

But unlike a private corporation, the county does not exist to make a profit. It exists to deliver services efficiently to the public. More correctly, it exists to deliver services to many "publics": the federal and state governments, the five supervisorial districts of the county, the poor, the sick, the developer, the environmentalist, the criminal, the victim, the young, the old and many more.

So how does one measure success in the governance of the "county corporation"? On the one hand, it has been said that if government is not surrounded by turmoil, it is not doing its job. On the other hand, it may be argued that the measure of effective governance is the absence of turmoil. Persons of reasonable mind have drawn both conclusions.

The point is this: Although a private corporation may suffer unending turmoil, if it produces steady profits and pays regular dividends, then creditors and shareholders will smile all the way to the bank. But should a municipal corporation — such as the county — suffer turmoil, there is nothing to take to the bank. The "dividends" in that case — the law enforcement, the health and social services, the road building, the pest eradication, the library services etc. — tend to be taken for granted. In consequence of this, the focus of some observers in the county tends to be on the process, i.e., county operations, rather than on the bottom line, i.e., the continuous flow of essential services to citizens.

In fact, media coverage of the county over the last year has, for the most part, dealt with the process. Little, if any, of the coverage has focused upon the bottom line. That bottom line is that the county, within the limits of its resources, has provided and will continue to provide a wide array of vitally needed and often innovative services. In that sense, the media coverage of the county has suffered from imbalance.

What is perhaps as disturbing as

that imbalance is the tendency of the media to concentrate on only one side of the coin. Examples:

The Telink Case

While coverage has been informative with regard to the alleged misdeeds of several county employees, little attention has been paid to the fact that the county has embarked on a pioneering approach to its telephone needs which will free up millions of dollars in savings for more roads, better law enforcement, more effective disease prevention etc.

The Nieto Matter

The media, while focusing on portions of confidential transcripts of executive sessions of the board, have neglected to point out that, unlike a private corporation whose personnel practices are not subject to public review, personnel management in a civil service system is, by its very nature, cumbersome and open to constant scrutiny by various public bodies and, of course, by the press. Also, the media, while daily reciting the charge of racial discrimination on the part of the county, notably neglected to point out the considerable success the county has had in achieving the objectives set forth in the consent decree of 1977.

Civil Service Commission

The media have emphasized the recent dispute between the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission. They failed to point out that such conflict is to be expected from a recent charter change which altered the jurisdictional boundaries of the two bodies. Moreover, the media paid a great deal of attention to the performance of a probationary employee who has since been removed from the sensitive post which was the focal point of the dispute between the county and the commission.

In spite of my dissatisfaction with the imbalance and lack of perspective which has, in general, shaped the media coverage of the county, I acknowledge the efforts of The Tribune

in attempting to deal analytically with a complex subject matter. However, I take strong exception to the main thesis of The Tribune series, i.e., that the county is in chaos. Turmoil? Possibly. Problems? Yes. Chaos? I think not.

The conclusion reached by The Tribune fails to make the necessary distinction between "the process" and the "bottom line." The county, throughout this period of alleged turmoil, has continued to deliver the services which its various constituencies expect and demand. The county, in spite of its problems, continues to be recognized throughout the state and the nation as a progressive and innovative governmental organization.

Some of the county's present problems are structural and some result from managerial decisions which, in retrospect, now appear ill-advised. Some of the problems are historical, stemming from the board's past decisions to deal with post-Proposition 13 cutbacks by reducing critical management and administrative staff.

The dimensions of the problem, as well as the possible solutions, are complex. The Board of Supervisors has struggled to come to grips with many of the issues referred to in The Tribune series well before that series commenced. Governments, like all organizations, must constantly reassess the way they go about their business if they are successfully to adapt to changed circumstances. The Board of Supervisors recognizes this fact and is committed to implementing whatever changes are necessary.

The Tribune has contributed to the identification of a number of possible remedies for the county's ills. What is needed as well are inputs from other concerned members of our community. I am proposing to my fellow supervisors that we schedule a series of public hearings in the near future for the purpose of receiving public inputs for modifying the County Charter. It is my hope that the board will entertain proposals to have the requisite charter amendments placed before the voters on the November ballot. No doubt, other changes can be identified which can be implemented without the need of charter amendment.

It is to be hoped that our efforts will result in a clearer definition of the legislative and executive functions in county government. At the same time, changing our County Charter will not relieve the county of the need to obey federal and state mandates, nor will it give us the control over our fiscal destiny we so urgently need, nor will it make it any easier to satisfy the often conflicting demands for our shrinking county revenues. Notwithstanding, I believe that the expectations alluded to above are reasonable, that the actions I have proposed are responsible and that positive results will follow from their adoption.