







































Finally, our findings add to what we know from contemporary theories of public administration, such as NPM, that suggest public administrators are proactive in their engagement with stakeholders. Indeed, our findings indicate that public administrators actively manage their environments (e.g., by engaging with external stakeholders). They also recognize systems level issues that can influence policy outcomes.

Still, it is important to point out that nearly 50% of the municipalities in our study did not indicate that they attempted to engage any type of external stakeholder at all in evaluating the feasibility of contracting out. Thus, while our theory of instrumental stakeholder engagement seems to explain the behavior of some municipalities it does not explain the behavior of all municipalities. As such, there are a number of questions that remain; and, future research should further explore the hypotheses in this study. Ideally, this research will use different policy areas and different measures of proactive management.

### **Disclosure Statement**

Data for this research came from the 2007 ICMA ACS. This data is publicly available for purchase. Data from this research also came from the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey and the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau's Public Finance dataset. While we cannot make the ICMA data open access, we can release a subset of the data within 15 days of publication online. Stata codes used to build key variables of interest are available upon request.

### **References**

- Behn, R. D. (1978). Closing a government facility. *Public Administration Review*, 38, 332-338. <https://doi.org/10.2307/975815>
- Beierle, T. C. (2002). The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. *Risk Analysis: An International Journal*, 22, 739-749. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.00065>
- Beveridge, R. (2012). Consultants, depoliticization and arena-shifting in the policy process: Privatizing water in Berlin. *Policy Sciences*, 45, 47-68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-011-9144-4>
- Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T., & O'Leary, R. (2005). The new governance: Practices and processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government. *Public Administration Review*, 65, 547-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00482.x>
- Borins, S. (2000). Loose cannons and rule breakers, or enterprising leaders? Some evidence about innovative public managers. *Public Administration Review*, 60, 498-507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00113>
- Borins, S. (2001). Public management innovation: Toward a global perspective. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 31, 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F02750740122064802>
- Borins, S. (2002). Leadership and innovation in the public sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23, 467-476. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730210449357>
- Bovaird, T. (2005). Public governance: Balancing stakeholder power in a network society. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 71, 217-228. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0020852305053881>
- Boxelaar, L., Paine, M., & Beilin, R. (2006). Community engagement and public administration: Of silos, overlays, and technologies of government. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 65, 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2006.00476.x>

- Boyne, G. A. (1998). Bureaucratic theory meets reality: Public choice and service contracting in U.S. local government. *Public Administration Review*, 58, 474-484. <https://doi.org/10.2307/977575>
- Brown, T. L., & Potoski, M. (2003). Transaction costs and institutional explanations for government service production decisions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13, 441-468. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpart/mug030>
- Brugha, R., & Varvasovsky, Z. (2000). Stakeholder analysis: A review. *Health Policy and Planning*, 15, 239-246. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/15.3.239>
- Bryson, J. M. (2004). What to do when stakeholders matter: Stakeholder identification and analysis techniques. *Public Management Review*, 6, 21-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030410001675722>
- Bryson, J. M. (2010). The future of public and nonprofit strategic planning in the United States. *Public Administration Review*, 70, s255-s267. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02285.x>
- Bryson, J. M., Patton, M. Q., & Bowman, R. A. (2011). Working with evaluation stakeholders: A rationale, step-wise approach and toolkit. *Evaluation and program planning*, 34(1), 1-12.
- Cameron, A. C., & Trivedi, P. K. (2009). *Microeconometrics with STATA*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Carr, D. S., & Halvorsen, K. (2001). An evaluation of three democratic, community-based approaches to citizen participation: Surveys, conversations with community groups, and community dinners. *Society & Natural Resources*, 14, 107-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/089419201300000526>
- Damanpour, F., & Schneider, M. (2008). Characteristics of innovation and innovation adoption in public organizations: Assessing the role of managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 495-522. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mun021>
- Dunteman, G. H., & Ho, M. H. R. (2005). *An introduction to generalized linear models* (Vol. 145). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ebdon, C. (2002). Beyond the public hearing: Citizen participation in the local government budget process. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 14, 273-294. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-14-02-2002-BO06>
- Feiock, R. C., & West, J. P. (1993). Testing competing explanations for policy adoption: Municipal solid waste recycling programs. *Political Research Quarterly*, 46, 399-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F106591299304600211>
- Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. (2002). To manage is to govern. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 541-554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00236>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fernandez, S., Smith, C. R., & Wenger, J. B. (2007). Employment, privatization, and managerial choice: Does contracting out reduce public sector employment? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26, 57-77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20227>
- Fernandez, S., Ryu, J. E., & Brudney, J. L. (2008). Exploring variations in contracting for services among American local governments: Do politics still matter? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 38, 439-462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074007311386>
- Gergen, K. J. (1969). Assessing the leverage points in the process of policy formation. A. R. Bauer, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *The study of policy formation* (pp. 181-203). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Handley, D. M., & Howell-Moroney, M. (2010). Ordering stakeholder relationships and citizen participation: Evidence from the community development block grant program. *Public Administration Review*, 70, 601-609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02181.x>

- Head, B. W. (2008). Assessing network-based collaborations: effectiveness for whom?. *Public Management Review*, 10, 733-749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030802423087>
- Hefetz, A., & Warner, M. (2004). Privatization and its reverse: Explaining the dynamics of the government contracting process. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14, 171-190. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muh012>
- Hess, M., & Adams, D. (2007). Innovation in public management: The role and function of community knowledge. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 12(1), 1-20.
- Hilderbrand, M. E., & Grindle, M. S. (1994). *Building sustainable capacity: Challenges for the public sector*. Prepared for the United Nations Development Programme, Pilot Study of Capacity Building by the Harvard Institute for International Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Homsy, G. C., & Warner, M. E. (2015). Cities and sustainability: Polycentric action and multilevel governance. *Urban Affairs Review*, 51, 46-73. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1078087414530545>
- Honadle, B. W. (1981). A capacity-building framework: A search for concept and purpose. *Public Administration Review*, 41, 575-580. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976270>
- Howlett, M. (2009). Policy analytical capacity and evidence-based policy-making: Lessons from Canada. *Canadian public administration*, 52, 153-175. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2009.00070\\_1.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2009.00070_1.x)
- Howlett, M. & Migone, A. (2013). Searching for substance: Externalization, politicization and the work of Canadian policy consultants 2006-2013. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 7(1), 112-133.
- International City County Management Association (2012). *Alternative Service Delivery: Full dataset*. Retrieved from [https://members.icma.org/eWeb/DynamicPage.aspx?Site=ICMARes&WebKey=e6991716-303c-427a-8238-f3c6c48a43a8&pager=10&ListSearchFor=Alternative%20Service%252%2000Delivery%20\(ASD\)](https://members.icma.org/eWeb/DynamicPage.aspx?Site=ICMARes&WebKey=e6991716-303c-427a-8238-f3c6c48a43a8&pager=10&ListSearchFor=Alternative%20Service%252%2000Delivery%20(ASD))
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen participation in decision-making: Is it worth the effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64, 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x>
- Jennings Jr., E. T., & Hall, J. L. (2011). Evidence-based practice and the use of information in state agency decision making. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22, 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muro40>
- Krueathep, W., Suwanmala, C., & Bureekul, T. (2012). The study of public opinion on fiscal and budgetary choices in the Thai General Election BE 2554. *Thai Journal of Public Administration*, 10, 71-105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x>
- Lawrence, L., Debbie, A., & Deagen, R. (2001). Choosing public participation methods for natural resources: A context-specific guide. *Society & Natural Resources*, 14, 857-872. <https://doi.org/10.1080/089419201753242779>
- Levin, J., & Tadelis, S. (2010). Contracting for government services: Theory and evidence from US cities. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 58, 507-541. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40985898>
- MacNair, R. H., Caldwell, R., & Pollane, L. (1983). Citizen participants in public bureaucracies: Foul-weather friends. *Administration & Society*, 14, 507-524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539978301400405>
- Mandell, M., & Steelman, T. (2003). Understanding what can be accomplished through interorganizational innovations: The importance of typologies, context, and management strategies. *Public Management Review*, 5, 197-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461667032000066417>

- McGuire, M. (2002). Managing networks: Propositions on what managers do and why they do it. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 599-609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00240>
- Mohr, R., Deller, S. C., & Halstead, J. M. (2010). Alternative methods of service delivery in small and rural municipalities. *Public Administration Review*, 70, 894-905. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02221.x>
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moynihan, D. P. (2003). Normative and instrumental perspectives on public participation: Citizen summits in Washington, DC. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 33, 164-188. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0275074003251379>
- Nabatchi, T. (2012). Putting the “public” back in public values research: Designing participation to identify and respond to values. *Public Administration Review*, 72, 699-708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02544.x>
- Nabatchi, T., & Amsler, L. B. (2014). Direct public engagement in local government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 44, 63S-88S. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0275074013519702>
- Nalbandian, J. (1989). The contemporary role for city managers. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 19, 261-278. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F027507408901900401>
- Nutt, P. (2002). *Why Decisions fail: Avoiding the blunders and traps that lead to debacles*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Osborne, D. E., & Gaebler, T. A. (1992). *Reinventing government*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (1998). Governance without government? Rethinking public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8, 223-243. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024379>
- Prell, C., Hubacek, K., & Reed, M. (2009). Stakeholder analysis and social network analysis in natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22, 501-518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802199202>
- Purdy, J. M. (2012). A framework for assessing power in collaborative governance processes. *Public Administration Review*, 72, 409-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02525.x>
- Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation*, 141, 2417-2431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014>
- Reed, M. S., Graves, A., Dandy, N., Posthumus, H., Hubacek, K., Morris, J., Prell, C., Quinn, C. H., & Stringer, L. C. (2009). Who’s in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90, 1933-1949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.01.001>
- Rowley, T. I., & Moldoveanu, M. (2003). When will stakeholder groups act? An interest-and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 204-219. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30040709>
- Saint-Martin, D. (1998). The new managerialism and the policy influence of consultants in government: An historical–institutionalist analysis of Britain, Canada and France. *Governance*, 11, 319-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0952-1895.00074>
- Saint-Martin, D. (2005). Management consultancy. In E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn, Jr., L. E. Lynn, & C. Pollitt (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of public management* (pp. 671-694). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schafer, J., & Zhang, Z. (2016). The role of stakeholders in municipal contracting out. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 40, 789-813.

- Schalk, J. (2011). Linking stakeholder involvement to policy performance: Nonlinear and stakeholder. *Political Science and Politics*, 39, 243-246.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0275074015615435>
- Schaller, L. E. (1964). Is the citizen advisory committee a threat to representative government?. *Public Administration Review*, 24, 175-179.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/973647>
- Skelcher, C., De Rynck, F., Klijn, E. H., & Voets, J. (2008). Designing democratic institutions for collaborative economic development: Lessons from Belgian and Dutch cases. In *The theory and practice of local governance and economic development* (pp. 215-232). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smirnova, O. V., & Leland, S. M. (2014). Cutback management during the great recession: The case of transit agencies and contracting out. *State and Local Government Review*, 46, 272-281. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0160323X14564777>
- Soma, K., & Vatn, A. (2014). Representing the common goods: Stakeholders vs. citizens. *Land Use Policy*, 41, 325-333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.06.015>
- Simon, H. A., Thompson, V. A., & Smithburg, D. W. (1991). *Public administration*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Stivers, C. (1992). A wild patience: A feminist view of ameliorative public administration. In M. T. Bailey, & R. Mayer, *Public administration in an interconnected world: Essays in the Minnowbrook tradition* (pp. 53-73). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger
- Svara, J. H. (1998). The politics-administration dichotomy model as aberration. *Public Administration Review*, 58, 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976889>
- Thomas, J. C., & Poister, T. H. (2009). Thinking about stakeholders of public agencies: The Georgia Department of Transportation stakeholder audit. *Public Organization Review*, 9, 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-008-0070-7>
- Torres-Reyna, O. (2010). *Getting started in factor analysis (using Stata 10)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 62, 527-540.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00235>
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. R. A. N., Shoham, A., Schwabsky, N., & Ruvio, A. (2008). Public sector innovation for Europe: A multinational eight-country exploration of citizens' perspectives. *Public Administration*, 86, 307-329.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00731.x>
- Walker, R. M. (2006). Innovation type and diffusion: An empirical analysis of local government. *Public Administration*, 84, 311-335.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00004.x>
- Wang, X. (2001). Assessing public participation in US cities. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 24, 322-336. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3381222>
- Walker, R. M., Avellaneda, C. N., & Berry, F. S. (2011). Exploring the diffusion of innovation among high and low innovative localities: A test of the Berry and Berry model. *Public Management Review*, 13, 95-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2010.501616>
- Wang, X., Hawkins, C., & Berman, E. (2014). Financing sustainability and stakeholder engagement: Evidence from U.S. cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 50, 806-834.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1078087414522388>
- Warner, M., & Hebdon, R. (2001). Local government restructuring: Privatization and its alternatives. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20, 315-336.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.2027>

- Weible, C. M. (2006). An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California marine protected area policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17, 95-117. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muj015>
- Weible, C. M. (2007). Stakeholder perceptions of scientists: Lake Tahoe environmental policy from 1984 to 2001. *Environmental Management*, 40, 853-865. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-007-9005-2>
- West, J. P., & Bowman, J. S. (2004). Stakeholder analysis of civil service reform in Florida: A descriptive, instrumental, normative human resource management perspective. *State and Local Government Review*, 36, 20-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0160323X0403600102>
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.
- Yang, K., & Callahan, K. (2007). Citizen involvement efforts and bureaucratic responsiveness: Participatory values, stakeholder pressures, and administrative practicality. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 249-264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00711.x>
- Yang, K., & Callahan, K. (2005). Assessing citizen involvement efforts by local governments. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 29, 191-216. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20447586>
- Zhang, Y., & Yang, K. (2009). Citizen participation in the budget process: The effect of city managers. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 21, 289-317. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-21-02-2009-B006>
- Zhang, Z., Gibson, B., & Schafer, J. G. (2018). Reexamining the relationship between fiscal stress and outsourcing. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 41, 22-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2017.1358645>

### Author Biographies

**Josephine Gatti Schafer** is the director of the Center for Public Affairs Research at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. In this role, she works directly with public officials and government agencies to build an evidence base for better governance practices. Prior to this role, she was an Assistant Professor at Kansas State University. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

**Zhiwei Zhang** is an Associate Professor at Kansas State University. He received his bachelor's degree in Public Administration from Beijing Institute of Machinery (2006), his Master of Public Administration (MPA) from Kansas State University (2009) and his Ph.D. (2013) from University of Kentucky. His research interests focus on public finance and budgeting, public procurement and public private partnership, donors' philanthropic behavior, and nonprofit finance and management.