



WILEY-
BLACKWELL



*Advancing excellence
in public service . . .*

A Response to James F. Guyot's "Representative Bureaucracy Recast"

Author(s): Norma M. Riccucci and Judith R. Sidel

Source: *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 1999), p. 369

Published by: [Blackwell Publishing](#) on behalf of the [American Society for Public Administration](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3110120>

Accessed: 12/09/2011 06:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Blackwell Publishing and American Society for Public Administration are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Public Administration Review.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Response to James F. Guyot's "Representative Bureaucracy Recast"

Norma M. Riccucci, University at Albany, State University of New York

Judith R. Sidel, University at Albany, State University of New York

In our *PAR* article (September/October 1997), "The Representativeness of State-Level Bureaucratic Leaders: A Missing Piece of the Representative Bureaucracy Puzzle," we offered one way to think about recasting the representative bureaucracy construct to capture a fuller picture of the representativeness of state bureaucracies. We find James F. Guyot's response to our article somewhat puzzling (*PAR*, July/August, 1998).

At the very minimum, by arguing that our analysis is "context free," he seems to miss the vital point of representative bureaucracy measures, which seek, at least in the sense of passive representation, to compare the demographic representativeness of public bureaucracies with the demographics of the general population. Interestingly enough, Guyot frames his analysis around basic ratios of gender integration into the bureaucracy, an approach which,

although important, is context-free.

Guyot then asserts that we "*overstate* [sic] the representativeness of bureaucracies" because we incorporate political appointees into our measure. To buttress his point, Guyot suggests that "when responsibility for getting the gender proportions right is focused at one decision point (the president, the governors) rather than distributed among the procedures of a competitive civil service, it stands to reason that the representation of a protected class will be considerably advanced."¹ We are somewhat baffled by this assertion since the research presented in our *PAR* article points to the low percentages of women and people of color appointed by governors to political posts. In 1996, the year for which we provide data, women comprised only 30.7 percent of total appointments across the states, and people of color fared worse (African Americans, 6.9 percent; Latinos, 3.2 per-

cent; American Indians, 0.9 percent; Asian Americans, 2.4 percent). Moreover, in no state had the percentage of women or people of color reached 50 percent (for example, the percentage of women appointees ranges from 5.0 percent in Nebraska to 48.5 percent in Maryland).² Thus, Guyot's conclusion that the "representation ratio at the very top may be stronger than the ratio at adjacent strata in the bureaucratic pyramid" is rather surprising. On the contrary, it is *not* necessarily the case that we can rely on a single decision point such as a governor to "[get] the gender proportion right."

Finally, we appreciate Guyot's comparisons of the percentages of women in appointive, career, and elective positions, but again this goes beyond the framework of representative bureaucracy into other important and much-needed research about the progress women are making in bureaucratic as compared to elective posts.

◆ ◆ ◆

Notes

1. It is beyond the scope of these comments to respond to Guyot's assertion about the effects of competitive civil service procedures on the distribution of women in the bureaucracy.
2. These data were published in a report we produced for the Center for Women in Government, University at Albany, State University of New York, Appointed Policy Makers in State Government: The National Profile (Fall 1996).