

The Influence of Red Tape on Bureaucratic Decision making: A Replication and Extension of Scott and Pandey (2000)

M. Jin Lee

Gene A. Brewer

Nicolai Petrovsky

Jessica Li

Sanjay Pandey



香港城市大學
City University of Hong Kong

專業 創新 胸懷全球
Professional • Creative
For The World



Type of Replication

	Same measurement and analysis	Different measurement and/or analysis
Same data set	1) Checking of measures and analysis	2) Reanalysis of data
Different data but same population	3) Exact replication	4) Conceptual extension
Different data from different population	5) Empirical generalization	6) Generalization and extension

Source: Adapted from Tsang and Kwan (1999)

Type of Replication

	Same measurement and analysis	Different measurement and/or analysis
Same data set	1) Checking of measures and analysis	2) Reanalysis of data
Different data but same population	3) Exact replication	4) Conceptual extension
Different data from different population	5) Empirical generalization	6) Generalization and extension

Source: Adapted from Tsang and Kwan (1999)

Research Question

- How does bureaucratic decision making change depending on the level of red tape influence?
- How does bureaucratic decision making change depending on the level of red tape influence in Hong Kong?

Research Design

- Training modules for newly hired social case workers in a local public assistance agency
- Pre-test survey
- Introducing the agency
- Reviewing four hypothetical clients who seek public assistances
 - High Compassion-Female
 - Low Compassion-Female
 - High Compassion-Male
 - Low Compassion-Male

Adaptation to HK context

- Case History
 - HK People with HK identity
 - Education, Location, Local information
- Organization
 - NGO
 - Since HK is one city
 - HK government uses a single standardized form for social services
- Social Benefits
 - Extra benefits which do not overlap with government services
 - Public Housing

Replication Design in HK

- Training modules for newly hired social case workers in a NGO
- Pre-test survey (same)
- Introducing the NGO
- Reviewing four hypothetical clients who seek public assistances
 - High Compassion-Female
 - Low Compassion-Female
 - High Compassion-Male
 - Low Compassion-Male

Client Cases

High Compassion -Female	LOW Compassion -Female	LOW Compassion -Male	High Compassion -Male
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living with two children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living with two children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divorced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drug addicted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alcoholic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not willingness to work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped out school because of drug habits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped out school for young marriage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physically being abused by her husband 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being suspected as a drug dealer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not willingness to work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to work
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal records mainly because of buying drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stopped career because of physical injuries • (Currently no handicap)

Social Benefits

- Mandatory decisions
 - Monthly Living Allowance
 - Monthly Supplemental Benefit
- Optional decisions
 - Job training/Employment Counseling
 - Clothing Allowance
 - Medical and Rehabilitation Grants
 - Substance Abuse Counseling
 - Day Care Services
 - Short-term Food Assistance
 - Grants to Cover Utilities Installation and Deposit Fees
 - Additional Supplement benefits
 - Priority Assignment of Public Housing

個案評核表
Client
Evaluation
Form

第七部份 SECTION 7: 基本福利評核 Basic Benefit Determination

A. 填上第三部份 F 項的金額 (總收入) Place the amount from Section 3, line F here (Total Income)

7A \$ XXX

B. 填上第六部份 C 項的金額 (調整每月支出) Place the amount from Section 6, line D here (Adjusted Monthly Outlays)

7B \$ XXX

C. 將 7B 項減去 7A 項 (淨損失) Subtract 7A from 7B (Net Deficit)

7C \$ XXX

D. 基本福利津貼 (填上 7C 金額) (要求的金額不能超過\$ 3,000)

7D \$ XXX

Basic Benefit Allowance (Enter the amount from line 7C above) (Note: Amount cannot exceed \$3,000)

E. 生活津貼 (要求的金額不能超過每人\$ 1,000)

7E \$

Living Allowance (Note: Amount cannot exceed \$1,000 per person)

F. 每月補助金 (要求的金額不能超過\$ 2,000)

7F \$

Monthly Supplemental Benefit (Note: Amount cannot exceed \$2,000)

G. 將 18 歲以下的兒女的數目乘以\$500

7G \$ XXX

Multiply the number of children under 18 living with by \$500

H. 填上 7D, 7E, 7F 和 7G 的總和 (總福利評核)

7H \$

Add Lines 7D, 7E, 7F and 7G (Total Benefit Determination)

I. 將第四部分的金額乘以.08

7I \$ XXX

Multiply the amount from SECTION 4 by .08

J. 將 7H 減去 7I (調整福利評核)

7J \$

Subtract Line 7I from 7H (Adjusted Benefit Determination)

服務一覽表 CHECKLIST OF SERVICES

請在每項你會為個案建議的服務打✓。

Place a checkmark✓ by each of the services you would recommend for this client.

1. 建議職業培訓/就業輔導 Recommendation for Job Training/Employment Counseling

是 YES _____

否 NO _____

2. 建議衣服津貼 Recommendation for Clothing Allowance

注意：此建議只被作為一次性津貼;要求的金額不能超過每人\$ 1,000。

Note: this recommendation is to be considered as a one-time award only; amount requested cannot exceed \$1,000 per person.

HK Social Services

職業培訓/就業輔導轉介表

Job Training/Employment Counseling Referral Form

申請人姓名

個案編號 Case

教育程度 Le

列出申請人

List any Train

certifications

HK Social Services

建議衣服津貼

Recommendation for Clothing Allowance

注意：這個建議
be considered as a

申請人姓名 Applicant

個案編號 Case Number

要求津貼金額 Amount

申請衣服津貼的原因
Document need for cl

HK Social Services

建議醫療及康復津貼

Recommendation for Medical and Rehabilitation Grants

申請人姓名 Applicant's name: _____ (中文) _____ (English)

個案編號 Case Number: _____ 日期 Date: _____

子女姓名 Name of Children:

Original Results

Table 3B. Regression results testing the effects of red tape, compassion, and selected covariates.

Dependent Variable: Total Number of Non-Recurrent Benefits and Services

I. Female Client Comparison (Adj. $R^2 = 0.35$)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value
Red Tape	-2.23	-0.56	-8.92***
Compassion	0.85	0.21	3.60***
Professional Field	-0.34	-0.01	-1.25
Years of Education	0.02	0.02	0.33
Altruism	0.01	0.05	0.73
Locus of Control	0.01	0.04	0.72
Rule Orientation	-0.01	-0.04	-0.56
Gender	-0.06	-0.02	-0.24

II. Male Client Comparison (Adj. $R^2 = 0.36$)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value
Red Tape	-2.32	-0.61	-9.74***
Compassion	0.53	0.14	2.40***
Professional Field	0.15	0.04	0.61
Years of Education	0.05	0.05	0.79
Altruism	0.02	0.09	1.48
Locus of Control	0.00	0.03	0.44
Rule Orientation	-0.01	-0.02	0.33
Gender	0.49	0.13	2.00**

* $p < 0.10$
 ** $p < 0.05$
 *** $p < 0.01$

Original Results

Table 3B. Regression results testing the effects of red tape, compassion, and selected covariates.

Dependent Variable: Total Number of Non-Recurrent Benefits and Services

I. Female Client Comparison (Adj. $R^2 = 0.35$)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value
Red Tape	-2.23	-0.56	-8.92***
Compassion	0.85	0.21	3.60***
Professional Field	-0.34	-0.01	-1.25
Years of Education	0.02	0.02	0.33
Altruism	0.01	0.05	0.73
Locus of Control	0.01	0.04	0.72
Rule Orientation	-0.01	-0.04	-0.56
Gender	-0.06	-0.02	-0.24

II. Male Client Comparison (Adj. $R^2 = 0.36$)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	T-Value
Red Tape	-2.32	-0.61	-9.74***
Compassion	0.53	0.14	2.40***
Professional Field	0.15	0.04	0.61
Years of Education	0.05	0.05	0.79
Altruism	0.02	0.09	1.48
Locus of Control	0.00	0.03	0.44
Rule Orientation	-0.01	-0.02	0.33
Gender	0.49	0.13	2.00**

* $p < 0.10$
 ** $p < 0.05$
 *** $p < 0.01$

Preliminary Results

DV: Number of assigned benefits

	Coefficient	Z-value	P-value
Female cases	N = 52	Prob > Chi² = 0.001	Pseudo R² = 0.138
Red Tape	-2.11	-3.67	0.000***
Compassion	0.27	0.52	0.600
Altruism	0.64	1.64	0.101
Bureaucratic personality	-0.42	-0.97	0.333
Locus of control	-0.67	-1.73	0.084**
Female	-0.27	-0.33	0.744
HK	-0.23	-0.39	0.695
Male cases	N = 52	Prob > Chi² = 0.069	Pseudo R² = 0.091
Red Tape	-1.44	-2.48	0.013**
Compassion	-0.20	-0.38	0.701
Altruism	-0.16	-0.43	0.667
Bureaucratic personality	0.3	0.74	0.458
Locus of control	-0.69	-1.65	0.100*
Female	0.63	0.83	0.405
HK	0.42	0.71	0.477

Preliminary Results

DV: Number of assigned benefits

	Coefficient	Z-value	P-value
Female cases	N = 52	Prob > Chi² = 0.001	Pseudo R² = 0.138
Red Tape	-2.11	-3.67	0.000***
Compassion	0.27	0.52	0.600
Altruism	0.64	1.64	0.101
Bureaucratic personality	-0.42	-0.97	0.333
Locus of control	☀ -0.67	-1.73	0.084**
Female	-0.27	-0.33	0.744
HK	-0.23	-0.39	0.695
Male cases	N = 52	Prob > Chi² = 0.069	Pseudo R² = 0.091
Red Tape	-1.44	-2.48	0.013**
Compassion	-0.20	-0.38	0.701
Altruism	-0.16	-0.43	0.667
Bureaucratic personality	0.3	0.74	0.458
Locus of control	☀ -0.69	-1.65	0.100*
Female	0.63	0.83	0.405
HK	0.42	0.71	0.477

Preliminary Results

Table 4. Mean level of assistance provided by client and red tape treatment level.

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion Female		Low Compassion Female	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Low	1419.27	301.41	1223.98	372.07
High	1203.77	298.31	907.21	299.27

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion Male		Low Compassion Male	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Low	861.94	237.66	773.27	213.07
High	688.31	192.36	591.38	114.13

US\$

Preliminary Results

Table 4. Mean level of assistance provided by client and red tape treatment level.

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion Female		Low Compassion Female	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Low	1419.27	301.41	1223.98	372.07
High	1203.77	298.31	907.21	299.27

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion Male		Low Compassion Male	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Low	861.94	237.66	773.27	213.07
High	688.31	192.36	591.38	114.13

US\$

Preliminary Results

DV: Total amount of all assigned benefits

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion		Low Compassion	
Female	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Low	757.95	265.33	618.95	282.09
High	611.61	259.64	593.33	205.55
Male	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Low	138.70	97.53	131.00	98.36
High	186.88	132.99	155.59	125.38

Exchanged to US\$

Preliminary Results

DV: Total amount of all assigned benefits

Level of Red Tape	High Compassion		Low Compassion	
Female	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Low ▼	757.95	265.33	618.95	282.09
High	611.61	259.64	593.33	205.55
Male	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Low ▲	138.70	97.53	131.00	98.36
High	186.88	132.99	155.59	125.38

Exchanged to US\$

Preliminary Conclusion

- Replication in a different culture
 - Cultural context
 - Negative reaction toward alcohols and drugs
 - Language
 - Academic language..
- Decision Making on the Number of Benefits
 - Red tape - Negative effect
 - Personal characteristics (Locus of Control) – negative effect
- Decision Making on Total Amount of Benefits
 - Compassion level might have minor effects..