

**PAD 6136-01: Seminar in Management Studies
(Public Management)
Spring 2016**

Professor Kaifeng Yang

Office: 656 Bellamy

Phone: 644-7611

Fax: 644-7617

email: kyang@fsu.edu

In-class meeting location: BEL 632 PAD Conference Room

Office Hours: For any given in-class meeting, 2:00pm-3:30pm the day before the class day; or by appointment.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Public management is complex and requires a sophisticated appreciation for the interconnections that sustain it. The jurisdictional, political, economic, and legal contexts shape its contours and constrain its actions. Everything that government does must first pass through a sieve that blends connections between levels and branches of government, partisan politics with substantive mission, economic efficiency with constitutional constraints, and tacit agreements between business, government, and nonprofit enterprises about their mutual intersections and boundaries. This course provides an in-depth analysis of public management in this context.

As a field of study that draws upon so many sources, covering public management scholarship in a comprehensive manner can be daunting. Fortunately, with other classes in the curriculum you are/will be exposed to different areas of public administration studies. We will focus on the recent public management movement.

OBJECTIVES:

After taking the class students should be able to:

1. Know the best scholarship on public management and inculcate a sense of critical appreciation.
2. Develop knowledge about the popular public management reforms
3. Articulate a creative research agenda
4. Develop a rich “insider” perspective and experiences on scholarly research
5. Develop and hone the abilities and skills needed to be a successful researcher
6. Understand the constraints and challenges faced by public managers

REQUIRED TEXTS:

Waterman, Richard, Amelia Rouse and Robert Wright. 2004. *Bureaucrats, Politics, and the Environment*. University of Pittsburg Press.

Kettl, Donald F. 2005. *The Global Public Management Revolution*, second edition. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

George Frederickson and Richard Ghere. 2005. *Ethics in Public Management*. M. E. Sharpe.

H. George Frederickson. 2010. *Social Equity and Public Administration: Origins, Developments, and Applications*. M. E. Sharpe.

Barry Bozeman and Mary Feeney. 2011. *Rules and Red Tape: A Prism for Public Administration Theory and Research*. M. E. Sharpe.

Barry Bozeman. 2007. *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism*. Georgetown University Press.

Other Readings

A number of research articles and book chapters will be used. Some of the material will be made available by the instructor on the course website; you will be responsible for obtaining others from the library.

COURSE POLICIES

University Attendance Policy

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

Academic Honor Policy

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to "...be honest and truthful and...[to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://fda.fsu.edu/Academics/Academic-Honor-Policy>)

In particular, borrowing and building upon others' ideas is acceptable, but presenting those ideas as your own without acknowledging it is not. It is common that doctoral students are held to higher standards on plagiarism and academic misconduct (e.g. even using a sentence from someone else's work without due attribution can be grounds for an F in the course) – this may sound unfair but it is to prepare you for a successful and long scholarly career. All written work should have a bibliography using a standard format (APA style preferred).

Violations of the rules in any assignment may be subject to a minimum penalty of failing grade for the assignment and could result in a grade of "F" for the course. I will clarify any of these items you do not understand.

Americans with Disabilities Act

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class. This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the: Student Disability Resource Center 874 Traditions Way 108 Student Services Building Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167 (850) 644-9566 (voice) (850) 644-8504 (TDD) sdrc@admin.fsu.edu <http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu>

Free Tutoring from FSU

On-campus tutoring and writing assistance is available for many courses at Florida State University. For more information, visit the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) Tutoring Services' comprehensive list of on-campus tutoring options at <http://ace.fsu.edu/tutoring> or contact tutor@fsu.edu. High-quality tutoring is available by appointment and on a walk-in basis. These services are offered by tutors trained to encourage the highest level of individual academic success while upholding personal academic integrity.

Syllabus Change Policy

Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

COURSE FORMAT

This class will meet in “concentrated” times to have face-to-face instructions and discussions. However, before we actually meet, students must read the materials, do the assignments, submit them online following a weekly calendar.

COURSE CALENDAR*

**subject to change each semester/year*

Topic	Online Portion		In-Class Portion	
	Week	Duration	Time	Location
Introduction	Week 1	01/07 – 01/09		
What is Public Management	Week 2	01/10 – 01/16	01/23 (Sat.) 8:45am-11:30am 1:30pm-4:15pm	Bel. 632
Environment, Bureaucratic Politics, and Public Management	Week 3	01/17 – 01/23		
Administrative Discretion	Week 4	01/24 – 01/30	01/26 (Tues.) 2:00pm-4:45pm	Bel. 632
Public Value & Public Management	Week 5	01/31 – 02/06	02/02 (Tues.) 2:00pm-4:45pm	Bel. 632
Organizational Goal Ambiguity	Week 6	02/07 – 02/13	02/09 (Tues.) 2:00pm-4:45pm	Bel. 632
Citizen Participation & Public Management	Week 7	02/14 – 02/20	02/16 (Tues.) 2:00pm-4:45pm	Bel. 632
Red Tape and Green Tape	Week 8	02/21 - 02/27	03/22 (Tues.) 2:00pm-4:45pm	Bel. 632
Collaborative Management	Week 9	02/28 – 03/05	03/26 (Sat.) 8:45am-11:30am 1:30pm-4:15pm	Bel. 632
Spring Break	Week 10	03/06 – 03/12		
Motivation and Public Service Motivation	Week 11	03/13 – 03/19		
Performance Measurement	Week 12	03/20 – 03/26	03/27 (Sun.) 1:30pm-4:15pm	Bel. 632
Social Equity and Public Management	Week 13	03/27 – 04/02	04/09 (Sat.) 8:45am-11:30am 1:30pm-4:15pm	Bel. 632
Public Management and Ethics	Week 14	04/03 - 04/09		
Class Presentations and workshops	Week 15	04/10 – 04/16	04/23 (Sat.) 8:30am-11:30pm 04/24 (Sun.) 8:30am-11:30pm	Bel. 632
Class Presentations and workshops	Week 16	04/17 – 04/23		
<i>Final Exam Week (Paper writing)</i>	Week 17	04/24 – 04/29		

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Readings

Readings are classified as required, suggested, or optional. The required (Marked with ^R) must be read and the suggested ones (marked with ^S) should be read. The optional ones (marked with ^O) are optional.

This is a seminar, which means the class meetings will focus primarily on *discussion rather than lecture*, so come prepared to engage in *informed* discussions of assigned readings and to contemplate the implications of the arguments. Complete the readings and then review them by evaluating theory in light of practice, research in light of theory, and practice in light of theory and research.

2. Concept Map, Questions, and Online Participation (30% of the grade)

This part of the grade will be determined by the quality and depth of your map, question/critique and contribution to online discussion. In order to contribute to the class, one has to read the materials, prepare a concept map, think of some discussion questions, and participate on the discussions board actively.

- Concept Map (10%)
 - a. Prepare a concept map of the readings to be shared with the class. Don't know what a concept map is? See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Concept_map or <http://cmap.ihmc.us/publications/researchpapers/theorycmaps/theoryunderlyingconceptmaps.htm>. There is also a free software: http://freemind.sourceforge.net/wiki/index.php/Main_Page; But PowerPoint is sufficient for this purpose. (Samples will be provided in class).
 - b. Upload your concept map on the Discussion Board by 8:00am Monday for the week.
 - c. When you prepare for your qualifying exam, concept maps could be a great help if they are now drawn in a proper way: it tells you the logic of and connections between the major readings, as well as the core ideas of the readings, without being too crowded in one page.
 - d. Evaluation: primarily whether you submit one or not each week. Missing one week loses 1%.
- Question (5%)
 - a. Prepare one discussion question that would interest or help you the most. Be as clear as you can.
 - b. Upload one of your questions on the Discussion Board by 8:00am Monday for the week. Start a new thread for your question so that other students and the instructor can comment. If you see an existing thread that is similar to yours, that means you are too late and please think of a different one.
 - c. Each student should start only one thread.
- Online Participation (15%)
 - a. The purpose of the discussion board is to frame and promote collaborative learning. Every student is enabled to have enough time to ask questions and respond to questions.
 - b. Three cardinal rules for Discussion Boards
 - The cultural of mutual respect that is part of this course extends into the virtual classroom environment
 - Participation in these discussion boards is required
 - Participation alone is not enough; a thoughtful and meaningful approach in your posts is required.
 - c. Evaluation
 - *Frequency*: although you are encouraged, but you are not required to respond to every question. But you are required to respond to at least one another student's question. You are required to post at least 5 times per session
 - *Follow-ups*: Demonstrates analysis of others' posts; extends meaningful discussion by building on previous posts.
 - *Content contribution*: Posts factually correct, reflective and substantive contribution; advances

discussion.

- *Reference & Support*: Uses references to literature, readings, or personal experience to support comments.
- *Clarity*: Contributes to discussion with clear, concise comments formatted in an easy to read style that is free of grammatical or spelling errors.

3. After-Class Analysis (15% of the grade)

After each in-class meeting, prepare a 400 (minimum) word *analysis* of the class *discussion*.

- The analysis should not be a mere summary of the materials; rather, it should focus on things coming out of the discussion and interest you the most, such as:
 - a. the metaphor/story/current events used or discussed
 - b. the linkages among the current materials
 - d. the linkages between current materials and those of a previous week or other courses
 - e. the criticisms or critique of the methods and research design of one or more of the readings
 - f. unresolved issues or future research questions
 - g. the implications of one or more of the readings for practice or theory or research
- Use bullets and numbering when necessary to make the analysis simpler.
- The best time to do this is right after the class meeting. You will find out how valuable it is to spend half an hour reflecting and writing on the discussions.
- The analysis should be emailed to the instructor 6 days after the class meeting. For classes scheduled in an extensive manner in weekends, one can choose the topic of only one of the sessions.
- My evaluation and comments will focus on both the substance and writing.

4. In-Class Participation (10% of the grade)

This part of the grade will be determined by the quality and depth of your contribution to in-class discussion.

- a. Although you may miss as many classes as you wish, your participation grade will suffer with each absence.
- b. Participation will be evaluated with 3 levels: 2 = contributes to the discussion by incorporating points in the assigned readings and provides thoughtful comments for each class; 1 = fails to demonstrate familiarity with readings or to substantively contribute to the discussion; 0=absent and no contribution to the discussion at all.

5. Final Paper (45% of the grade)

For the final paper, you have four options:

- 1) Work on a publishable manuscript using extant data;
- 2) Work on a publishable theoretical manuscript; or
- 3) Work with the instructor and other students on one of two literature review projects—one is on citizen participation and the other is on evidence-based management.
- 4) Work on a research proposal.

Regardless of the option you take, you have to write a one-page proposal, meet with the instructor and get your topic approved before March 25. But if you can, you should start this process as early as possible.

No length requirement, it is normally expected to be about 18 double-spaced pages, excluding the references and tables.

I would recommend option 1, 2, or 3 if you have a generally clear idea about the kind of research you want to do in the next few years. For option 1, I will make available several datasets; we should have access to most ICMA datasets; and you can also use other datasets. However, the four options are equally valued.

Remember that the paper should contain an analytical or critical component – they **MUST** be more than simple descriptive summaries of the readings. For example, identify inconsistencies between theory, research, and practice that deserve further thought. Contemplate variables that are missing from models. Consider challenges for practice that can be addressed through theory and research. Suggest research that would probe or advance the author(s) argument(s). Discuss whether a management technique described at one level of government might be applied at another level. Most important is this question: How does this work contribute to our understanding of public management? Use these assignments to capture **YOUR** creative ideas that are triggered by the ideas put forth in the readings. Ideally, each Management Paper could be the seed for a research project.

In addition to turning in a hardcopy, you will make a short, oral presentation summarizing your paper.

FIRST DAY ATTENDANCE SURVEY

This survey is not part of your grade but fulfills FSU's first day of class attendance policy and must be completed sometime before 12:00pm (Noon) Saturday of the first week of class (Jan. 10th). The survey can be found in the "Assignments" section of the course Blackboard website. Failure to complete this survey on time will result in the student being automatically dropped from the course.

COURSE CALENDAR FOR IN-CLASS MEETINGS*

**subject to change each semester/year*

If not otherwise specified, the class is held in BEL632, 5:30pm-8:15pm.

- | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|---|
| S 1 | (Jan. 24) | Introduction & Overview (8:45am-11:30am) |
| S 2 | (Jan. 24) | What is Public Management (8:45am-11:30am) |
| S 3 | (Jan. 28) | Environment, Bureaucratic Politics, and Public Management |
| S 4 | (Feb. 04) | Administrative Discretion |
| S 5 | (Feb. 11) | Public Value & Public Management |
| S 6 | (Feb. 18) | Organizational Goal Ambiguity |
| S 7 | (Feb. 25) | Citizen Participation & Public Management |
| S8 | (April 18) | Red Tape and Green Tape (8:45am-11:30am) |
| S 9 | (April 18) | Collaborative Management (8:45am-11:30am) |
| S 10 | (April 18) | Motivation and Public Service Motivation (2:00pm-5:00pm) |
| S 11 | (April 18) | Performance Measurement (2:00pm-5:00pm) |
| | | <i>* Final paper details discussed/approved before March 25 (the earlier, the better)</i> |
| S12 | (April 19) | Social Equity and Public Management (2:00pm-5:00pm) |
| S13 | (April 19) | Public Management and Ethics (2:00pm-5:00pm) |
| S14 | (April 22) | Class Presentations and Workshop |
| S15 | (May 1) | Final Exam Week: Paper polishing and submission |
| | | <i>** Final Paper due 11:50pm, May 1.</i> |

READINGS

Note 1:

PAR: *Public Administration Review*; JPART: *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*
PAQ: *Public Administration Quarterly* ARPA: *American Review of Public Administration*
AJPS: *American Journal of Political Science* AMR: *Academy of Management Review*
AMJ: *Academy of Management Journal* IRAS: *International Review of Administrative Science*
PPMR: *Public Performance & Management Review* IJPA: *International Journal of Public Administration*

Note 2:

° Optional reading
S Suggested reading
R Required reading

Session 1 Introduction and Review of Syllabus

Read:

- ^R Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 1995. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter 7: "Making Good Arguments: An Overview," pp. 88-93.
- ^R Van De Ven, A. 1989. Nothing is quite so practical as a good theory. *AMR* 14(4): 486-489.
- ^S Kilduff. Editors' comments. 2006. Publishing Theory. *AMR* 31(2): 252-255.
- ^S Bacharach, S. 1989. Organizational theories: some criteria for evaluation. *AMR* 14(4): 496-515.
- ^S Corley & Gioia. 2011. Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *AMR* 36(1): 12-32.

Session 2 What is "Public" "Management"

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know the relationship between public management and public administration; (2) understand why public management as a new movement emerged; (3) know the contents of recent "global" public management reforms. (4) know the major differences, if any, between public and private organizations;

Read:

- ^R Kettl, Donald F. 2005. *The Global Public Management Revolution*, second edition. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- ^S Kelman, Steven, Fred Thompson, L.R. Jones, and Kuno Schelder. 2003. Dialogue on Definition and Evolution of the field of Public Management. *International Public Management Review*, 4(2): 1-19.
- ^S Bozeman, Barry. 1993a. Introduction: two concepts of public management. In *Public Management: The State of the Art*, edited by B. Bozeman, 1-6. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- ^S _____. 1993b. Conclusion: Searching for the core of public management. In *Public Management: The State of the Art*, edited by B. Bozeman, 361-363. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- ^S Brudney, Jeffrey, Laurence O'Tootle, and Hal Rainey. 2000. Introduction: Public management in an era of complexity and challenge. In *Advancing Public Management*, edited by J. Brudney, L. O'Tootle, and H. Rainey, 1-14. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- ^S Perry, James L., and Hal G. Rainey. 1988. The public-private distinction in organizational theory: A critique and research strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(2): 182-201.
- ^S Rainey, Hal G., and Young Han Chun. 2005. Public and Private Management Compared. In Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn and Christopher Pollitt (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford University Press (pp. 72-102).
- [°] Rainey, Hal G. 1983. Public Agencies and Private Firms: Incentive Structures, Goals, and Individual Roles. *Administration & Society*, 15(2): 207-242.
- [°] Hood, Christopher. 2005. Public management: The word, the movement, the science. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by E. Ferlie, L. Lynn, and C. Pollitt, 7-26. New York: Oxford University Press.

- ° Rainey, Hal G., and Barry Bozeman. 2000. Comparing Public and Private Organizations: Empirical Research and the Power of the A Priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2): 447-469.
- ° Bozeman, Barry, and Stuart I. Bretschneider. 1994. The 'Publicness Puzzle' in Organization Theory: A Test of Alternative Explanations of Differences between Public and Private Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4(2): 197-224.
- ° Boyne, George A. 2002. Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, (39): 97-122.
- ° Weisbrod, Burton W. 1997. The Future of the Non-profit Sector: It's Entwining with Private Enterprise and Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 16(4): 541-555.
- ° Johansen and Zhu. 2014. Market competition, political constraint, and managerial practice in public, nonprofit and private American hospitals. *JPART* 24(1): 159-184.

A different view?

- ^S Lynn, Laurence. 2005. Public management: A concise history of the field. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by E. Ferlie, L. Lynn, and C. Pollitt, 27-50. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ° Frederickson, H. George. 1989. "Minnowbrook II: Changing Epochs of Public Administration." *PAR* 49(2): 95-100.
- ° Lynn, Laurence E. 2001. "The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For." *PAR*, 61(2): 144-160.
- ° Riccucci, Norma M. 2001. "The 'Old' Public Management versus the "New" Public Management: Where Does Public Administration Fit In?" *PAR*, 61(2), 172-175.

Session 3 Environment, Bureaucratic Politics, and Public Management

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know the common environment variables of public management; (2) the limitations of the traditional principal-agent model; (3) the multiple actor model of bureaucratic politics; (4) how bureaucratic politics affects public management and vice versa.

Read:

- ^R Waterman, Richard, Amelia Rouse and Robert Wright. 2004. *Bureaucrats, Politics, and the Environment*. University of Pittsburg Press.
- ^S Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence O'Toole, Jr. 2008. Management Theory and Occam's Razor: How Public Organizations Buffer the Environment. *Administration & Society* 39(8): 931-958.
- ^S O'Toole and Meier. 1999. Modeling the impact of public management: The implications of structural context. *JPART* 9(4): 505-526.
- ^S Kaifeng Yang. 2009. Examining Perceived Honest Performance Reporting by Public Organizations: Bureaucratic Politics and Organizational Practice. *JPART*.
- ^S Pandey, Sanjay K. and Bradley E. Wright. 2006. Connecting the Dots in Public Management: Political Environment, Organizational Goal Ambiguity, and the Public Manager's Role Ambiguity. *JPART* 16: 511-532.
- ° Maor, Gilad, and Bloom. 2013. Organizational reputation, regulatory talk, and strategic silence. *JPART* 23(3): 581-608.
- ° Kaifeng Yang and Sanjay Pandey. 2008. Political Environment and Administrative Reform: How Do They Affect Employee Commitment. *JPART*.
- ° Simon Calmar Andersen and Peter B. Mortensen 2010. Policy Stability and Organizational Performance: Is There a Relationship? *JPART* 20: 1-22.
- ° Donahue and O'Leary. 2012. Do Shocks change organizations? The case of NASA. *JPART* 22(3): 395-426.

Session 4 Administrative Discretion

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) reason on how much discretion managers should have; (2) know why discretion is important for performance; (3) know antecedents of discretion.

Read:

The context and the complexity:

- ^R Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Chapter 2: "Street-Level Bureaucrats as Policy Makers," pp. 13-25.
- ^S Kaifeng Yang and Marc Holzer. 2005. Administrative discretion in a turbulent time: An introduction. *PAQ* 29(1/2): 128-141.
- ^O Mastroski, Stephen. 2004. Controlling street-level police discretion. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593: 100-118.

The importance of discretion:

- ^S Sowa, Jessica and Sally Selden. 2003. Administrative discretion and active representation: An expansion of the theory of representative bureaucracy. *Public Management Review* 63(6): 700-710.
- ^S Curtis Wood. 2011. Understanding the Consequences of Municipal Discretion. *ARPA* 41(4): 411-27.
- ^O Donald Moynihan. 2006. Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. *PAR* 66(1): 78-90.

The antecedents of discretion:

- ^R Carpenter, D. & Krause, G. 2011. Reputation and public administration. *PAR* 72(1): 26-32.
- ^S Keiser, Lael and Joe Soss. 1998. With good cause: Bureaucratic discretion and the politics of child support enforcement. *AJPS* 42(4): 1133-1156.
- ^O Epstein, David and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1994. Administrative procedures, information, and agency discretion. *AJPS* 38(3): 697-722.

Correlates

- ^R Kelly, Marisa. 1994. Theories of justice and street-level discretion. *JPART* 4(2): 119-140.

Other:

- ^S Kutsal Yesilkagit and Jørgen G. Christensen. 2010. Institutional Design and Formal Autonomy: Political versus Historical and Cultural Explanations. *JPART* 20: 53-74
- ^O Doo-Rae Kim. 2008. Political Control and Bureaucratic Autonomy Revisited: A Multi-Institutional Analysis of OSHA Enforcement. *JPART* 2008 18: 33-55
- ^O William Ouchi. 2005. "Making Public Schools Work: Management Reform as Key." *Academy of Management Journal* 48(6): 929-934.
- ^O Kaufman, Herbert. 1981. "The Confines of Leadership," in *The Administrative Behavior of Federal Bureau Chiefs*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 91-138.

Session 5 Public Value and Public Management

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) understand the complexity of defining public values; (2) know different approaches to creating public values; (3) develop a practical strategy of creating public value in practice.

Read:

- ^R Barry Bozeman. 2007. *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism*. Georgetown University Press.
- ^S Mark Moore. 2000. Managing for Value: Organizational Strategy in For-Profit, Nonprofit, and Governmental Organizations. *NVSQ*.
- ^S Douglas Morgan. Chapter on "Public Interest."
- ^S Quinn and Rohrbaugh. 1983. A spatial model of effective criteria: toward a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*.
- ^O Bozeman, B., & Moulton, S. (2011). Integrative Publicness: A Framework for Public Management Strategy and Performance. *JPART* 21 (suppl 3), i363-i380
- ^O Jorgensen, T., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public Values: An Inventory. *Administration & Society*, 39(3), 354-381.
- ^O Nabatchi, T. (2012). Putting the "Public" Back in Public Values Research: Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Values. *Public Administration Review*, 72(5), 699-708.
- ^O Rhodes, R., & Wanna, J. (2009). Bringing the Politics Back In: Public Value in Westminster Parliamentary Government. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 161-183.

- ° Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 41-57.
- ° Van Der Wal, Z. (2009). Public Value Privatized? The Need for a Continuous Emphasis on How to Actualize the Public Interest. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 166-167.

Session 6 Organizational Goal Ambiguity

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know why goal ambiguity is important for public management; (2) know different ways of measuring goal ambiguity; (3) know consequences of goal ambiguity; (4) know how to reduce goal ambiguity.

Read:

- ^R Chun, Young Han, and Hal G. Rainey. 2005. Goal Ambiguity in U.S. Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 15(1): 1-30.
- ^R Noordegraaf, Mirko, and Tineke Abma. 2003. Management by Measurement? Public Management Practices amidst Ambiguity. *Public Administration*, 81(4): 853-871.
- ^R March, James G. 1978. Bounded Rationality, Ambiguity, and the Engineering of Choice. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9(2): 587-608.
- ^S Chun, Young Han, and Hal G. Rainey. 2005. Goal Ambiguity and Organizational Performance in U.S. Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 15(4): 529-557.
- ^S Rizzo, John R., Robert J. House, and Sidney I. Lirtzman. 1970. Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2): 150-163.
- ^S Simon, Herbert A. 1964. On the Concept of Organizational Goal. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(1): 1-22.
- ^S Pandey, Sanjay K., and Hal G. Rainey. 2006. Public Managers' Perceptions of Organizational Goal Ambiguity: Analyzing Alternative Models. *International Public Management Journal*, 9(2): 85-112.
- ° Ouchi, William G. 1979. A Conceptual Framework for the Design of Organizational Control Mechanisms. *Management Science*, 25(9): 833-848.
- ° Lan, Zhiyong, and Hal G. Rainey. 1992. Goals, Rules, and Effectiveness in Public, Private, and Hybrid Organizations: More Evidence on Frequent Assertions About Differences. *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 2(1): 5-28.
- ° Jung. 2014. Why are Goals Important in the Public Sector? *JPART* 24(1): 209-234.

Session 7 Citizen Participation and Public Management

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) understand the importance of citizen participation; (2) know the common types of participation; (3) know the practical challenges; (3) understand the factors that affect participation outcomes.

Read:

- ^R King, Cheryl S., Kathryn M Feltey, and Bridget Susel 1998. The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 58 (4): 317-326.
- ^S Irvin, Ren é A. and John Stansbury. 2004. Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review* 64 (1): 55-65.
- ^R Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216-24.
- ^R Thomas, John. 1990. Public involvement in public management: Adapting and testing a borrowed theory. *Public Administration Review* 50(4):435-445.
- ^S Kaifeng Yang and Sanjay Pandey. 2011. Further Dissecting the Black Box of Citizen Participation: When Does Citizen Involvement Lead to Good Outcomes? *PAR*.
- ^S Walters, Lawrence, James Aydelotte and Jessica Miller. 2000. Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review* 60(4): 349-359.
- ° Yang, Kaifeng and Kathe Callahan. 2007. Citizen involvement efforts and bureaucratic responsiveness. *Public Administration Review* 67(2): 249-264.

- ° Fung, Archon. 2006. Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review* Special issue on collaborative public management: 66-75.
- ° _____. 2005. Assessing Citizen Involvement Efforts by Local Government. *Public Performance & Management Review* 29(2):191-216.
- ° Stewart, Kennedy. 2007. Write the rules and win: Understanding citizen participation game dynamics. *Public Administration Review* 67(6): 1067-1076.
- ° Schachter, Hindy. 1995. Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves: Two Models for Improving Government Performance. *Public Administration Review* 55 (6): 530-537.
- ° Neshkova and Guo. 2012. Public participation and organizational performance: Evidence from state agencies. *JPART* 22(2): 267-288.

Session 8 Red Tape and Green Tape

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know the complexities about red tape; (2) know the consequence of red tape; (3) know how to improve the studies of red tape and green tape.

Read:

- ^R Barry Bozeman and Mary Feeney. 2011. *Rules and Red Tape: A Prism for Public Administration Theory and Research*. M. E. Sharpe.
- ° Bozeman, Barry. 1993. A Theory of Government 'Red Tape'. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(3): 273-303.
- ° Brewer, Gene A., and Richard M. Walker. 2010. Explaining Variations in Perceptions of Red Tape: A Professionalism-Marketization Model. *Public Administration* 88 (2).
- ^R DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009. Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Organizational Rules. *JPART* 19 (2):361-384.
- ° Pandey, Sanjay K., and Patrick G. Scott. 2002. Red Tape: A Review and Assessment of Concepts and Measures. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4): 553-580.
- ^S Adler, Paul S., and Bryan Borys. 1996. Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1): 61-89.
- ^S Gene A. Brewer and Richard M. Walker. 2010. The Impact of Red Tape on Governmental Performance: An Empirical Analysis. *JPART* 20: 233-257.
- ^S Bozeman, Barry, and Patrick G. Scott. 1996. Bureaucratic Red Tape and Formalization: Untangling Conceptual Knots. *American Review of Public Administration*, 26(1): 1-17.
- ^S Feeney. 2012. Organizational red tape: A measurement experiment. *JPART* 22(3): 427-444.
- ° Leisha, DeHart-Davis. 2009. Green Tape and Public Employee Rule Abidance: Why Organizational Rule Attributes Matter. *PAR* 69 (5):901-910.
- ° Coursey, David, and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007. Content Domain, Measurement, and Validity of the Red Tape Concept: A Second-Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *American Review of Public Administration* 37(3): 342-361.
- ° Kaufman, Herbert. 1977. *Red Tape: Its Origin, Uses and Abuses*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- ° Mausch, M. 1985. Vicious Circles in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30(1): 14-33.
- ° Rushing, William A. 1966. Organizational Rules and Surveillance: Propositions in Comparative Organizational Analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10(4): 423-443.

Session 9 Collaborative management

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) understand the concept of network and collaborative management; (2) know the process of collaboration; (3) know the factors leading to successful collaboration; (4) know managerial skills necessary for collaboration.

Read:

- ^S Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2001. Big Questions in Network Management Research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11 (July): 295-326.
- ^S Meier, Kenneth J., and Laurence J. O'Toole Jr. 2003. Public Management and Educational Performance: The Impact of Managerial Networking. *Public Administration Review*, 63(6): 689-699.
- ^R *Public Administration Review*. 2006. Special Issue on Collaborative Public Management,

Supplement to Volume 66 –doctoral students read all articles in the issue; MPA students choose three to read.

- ^S Brinton Milward, et al. 2010. Governance and Collaboration: An Evolutionary Study of Two Mental Health Networks. *JPART* 20:i125–i141.
- ^O Eugene Bardach. 2001. Developmental Dynamics: Interagency Collaboration as an Emergent Phenomenon. *JPART* 11(2):149-164.
- ^O Megan Mullin and Dorothy M. Daley. 2010. Working with the State: Exploring Interagency Collaboration within a Federalist System. *JPART* 20:757–778.
- ^O Ann Marie Thomson, Jim Perry, and Theodore K. Miller. 2009. Conceptualizing and Measuring Collaboration. *JPART* 19:23–56.
- ^O Anna A. Amirkhanyan. 2009. Collaborative Performance Measurement: Examining and Explaining the Prevalence of Collaboration in State and Local Government Contracts. *JPART* 19:523–554.

Session 10 Motivation and Public Service Motivation

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know the construct of public service motivation; (2) the antecedents and consequence of PSM; (3) the potential criticisms of PSM; and (4) the link between PSM and public management reforms.

Read:

- ^R Perry, James, Debra Mesch and Laurie Paarlberg. Motivating Employees in a New Governance Era: The Performance Paradigm Revisited. *Public Administration Review*. 66(4): 89-122.
- ^R Kim et al. (2013). Investigating the Structure and Meaning of Public Service Motivation across Populations: Developing an International Instrument and Addressing Issues of Measurement Invariance. *JPART* 23 (1), 79-102.
- ^R Moynihan, Donald P., and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2007. The Role of Organizations in Fostering Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*.
- ^S Coursey, David and Sanjay Pandey. 2007. Public service motivation measurement. *Administration & Society* 39(5): 547-568.
- ^S Sangmook Kim and Wouter Vandenabeele. 2010. A Strategy for Building Public Service Motivation Research Internationally. *PAR* (Sep/Oct): 701-709.
- ^S Brad Wright and Adam Grant. 2010. Unanswered Questions about Public Service Motivation. *PAR* (Sep/Oct): 691-700.
- ^S Jim Perry, Annie Hondeghem, and Loise Wise. 2010. Revisiting the Motivational Bases of Public Service. *PAR* (Sep/Oct): 681-690.
- ^R Kjeldsen, A. M., & Jacobsen, C. B. t. 2012. Public Service Motivation and Employment Sector: Attraction or Socialization? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*
- ^O David J. Houston. 2006. "Walking the Walk" of Public Service Motivation: Public Employees and Charitable Gifts of Time, Blood, and Money. *JPART* 16: 67-86.
- ^O Nalbandian, John, and J. Terry Edwards. 1983. The Professional Values of Public Administrators: A Comparison with Lawyers, Social Workers, and Business Administrators. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 4: 114-127.
- ^O Wittmer, Dennis. 1991. Serving the People or Serving for Pay: Reward Preference Among Government, Hybrid Sector, and Business Managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 14(4): 369-383.
- ^O Sangmook Kim. 2009. Testing the Structure of Public Service Motivation in Korea: A Research Note. *JPART* 19: 839-851
- ^O Vandenabeele, et al. 2006. Public service motivation in an international comparative perspective. *Public Policy Administration* 21(1): 13-31.
- ^O Wright, Bradley E. 2007. "Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter?" *Public Administration Review*, 67(1): 54-64.
- ^O Wright, Bradley E. 2004. "The Role of Work Context in Work Motivation: A Public Sector Application of Goal and Social Cognitive Theories." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(1): 59-78.

Session 11 Performance Measurement

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) know why performance measurement has become so important for government agencies; (2) understand the common components of a performance system; (3) know the potential pitfalls of performance measurement; (4) development skills in using performance measurement.

Read:

- ^R Poister. Chapter 3. Identifying real outcomes and other performance measures.
- ^O Harry Hatry. 1999. *Performance Measurement: Getting Results*. Washington DC: Urban Institute Press.
- ^R Behn, Robert. 2003. Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review* 63(5): 586-606.
- ^S De Lancer Julnes, Patria and Marc Holzer. 2001. Promoting the Utilization of Performance Measures in Public Organizations: An Empirical Study of Factors Affecting Adoption and Implementation. *Public Administration Review* 61(6): 693-708.
- ^O Steven Poister and Gregory Streib. 1999. Performance Measurement in Municipal Government: Assessing the State of the Practice. *Public Administration Review* 59(4): 325-335.
- ^S Donald Moynihan. 2006. Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 78-90.
- ^O Donald Moynihan. 2005. Why and How do State Governments Adopt and Implement Managing for Results? Reforms? *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 15(2): 219-243.
- ^S Modell, Sven. 2001. Performance Measurement and Institutional Processes. *Management Accounting Research* 12: 437-64.
- ^R Moynihan, Donald P. 2005. "Goal-based Learning and the Future of Performance Management." *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 203-216.
- ^O Jostein Askim, Åge Johnsen, and Knut-Andreas Christophersen. 2008. Factors behind Organizational Learning from Benchmarking: Experiences from Norwegian Municipal Benchmarking Networks. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 18: 297-320.
- ^S Carolyn J. Heinrich. 1999. Do Government Bureaucrats Make Effective Use of Performance Management Information? *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 9: 363-394.
- ^O Kaifeng Yang and Junyi Hsieh. 2007. Managerial Effectiveness of Government Performance Measurement: Testing a Middle Range Model. *Public Administration Review* 67(5): 861-879.
- ^O Kaifeng Yang and Sanjay Pandey. 2008. Political Environment and Administrative Reform: How Do They Affect Employee Commitment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.
- ^S Yang, Kaifeng and Marc Holzer. 2006. The Performance-Trust Link: Implications for Performance Measurement. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 114-126.
- ^O Kaifeng Yang. 2008. Examining Perceived Honest Performance Reporting by Public Organizations: Bureaucratic Politics and Organizational Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.
- ^O Moynihan and Pandey. 2010. The big question for performance management: Why do managers use performance information. *JPART*.
- ^O Hvidman and Andersen. 2014. Impact of Performance Management in Public and Private Organizations. *JPART* 24(1): 35-58.

Session 12 Social Equity and Public Management

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) understand the importance of equity in public management; (2) know the meaning of equity; (3) know how social equity relates to various aspects of public management; (4) develop some future research questions in this area.

Read:

- ^R H. George Frederickson. 2010. *Social Equity and Public Administration: Origins, Developments, and Applications*. M. E. Sharpe.
- ^S Susan Gooden and Shannon Portillo. 2011. Advancing Social Equity in the Minnowbrook Tradition. *JPART* 21:i61-i76.
- ^O David Pitts. 2011. A Little Less Conversation, a Little More Action: Using Empirical Research to Promote Social Equity. *JPART* 21:i77-i82

- ^S Brian Collins and Brian Gerber. 2008. Taken for Granted? Managing for Social Equity in Grant Programs. *PAR* (Nov/Dec): 1128-1141.
- ^O _____. 2006. Redistributive Policy and Devolution: Is State Administration a Road Block (Grant) to Equitable Access to Federal Funds?. *JPART* 16:613-632.
- ^S Craig Smith and Sergio Fernandez. 2010. Equity in Federal Contracting. *PAR* (Jan/Feb): 87-94.
- ^S Julie Dolan. 2004. Gender Equity: Illusion or Reality for Women in the Federal Executive Service? *PAR* (May/June): 299-308.

Session 13 Public Management and Ethics

Objective: After taking this class students should be able to (1) understand public management from an ethics perspective; (2) know the management of ethics in public organizations; (3) know some empirical ways of studying ethics in public organizations.

Read:

- ^R Terry Cooper. 2004. Big Questions in Administrative Ethics. *PAR* 64(4): 395-407.
- ^R George Frederickson. 2010. Searching for Virtue in the Public Life. *Public Integrity* 12(3): 239-246.
- ^R Robert Smith. 2003. Enforcement or Ethical Capacity. *PAR* 63(3): 283-295.
- ^S George Frederickson and Richard Ghere. 2005. *Ethics in Public Management*. M. E. Sharpe.
- ^S Helena Stensota. 2010. The Conditions of Care: Reframing the Debate about Public Sector Ethics. *PAR* March/April: 295-303.
- ^O Sam Overman and Linda Foss. 1991. Professional Ethics: An Empirical Test of the "Separatist Thesis". *JPART* 1(2): 131-146.
- ^O Dobel, J. Patrick. 2006. Public Management as Ethics." In Ferlie, Ewan, Laurence E. Lynn Jr. and Christopher Pollitt (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. 157-181.
- ^O Mackenzie, G. Calvin. 2002. *Scandal Proof: Do Ethics Laws Make Government Ethical?* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, Chapter 7: "Lessons," pp. 149-177.
- ^O Brewer, Gene and Sally Selden. 1998. Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *JPART* 8(3): 413-439.
- ^O Kaifeng Yang. (2009). Institutional Congruence, Ideas, and Anti-Corruption Policy: The Case of China and The United States. *Public Administration Review* 69 (supplement): 142-151.
- ^O Parmelee, Marcia, Janet P. Near, and Tamila C. Jensen. 1982. Correlates of whistle-blowers' perceptions of organizational retaliation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 27(1): 17-34.
- ^O Denhardt, Kathryn. 1988. *The Ethics of Public Service*. Chapter 5: The path to a more ethical public administration: the organization. New York: Greenwood Press.
- ^O Burke, John P. 1989. Reconciling Public Administration and Democracy: The Role of the Responsible Administrator. *Public Administration Review*, 49(2): 180-185.
- ^O Stewart, Debra and Norman Sprinthall. 1993. The impact of demographic, professional, and organizational variables and domain on the moral reasoning of public administrators. In H. G. Frederickson, ed., *Ethics and Public Administration*, 205-219. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- ^O Donald Menzel. 2007. *Ethics Management for Public Administrators*. M. E. Sharpe. (Recommended, not required)

Session 14 Class Project Workshop

Session 15 Final Paper Due 11:50pm May 1st

Appendix 1: Example of a concept map

More examples will be shown during the first class.

