

PIA 3005: Field Seminar in Public Administration (Spring 2022)

Course Information:

Class Time: Tuesday, 12:00pm–3:00pm
Classroom: 3200 Wesley W. Posvar Hall

Professor:

Gary E. Hollibaugh, Jr.
Email: gary.hollibaugh@pitt.edu
Office: 3802 Wesley W. Posvar Hall
Office Hours (Zoom Only): Monday and Friday, 9:00am-11:00am
By Appointment
Office Hours Signup: <https://calendly.com/gholliba/spring-2022-office-hours>

Course Description

This is the doctoral field course in public administration. This course reviews major developments in the field of public administration, beginning with its historical origins and then focusing on its current research frontiers. The purpose of the course is to prepare students to teach and conduct research in the field of public administration. To that end, students will be expected to turn in weekly reviews of the readings (3 to 4 pages each week per assigned reading) and a research design or paper that might form the basis of a submission to an academic journal. By no means should the readings appearing in this syllabus be construed as a comprehensive listing of what might be covered on the comprehensive exam. Rather, these readings, coupled with the various assigned and listed readings in other coursework and on the reading list, should provide students with the requisite breadth and depth of public administration scholarship for both academic and professional purposes. The format of the course will revolve around class discussion. Students are expected to read thoroughly before each class and to come prepared to critically discuss the readings. This course is open to doctoral students in any field. Master's students with sufficient background, as judged by the instructor, may enroll with the permission of the instructor.

Books and Course Materials

No books are required. All readings will be available via Pitt's [EZProxy](#) or on Canvas.

Policy on Academic Integrity

All students are expected to adhere to the standards of academic honesty. Any student engaged in cheating, plagiarism, or other acts of academic dishonesty would be subject to disciplinary action. Any student suspected of violating this obligation for any reason during the semester will be required to participate in the procedural process, initiated at the instructor level, as outlined in the University Guidelines on Academic Integrity at <https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty/academic-integrity-freedom/academic-integrity-guidelines>. In particular, any assignment found to have plagiarized material will automatically receive a failing grade for the assignment, and serious cases of plagiarism can result in a failing grade for the class, so take the time to familiarize yourself

with the rules of citation and with GSPIA's policy (found in the GSPIA handbook of academic policies and procedures).

Policy on Disabilities

If you require special accommodations or classroom modifications, please notify both the instructor and Disability Resources and Services by the end of the first week of the term. The office of Disability Resources and Services is located in 140 William Pitt Union (412-648-7890 [voice or TDD]), and their website is at <http://www.dr.s.pitt.edu>. If you have a physical, learning, or emotional disability, please let me know as early as you can so that I can accommodate you.

Policy on Classroom Recording

To ensure the free and open discussion of ideas, students may not record classroom lectures, discussion and/or activities without the advance written permission of the instructor, and any such recording properly approved in advance can be used solely for the student's own private use.

Policy on Technology

This course relies on access to computers and the Internet, though at some point during the semester you *will* have a problem with technology—your laptop will crash, a file will become corrupted, a server will go down, or something else will occur. These are facts of life, not emergencies. Technology problems will not normally be accepted as excuses for unfinished work. Count on “stuff” happening and protect yourself by doing the following:

- Plan ahead—start early, particularly if scarce resources are required.
- Save work often.
- Make regular backups of files in a different location from the originals (e.g., the cloud).
- Save drafts of work at multiple stages.
- Practice safe computing when surfing the web and checking email.
- On your personal computer, install and use software to control viruses and malware.

When submitting any assignment electronically in this course, you are responsible for any technological problems (e.g., internet connection difficulties, corrupted files, etc.). To prevent problems along with the associated lateness penalties, you should submit papers well before the deadline and take proactive steps to ensure that the file was not corrupted (e.g., check it after uploading to Canvas or copy yourself on emails and check the attached file). Again, please do not trust your computer to function correctly at the last minute.

Policy on Diversity, Inclusion, and Academic Freedom

Members of our community are encouraged to speak, write, listen, challenge and learn, without fear of censorship. Civility and mutual respect are vital to all of us, and freedom of expression does not mean the freedom to harass or threaten others. You will find that we expect members of our community to be engaged in rigorous debate, discussion, and even disagreement. At times this may challenge you and even cause discomfort. However, fostering the free exchange of ideas helps to build a campus that welcomes people of all backgrounds. Diversity of opinion and background is a fundamental strength of our community, and I consider this classroom to be a place where you will be treated with respect, and I welcome individuals of all ages, backgrounds, beliefs, documentation statuses, ethnicities, genders, gender identities, gender expressions, national origins, political beliefs, religious affiliations, sexual orientations, ability, and other visible and nonvisible differences. All members of this class are expected to contribute to a respectful, welcoming and inclusive environment for every other member of the class, so everyone can have the freedom to espouse and explore a wide range of ideas. As such, I expect that all students—as well as the instructor—will follow the guidelines set out in the **Pitt Promise**:

- I will embrace the concept of a civil community, which abhors violence, theft, and exploitation of others.
- I will commit myself to the pursuit of knowledge with personal integrity and academic honesty.
- I will respect the sanctity of the learning environment and avoid disruptive and deceitful behavior toward other members of the campus community.
- I will support a culture of diversity by respecting the rights of those who differ from myself.
- I will contribute to the development of a caring community where compassion for others and freedom of thought and expression are valued.
- I will honor, challenge, and contribute to the scholarly heritage left by those who preceded me and work to leave this a better place for those who follow.

Assignments

NOTE: Unless otherwise specified, all assignments must be turned in to Canvas at or before the beginning of class on the listed due date, and all must comport with the following formatting requirements:

- Double-spaced
- Size 11 font
- One-inch margins
- Standard font (e.g., Times New Roman, Arial, Helvetica, or something similar)
- Chicago style citations with inline citations and a reference list

Further note that neither reference lists nor technical appendices will count against any stated page limits.

Summaries of the Readings (30% of grade). Each week for which we have readings, each student will be required to provide a summary (three to four page minimum per reading) of at least one of the week's *required* readings, which will be assigned the previous week. Each summary will consist of a summary of the main argument, the evidence used in support of the argument, the theoretical model or framework used (if any), and the empirical data and methods used (if present). Students will discuss what the authors did well, critique as needed, and will write at least three questions to pose to the rest of the class.

Participation in Discussion (20% of grade). All students will be expected to have read the readings before class and to participate in discussion in a professional manner. Failure to participate will adversely affect your course grade.

Research Proposal (10% of grade). Each original research proposal will address a topic covered—or at least related to—one of the topics discussed in the course. Students are to develop an original research question and empirical design motivated by any of the required *or supplementary* readings. These questions are intended to push students beyond mere discussion of the course readings that occurs during the class seminar sessions by having each student begin to generate their own original research ideas. These original research proposals will be five pages long (double-spaced, *excluding endnotes & references*), and must conform to the Chicago Style Manual. All proposals must be submitted no later than **March 15**.

Research Design or Paper (20% of grade). The research paper will consist of an original scholarly inquiry into a substantive problem relating to the topics broadly covered in the course. This paper should be written as a journal-style article manuscript and must include the following components:

1. Statement of a research puzzle/question (incorporating a literature review);
2. A theory used to explain the puzzle/question (including central hypotheses);
3. Substantive information about relevant data used to analyze the linkage between theory and puzzle/question;
4. Data, ancillary hypotheses, and research methods;
5. Empirical findings; and
6. Conclusion/implications.

Alternatively, students may submit a research *design* that consists of bullet points (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6). In this case, the data and methods section (bulletpoint #4) will focus on the specific empirical methods and approaches to be applied to the data (which requires you to think hard about how the data might be structured, even if you do not end up collecting it), and the concluding section (bulletpoint # 6) will focus on what the possible implications of the research might

be, pending the actual results. All paper topics must be approved by the instructor by no later than **March 1** and the final paper or design is due to the instructor and discussant no later than 11:59pm on **April 22**.

Research Presentation (10% of grade). On **April 26**, each student will give a conference-style presentation of their research paper/design. Presentations should be between 10-15 minutes and should cover all six (five for research designs) bullet points listed in the previous section. After each presentation, the discussant of the paper/design will speak for five minutes, and following that there will be a brief (five to ten minutes or so) period for questions.

Research Discussant (10% of grade). The discussant will critique a colleague’s original research paper or research design at the end of the semester. This should appear in the form of four to five typed pages of comments submitted jointly to both the author and instructor at the time of the original research paper presentations on **April 26**. The first 10%-25% of such remarks should summarize what the paper is about and provide an overview of the strengths. The remaining portion of these remarks should list constructive comments and suggestions intended to improve the author’s work. The discussant will spend five minutes summarizing their remarks at the end of the presentation of the relevant paper/design.

Grading

Below is how your final percentage grade will be mapped into a letter grade.

Percentage point range	Letter grade
93+	A
90–92.999...	A-
87–89.999...	B+
83–86.999...	B
80–82.999...	B-
77–79.999...	C+
73–76.999...	C
70–72.999...	C-
60–69.999...	D
0–59.999...	F

Late Assignments

Assignments are due at or before the beginning of class on the dates indicated on the syllabus. **All assignments must be submitted via Canvas.** Written material submitted within 24 hours of the deadline will be accepted with a 10% grade reduction per day, and nothing will be accepted more than 24 hours after the deadline without prior approval of the instructor.

However, students occasionally request an extension at the end of the semester if they cannot complete their assignments due to serious unforeseen circumstances. A “G” grade will be given only under exceptional circumstances, at the discretion of the instructor, and should be discussed

with the instructor before the end of the term. According to GSPIA policy, a student must remove the G grade by completing the assigned work for the course as soon as possible in the semester following the course.

Grade Appeals

All appeals must be made in writing to the instructor. No grade appeals will be considered within the first 24 hours of a grade being posted on Canvas; those that come in within the first 24 hours will be discarded. All grade appeals must be received within seven calendar days of the grade being posted on Canvas to be considered (unless the due date is within ten days of the grade submission deadline, in which case appeals must be received within one calendar day); those that arrive after this deadline will be discarded. All appeals must contain the following information:

- The name of the assignment in question.
- The reason why you believe your grade should be higher. Be specific and discuss this in the context of the requirements of the assignment.
- Determine whether you believe it is an error of calculation (that is, the instructor incorrectly tabulated points), judgment (the grade received does not reflect the quality of the assignment), or both.

If the instructor determines that an error of calculation is present, then the correct grade will be calculated and the correct grade will be posted. If it is argued by the student that an error of judgment is present, then the student has the option to have the assignment graded *de novo* by the instructor. Because this will be a regrade, there is the possibility that the grade given to the regraded assignment will be lower than that given to the initial submission. Regardless, all decisions by the instructor are final.

Policy on Email

Any requests to the instructor (*e.g.*, meetings outside of office hours) *must* be made in writing via email so everyone has a record of the request and decision. **For emails sent between Monday and Thursday, inclusive, please allow the instructor up to 48 hours to respond. For those sent between Friday and Sunday, inclusive, please allow the instructor up to 96 hours to respond.** *The instructor endorses the general principles for email communication (for any professional communication via email, not just those for this class) outlined here.*

Covid-19 Policy

I want to be frank. Life is challenging right now, and none of us are really okay. We're all just pretending. You most likely know people who have lost their jobs, have tested positive for Covid-19, have been hospitalized, or perhaps have even died. Most or all of you have had changes in your work responsibilities and increased family care responsibilities. You might be caring for extra people right now, and you are likely facing uncertain job prospects (or have been laid off!).

I'm fully committed to making sure that you learn everything you were hoping to learn from

this class! I will make whatever accommodations I can to help you understand the class material. Under ordinary conditions, I am flexible and lenient with grading and course expectations when students face difficult challenges. Under current conditions, that flexibility and leniency is intensified. If you tell me you are having trouble, I will not judge you or think less of you. I hope you'll extend me the same grace.

You never owe me personal information about your health (mental or physical). If you need extra help, or if you need more time with something, or if you feel like you're behind or not understanding everything, do not suffer in silence! Talk to me! I will work with you. I promise.

Please email me to set up a time to meet over Zoom, or we can have an email dialogue, if you prefer. I want you to learn lots of things from this class, but I primarily want you to stay healthy, balanced, and grounded during this crisis.

Course Topics

Note: The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary. We may not cover all of these topics, nor all of the readings listed. Conversely, time permitting, other topics might be covered in this course. Moreover, even if we do not cover something in class, you are still responsible for knowing what is in the readings.

January 11: Introduction to the Course

January 18: Foundations of Modern Public Administration

- *Required Readings*

- Dahl, Robert A. 1947. “**The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems.**” *Public Administration Review* 7(1):1–11.
- Finer, Herman. 1941. “**Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government.**” *Public Administration Review* 1(4):335–350.
- Friedrich, Carl J. 1940. “**Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility.**” *Public Policy* 1(1):3–24.
- Kaufman, Herbert. 1956. “**Emerging Conflicts in the Doctrines of Public Administration.**” *American Political Science Review* 50(4):1057–1073.
- Long, Norton E. 1952. “**Bureaucracy and Constitutionalism.**” *American Political Science Review* 46(3):808–818.
- Nelson, Michael. 1982. “**A Short, Ironic History of American National Bureaucracy.**” *Journal of Politics* 44(3):747–778.
- Roberts, Alasdair. 2020. “**Bearing the White Man’s Burden: American Empire and the Origin of Public Administration.**” *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 3(3):185–196.
- Schachter, Hindy Lauer. 2002. “**Women, Progressive-Era Reform, and Scientific Management.**” *Administration & Society* 34(5):563–578.

- Simon, Herbert A. 1946. “**The Proverbs of Administration.**” *Public Administration Review* 6(1):53–67.

- *Supplementary Readings*

- Appleby, Paul H. 1949. *Policy and Administration*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Barnard, Chester I. 1938. *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bertelli, Anthony M. and Madalina Busuioc. 2021. “Reputation-Sourced Authority and the Prospect of Unchecked Bureaucratic Power.” *Public Administration Review* 81(1):38–48.
- Blau, Peter M. 1955. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy: A Study of Interpersonal Relations in Two Governmental Agencies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, James M. and Gordon Tullock. 1963. *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. and George A. Krause. 2012. “Reputation and Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 72(1):26–32.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. and George A. Krause. 2015. “Transactional Authority and Bureaucratic Politics.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(1):5–25.
- Cyert, Richard M. and James G. March. 1992. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Second Edition. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gaus, John Merriman. 1947. *Reflections on Public Administration*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Gulick, Luther. 1937. “Notes on the Theory of Organization.” In *The Early Sociology of Management and Organizations, Volume IV: Papers on the Science of Administration*, edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, 1–49. New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Hindy, Lauer Schachter. 2002. “Women, Progressive-Era Reform, and Scientific Management.” *Administration & Society* 34(5):563–578.
- Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. 2001. “The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For.” *Public Administration Review* 61(2):144–160.
- March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. 1993. *Organizations*. Second Edition. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O’Toole. 2006. *Bureaucracy in a Democratic State: A Governance Perspective*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mosher, Frederick C. 1968. *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Plant, Jeremy F. 2011. “Carl J. Friedrich on Responsibility and Authority.” *Public Administration Review* 71(3):471–482.

- Selznick, Philip. 1943. “An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy.” *American Sociological Review* 8(1):47–54.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1997. *Administrative Behavior*. Fourth Edition. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1948. *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952. “Development of Theory of Democratic Administration.” *American Political Science Review* 46(1):81–103.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1991. “Comparative Economic Organization: The Analysis of Discrete Structural Alternatives.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36(2):269–296.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1999. “Public and Private Bureaucracies: A Transaction Cost Economics Perspective.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 15(1):306–342.
- Wilson, Woodrow. 1887. “The Study of Administration.” *Political Science Quarterly* 2(2):197–222.

January 25: Tasks in Administrative Organizations

- *Required Readings*

- Anderson, Derrick M. and Justin M. Stritch. 2016. “Goal Clarity, Task Significance, and Performance: Evidence From a Laboratory Experiment.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 26(2):211–225.
- Bertelli, Anthony M. 2016. “Who Are the Policy Workers, and What Are They Doing? Citizen’s Heuristics and Democratic Accountability in Complex Governance.” *Public Performance & Management Review* 40(2):208–234.
- Carrigan, Christopher. 2018. “Unpacking the Effects of Competing Mandates on Agency Performance.” *Public Administration Review* 78(5):669–683.
- Chun, Young Han and Hal G. Rainey. 2005. “Goal Ambiguity in U.S. Federal Agencies.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(1):1–30.
- DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009. “Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Organizational Rules.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(2):361–384.
- Moynihan, Donald, Pamela Herd, and Hope Harvey. 2015. “Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(1):43–69.
- Pfaff, Steven, Charles Crabtree, Holger L. Kern, and John B. Holbein. 2021. “Do Street-Level Bureaucrats Discriminate Based on Religion? A Large-Scale Correspondence Experiment among American Public School Principals.” *Public Administration Review* 81(2):244–259.
- Wood, Abby K. and David E. Lewis. 2017. “Agency Performance Challenges and Agency Politicization.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 27(4):581–595.

- *Supplementary Readings*

- Brehm, John and Scott Gates. 1997. *Working, Shirking, and Sabotage: Bureaucratic Response to a Democratic Public*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Carpenter, Daniel P., Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, Susan Moffitt, and Clayton Nall. 2012. “The Complications of Controlling Agency Time Discretion: FDA Review Deadlines and Postmarket Drug Safety.” *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1):98–114.
- Carpenter, Daniel P., Susan I. Moffitt, Colin D. Moore, Ryan T. Rynbrandt, Michael M. Ting, Ian Yohai, and Evan James Zucker. 2010. “Early Entrant Protection in Approval Regulation: Theory and Evidence from FDA Drug Review.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 26(3):515–545.
- Downs, Anthony. 1967. *Inside Bureaucracy*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown
- Herd, Pamela and Donald P. Moynihan. 2018. *Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Heinrich, Carolyn J. 2016. “The Bite of Administrative Burden: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation.” *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 26(3):403–420.
- Huber, Gregory A. 2007. *The Craft of Bureaucratic Neutrality: Interests and Influence of Government Regulation in Occupational Safety*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufman, Herbert A. 1960. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Moffitt, Susan L. 2010. “Promoting Agency Reputation through Public Advice: Advisory Committee Use in the FDA.” *Journal of Politics* 72(3):880–893.
- Rainey, Hal G. and Chan Su Jung. 2015. “A Conceptual Framework for Analysis of Goal Ambiguity in Public Organizations.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(1):71–99.
- Scholz, John T. and B. Dan Wood. 1999. “Equity, Efficiency, and Politics: Democratic Controls on the Tax Collector.” *American Journal of Political Science* 43(4):1166–1188.
- Ting, Michael M. 2011. “Organizational Capacity.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 27(2):245–271.
- Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books.

February 1: Inter-Agency, Inter-Governmental, and Inter-Sector Coordination Between Administrative Organizations

- *Required Readings*

- Amirkhanyan, Anna A., Hyun Joon Kim, and Kristina T. Lambright. 2012. “**Closer Than “Arms Length”**: Understanding the Factors Associated With Collaborative Contracting.” *American Review of Public Administration* 42(3):341–366.

- Ansell, Chris and Alison Gash. 2008. “Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(4):543–571.
 - Brown, Trevor L., Matthew Potoski, and David Van Slyke. 2016. “Managing Complex Contracts: A Theoretical Approach.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 26(2):294–308.
 - Emerson, Kirk, Tina Nabatchi, and Brian Balogh. 2012. “An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(1):1–29.
 - Knott, Jack H. 1993. “Comparing Public and Private Management: Cooperative Effort and Principal-Agent Relationships.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 3(1): 93–119.
 - Ostrom, Vincent, Charles M. Tiebout, and Robert Warren. 1961. “The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry.” *American Political Science Review* 55(4):831–842.
 - Romzek, Barbara S. and Jocelyn M. Johnston. 2005. “State Social Services Contracting: Exploring the Determinants of Effective Contract Accountability.” *Public Administration Review* 65(4):436–449
 - Williamson, Oliver E. 1979. “Transaction-Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations.” *Journal of Law & Economics* 22(2): 233–261.
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Alonso, José M., Judith Clifton, and Daniel Díaz-Fuentes. 2015. “Did New Public Management Matter? An Empirical Analysis of the Outsourcing and Decentralization Effects on Public Sector Size.” *Public Management Review* 17(5):643–660
 - Bertelli, Anthony M. 2006. “Governing the Quango: An Auditing and Cheating Model of Quasi-Government Authorities.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(2):239–261.
 - Fernandez, Sergio. 2009. “Understanding Contract Performance: An Empirical Analysis.” *Administration & Society* 41(1):67–100.
 - Koppell, Jonathan G. S. 2003. *The Politics of Quasi-Government*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 - Milward, H. Brinton and Keith G. Provan. 2000. “Governing the Hollow State.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2):359–380.
 - Van Slyke, David M. 2003. “The Mythology of Privatization in Contracting for Social Services.” *Public Administration Review* 63(3):296–315.

February 8: Human Capital in Administrative Organizations

- *Required Readings*
 - Brewer, Gene A. and Richard M. Walker. 2013. “Personnel Constraints in Public Organizations: The Impact of Reward and Punishment on Organizational Performance.” *Public Administration Review* 73(1):121–131.

- Bullock, Justin B., Justin M. Stritch, and Hal G. Rainey. 2015. “International Comparison of Public and Private Employees’ Work Motives, Attitudes, and Perceived Rewards.” *Public Administration Review* 75(3):479–489.
 - Fernandez, Sergio and Tima Moldogaziev. 2013. “Using Employee Empowerment to Encourage Innovative Behavior in the Public Sector.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(1):155–187.
 - Kellough, J. Edward and Lloyd G. Nigro. 2006. “Dramatic Reform of the Civil Service: At-Will Employment and the Creation of a New Public Workforce.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(3):447–466.
 - Kinane, Christina M. 2021. “Control Without Confirmation: The Politics of Vacancies in Presidential Appointments.” *American Political Science Review* 115(2):599–614.
 - Lewis, David E. 2019. “Deconstructing the Administrative State.” *Journal of Politics* 81(3):767–789.
 - Perry, James L. 2010. “A Strategic Agenda for Public Human Resource Management.” *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 30(1):20–43.
 - Petrovsky, Nicolai, Oliver James, and George Boyne. 2015. “New Leaders’ Managerial Backgrounds and the Performance of Public Organizations: The Theory of Publicness Fit.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(1):217–236.
 - Tolbert, Pamela S. and Lynne G. Zucker. 1983. “Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880–1935.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 27(4):22–39
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Aberbach, Joel D. and Bert A. Rockman. 2000. *In the Web of Politics: Three Decades of the U.S. Federal Executive*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
 - Hecl, Hugh. 1977. *A Government of Strangers: Executive Politics in Washington*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
 - Hollibaugh, Gary E., Jr., Gabriel Horton, and David E. Lewis. 2014. “Presidents and Patronage.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58(4):1024–1042.
 - Kellough, J. Edward and Lloyd G. Nigro. 2014. *The New Public Personnel Administration*. 7th edition. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
 - Lewis, David E. 2008. *The Politics of Presidential Appointments: Political Control and Bureaucratic Performance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
 - Resh, William G. 2015. *Rethinking the Administrative Presidency: Trust, Intellectual Capital, and Appointee-Careerist Relations in the George W. Bush Administration*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
 - Seidman, Harold and Robert S. Gilmour. 1986. *Politics, Position, and Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

February 15: Leadership and Managerial Capabilities Within Administrative Organizations

• *Required Readings*

- Bellé, Nicola and Paolo Cantarelli. 2018. “The Role of Motivation and Leadership in Public Employee’s Job Preferences: Evidence from Two Discrete Choice Experiments.” *International Public Management Journal* 21(2):191–212.
- Bertelli, Anthony M. and Laurence J. Lynn, Jr. 2003. “Managerial Responsibility.” *Public Administration Review* 63(3): 259–268.
- Bozeman, Barry and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2004. “Public Management Decision Making: Effects of Decision Content.” *Public Administration Review* 64(5):553–565.
- Fernandez, Sergio. 2005. “Developing and Testing an Integrative Framework of Public Sector Leadership: Evidence from the Public Education Arena.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(2):197–217.
- Hassan, Shahidul and Deneen M. Hatmaker. 2015. “Leadership and Performance of Public Employees: Effects of the Quality and Characteristics of Manager-Employee Relationships.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(4):1127–1155.
- Keiser, Lael R. 2010. “Understanding Street-Level Bureaucrats’ Decision Making: Determining Eligibility in the Social Security Disability Program.” *Public Administration Review* 70(2):247–257.
- Landau, Martin and Russell Stout, Jr. 1979. “To Manage is Not to Control: Or the Folly of Type II Errors.” *Public Administration Review* 39(2):148–156.
- Moynihan, Donald P. and Stéphane Lavertu. 2012. “Cognitive Biases in Governing: Technology Preferences in Election Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 71(1):68–77.
- van Wart, Montgomery. 2003. “Public-Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment.” *Public Administration Review* 63(2):214–228.

• *Supplementary Readings*

- Brodbeck, Felix C., Rudolf Kerschreiter, Andreas Mojzisch and Stefan Schulz-Hardt. 2007. “Group Decision Making Under Conditions of Distributed Knowledge: The Information Asymmetries Model.” *Academy of Management Review* 32(2):459–479.
- Heimann, Larry C.F. 1997. “Understanding the Challenger Disaster: Organizational Structure and the Design of Reliable Systems.” *American Political Science Review* 87(2):421–435.
- Hodgkinson, Gerard P. and Mark P. Healey. 2008. “Cognition in Organizations.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 59(1):387–417.
- Ilgen, Daniel R. 1999. “Teams Embedded in Organizations: Some Implications.” *American Psychologist* 54(2):129–139.
- Ilgen, Daniel R., John R. Hollenbeck, Michael Johnson, and Dustin Jundt. 2005. “Teams in Organizations: From Input-Process-Output Models to IMO Models.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 56(1):517–543.

- Jilke, Sebastian, Gregg G. Van Ryzin, and Steven Van de Walle. 2016 “Responses to Decline in Marketized Public Services: An Experimental Evaluation of Choice Overload.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 26(3):421–432.
- Jones, Bryan D. 1999. “Bounded Rationality.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1):297–321.
- Kaufman, Herbert. 1981. *The Administrative Behavior of Federal Bureau Chiefs*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Kerr, Norbert L. and R. Scott Tindale. 2004. “Group Performance and Decision Making.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 55(1):623–655.
- Lindblom, Charles. 1959. “The Science of “Muddling Through.”” *Public Administration Review* 19(2):79–88.
- Miller, Gary J. 1992. *Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moynihan, Donald P. and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2005. “Testing How Management Matters in an Era of Government by Performance Management.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(3):421–439.

February 22: Hierarchies, Networks, and Markets in Public Administration

- *Required Readings*

- Brown, Trevor L., Matthew Potoski, and David M. Van Slyke. 2006. “**Managing Public Service Contracts: Aligning Values, Institutions, and Markets.**” *Public Administration Review* 66(3):323–331.
- Hammond, Thomas H. and Paul A. Thomas. 1989. “**The Impossibility of a Neutral Hierarchy.**” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 5(1):155–184.
- 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.
- Miller, Gary J. and Andrew B. Whitford. 2007. “**The Principal’s Moral Hazard: Constraints on the Use of Incentives in Hierarchy.**” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(2): 213–233.
- O’Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 1997. “**The Implications for Democracy of a Networked Bureaucratic World.**” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(3):443–459.
- O’Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 2015. “**Networks and Networking: The Public Administrative Agendas.**” *Public Administration Review* 75(3):361–371.
- Riccucci, Norma M. 2001. “**The ‘Old’ Public Management Versus the ‘New’ Public Management: Where Does Public Administration Fit In?**” *Public Administration Review* 61(2):172–175.
- Stark, Andrew. 2011. “**The Distinction between Public, Nonprofit, and For-Profit: Revisiting the ‘Core Legal’ Approach.**” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(1):3–26.

- Thacher, David. 2004. “Interorganizational Partnerships as Inchoate Hierarchies: A Case Study of the Community Security Initiative.” *Administration & Society* 36(1):91–127.
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2001. “Big Questions in Public Network Management Research.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(3):295–326.
 - Bendor, Jonathan. 1985. *Parallel Systems: Redundancy in Government*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
 - Berry, Frances S., Ralph S. Brower, Sang Ok Choi, Wendy Xinfang Goa, HeeSoun Jang, Myungjung Kwon, and Jessica Word. 2004. “Three Traditions of Network Research: What the Public Management Research Agenda Can Learn from Other Research Communities.” *Public Administration Review* 64(5):539–552.
 - LaPorte, Todd R. 1996. “Shifting Vantage and Conceptual Puzzles in Understanding Public Organization Networks.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1):49–74.
 - Light, Paul C. 1995. *Thickening Government: Federal Hierarchy and the Diffusion of Accountability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
 - McGuire, Michael and Robert Agranoff. 2011. “The Limitations of Public Management Networks.” *Public Administration* 89(2):265–284.
 - O’Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 1997. “Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 57(1):45–52.
 - Provan, Keith G. and H. Brinton Milward. 1995. “A Preliminary Theory of Interorganizational Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Four Community Mental Health Systems.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40(1):1–33.
 - Teisman, Geert R. and Erik-Hans Klijn. 2002. “Partnership Arrangements: Governmental Rhetoric or Governance Scheme?” *Public Administration Review* 62(2):197–205.
 - Thomson, Anne Marie, James L. Perry, and Theodore K. Miller. 2009. “Conceptualizing and Measuring Collaboration.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(1):23–56.

March 1: Public Administration’s Internal Environment: Expertise, Motivation, and Performance

- Research Topics Due to Instructor by 11:59pm on March 1
- *Required Readings*
 - Amirkhanyan, Anna A., Hyun Joon Kim, and Kristina T. Lambright. 2014. “The Performance Puzzle: Understanding the Factors Influencing Alternative Dimensions and

- Views of Performance.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24(1):1–34.
- Grissom, Jason A., Samantha L. Viano, and Jennifer L. Selin. 2016. “*Understanding Employee Turnover in the Public Sector: Insights from Research on Teacher Mobility.*” *Public Administration Review* 76(2):241–251.
 - Perry, James L., Debra Mesch, and Laurie Paarlberg. 2006. “*Motivating Employees in a New Governance Era: The Performance Paradigm Revisited.*” *Public Administration Review* 66(4):505–514.
 - Perry, James L. and Lois Recascino Wise. 1990. “*The Motivational Bases of Public Service.*” *Public Administration Review* 50(3):367–373.
 - Pollitt, Christopher. 2006. “*Performance Management in Practice: A Comparative Study of Executive Agencies.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(1):25–44.
 - Richardson, Mark D. 2019. “*Politicization and Expertise: Exit, Effort, and Investment.*” *Journal of Politics* 81(3):878–891.
 - Teodoro, Manuel P. 2010. “*Contingent Professionalism: Bureaucratic Mobility and the Adoption of Water Conservation Rates.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(2):437–459.
 - Thompson, James R. 2006. “*The Federal Civil Service: The Demise of an Institution.*” *Public Administration Review* 66(4):496–503.
 - 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.
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Bertelli, Anthony M. 2007. “*Determinants of Bureaucratic Turnover Intention: Evidence from the Department of Treasury.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(2):235–258.
 - Gailmard, Sean and John W. Patty. 2012. *Learning While Governing: Expertise and Accountability in the Executive Branch.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 - Heckman, James, Carolyn Heinrich, and Jeffrey Smith. 1997 “*Assessing the Performance of Performance Standards in Public Bureaucracies.*” *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 87(2):389–395.
 - Hollibaugh, Gary E., Jr. 2015. “*Naïve Cronyism and Neutral Competence: Patronage, Performance, and Policy Agreement in Executive Appointments.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(2):341–372.
 - Marvel, John D. 2016 “*Unconscious Bias in Citizens’ Evaluations of Public Sector Performance.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 26(1):143–158.
 - Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O’Toole, Jr. 1999. “*Modeling the Impact of Public Management: Implications of Structural Context.*” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(4):505–526.

- Meier, Kenneth J. and Laurence J. O’Toole, Jr. 2013. “Subjective Organizational Performance and Measurement Error: Common Source Bias and Spurious Relationships.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(2):429-456.
- Mosher, Frederick C. 1968. *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rainey, Hal G. and Paula Steinbauer. 1999. “Gallopings Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(1):1–32.
- Wilson, James Q. 1995. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. Second Edition. New York: Basic Books.

March 8: SPRING BREAK — NO CLASS

March 15: Research Workshop I

- Research Proposals Due to Instructor by 11:59am on March 15 for in-class discussion

March 22: Representative Bureaucracy—Descriptive and Substantive Representation in Public Administration

- *Required Readings*

- Andrews, Rhys and Rachel Ashworth. 2015. “Representation and Inclusion in Public Organizations: Evidence from the U.K. Civil Service.” *Public Administration Review* 75(2):279–288.
- Cook, Brian J. 1992. “The Representative Function of Bureaucracy: Public Administration in Constitutional Perspective.” *Administration and Society* 23(4):403–429.
- Foldy, Erica Gabrielle. 2004. “Learning from Diversity: A Theoretical Exploration.” *Public Administration Review* 64(5):529–538.
- Johnson, Tim. 2015. “Service after Serving: Does Veterans’ Preference Diminish the Quality of the US Federal Service?” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(3):669–696.
- Kennedy, Brandy. 2014. “Unraveling Representative Bureaucracy: A Systematic Analysis of the Literature.” *Administration & Society* 46(4):395–421.
- Kropf, Martha, Timothy Vercellotti and David C. Kimball. 2013. “Representative Bureaucracy and Partisanship: The Implementation of Election Law.” *Public Administration Review* 73(2):242–252.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 2019. “Theoretical Frontiers in Representative Bureaucracy: New Directions for Research.” *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 2(1):39–56.
- Nielsen, Vibeke Lehmann. 2015. “Personal Attributes and Institutions: Gender and the Behavior of Public Employees. Why Gender Matters to not only “Gendered Policy Areas.”” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 25(4):1005–1029.

- Riccucci, Norma M. and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2017. “Representative Bureaucracy: A Lever to Enhance Social Equity, Coproduction, and Democracy.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 77(1):21–30.
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Bhavnani, Rikhil R. and Alexander Lee. “Does Affirmative Action Worsen Bureaucratic Performance? Evidence from the Indian Administrative Service.” *American Journal of Political Science* 65(1):5–20.
 - Bowling, Cynthia J., Christine A. Kelleher, Jennifer Jones, and Deil S. Wright. 2006. “Cracked Ceilings, Firmer Floors, and Weakening Walls: Trends and Patterns in Gender Representation among Executives Leading American State Agencies, 1970–2000.” *Public Administration Review* 66(6):823–836.
 - Brunjes, Benjamin M. and J. Edward Kellough. 2018. “Representative Bureaucracy and Government Contracting: A Further Examination of Evidence from Federal Agencies.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 28(4):519–534.
 - Dolan, Julie. 2002. “Representative Bureaucracy in the Federal Executive: Gender and Spending Priorities.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(3):353–375.
 - Dolan, Julie. 2004. “Gender Equity: Illusion or Reality for Women in the Federal Executive Service?” *Public Administration Review* 64(3):299–308.
 - Fernandez, Sergio, Deanna Malatesta, and Craig R. Smith. 2013. “Race, Gender, and Government Contracting: Different Explanations or New Prospects for Theory?” *Public Administration Review* 73(1):109–120.
 - Greene, Vernon, Sally Coleman Selden, and Gene Brewer. 2001. “Measuring Power and Presence: Bureaucratic Representation in the American States.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(3):379–402.
 - Grissom, Jason A., Jill Nicholson-Crotty, and Lael Keiser. 2012. “Does My Boss’s Gender Matter? Explaining Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover in the Public Sector.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(4):649–673.
 - Lewis, Gregory B. and David W. Pitts. 2011. “Representation of Lesbians and Gay Men in Federal, State, and Local Bureaucracies.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(1):159–180.
 - Marvel, John D. and William G. Resh. 2015. “Bureaucratic Discretion, Client Demographics, and Representative Bureaucracy.” *American Review of Public Administration* 45(3):281–310.
 - Opstrup, Niels and Anders R. Villadsen. 2015. “The Right Mix? Gender Diversity in Top Management Teams and Financial Performance.” *Public Administration Review* 75(2):291–301.
 - Riccucci, Norma M., Gregg G. Van Ryzin, and Cecilia F. Lavena. 2014. “Representative Bureaucracy in Policing: Does It Increase Perceived Legitimacy?” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24(3):537–551.

- Riccucci, Norma M., Gregg G. Van Ryzin and Huafang Li. 2016. “Representative Bureaucracy and the Willingness to Coproduce: An Experimental Study.” *Public Administration Review* 76(1): 121–130.
- Saidel, Judith R. and Karyn Loscocco. 2005. “Agency Leaders, Gendered Institutions, and Representative Bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review* 65(2):158–170.
- Smith, Amy E. and Karen R. Monaghan. 2013. “Some Ceilings Have More Cracks: Representative Bureaucracy in Federal Regulatory Agencies.” *American Review of Public Administration* 43(1):50–71.

March 29: Political Institutions & Organized Interests

• *Required Readings*

- Clinton, Joshua D., David E. Lewis, and Jennifer Selin. 2014. “**Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight.**” *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2):387–401.
- Golden, Melissa Martino. 1998. “**Interest Groups in the Rule Making Process: Who Participates? Whose Voice Gets Heard?**” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2):245–270.
- Gordon, Sanford C. 2011. “**Politicizing Agency Spending Authority: Lessons From a Bush Era Scandal.**” *American Political Science Review* 105(4):717–734.
- MacDonald, Jason A. 2010. “**Limitation Riders and Congressional Influence over Bureaucratic Policy Decisions.**” *American Political Science Review* 104(4):766–782.
- McCubbins, Mathew D., and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. “**Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms.**” *American Journal of Political Science* 28(1):165–179.
- Nicholson-Crotty, Jill and Susan M. Miller. 2012. “**Bureaucratic Effectiveness and Influence in the Legislature.**” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(2):347–371.
- Potter, Rachel A. 2017. “**Slow-Rolling, Fast-Tracking, and the Pace of Bureaucratic Decisions in Rulemaking.**” *Journal of Politics* 79(3):841–855.
- Roberts, Alasdair. 1996. “**Why the Brownlow Committee Failed: Neutrality and Partisanship in the Early Years of Public Administration.**” *Administration and Society* 28(1):3–38.
- Yackee, Susan Webb. 2012. “**“The Politics of Ex Parte Lobbying: Pre-Proposal Agenda Building and Blocking During Agency Rulemaking.”** *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22(2):373–393.

• *Supplementary Readings*

- Balla, Steven J. and John R. Wright. 2001. “Interest Groups, Advisory Committees, and Congressional Control of the Bureaucracy.” *American Journal of Political Science* 45(4):799–812.

- Bertelli, Anthony M. and Christian Grose. 2009. “Secretaries of Pork? A New Theory of Distributive Public Policy.” *Journal of Politics* 71(3):926-945.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. 1996. “Adaptive Signal Processing, Hierarchy, and Budgetary Control in Federal Regulation.” *American Political Science Review* 90(2):283–302
- Carpenter, Daniel P. 2002. “Groups, the Media, Agency Waiting Costs, and FDA Drug Approval.” *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3):490–505.
- LeRoux, Kelly. 2009. “Paternalistic or Participatory Governance? Examining Opportunities for Client Participation in Nonprofit Social Service Organizations.” *Public Administration Review* 69(3):504-517.
- Lowande, Kenneth. 2018. “Who Polices the Administrative State?” *American Political Science Review* 112(4):874–890.
- McCubbins, Mathew D., Roger G. Noll, and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. “Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 3(2):243–277.
- Moe, Terry M. 1985. “Control and Feedback in Economic Regulation: The Case of the NLRB.” *American Political Science Review* 79(4):1094–1116.
- 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.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(4):511-532.
- Pollitt, Christopher. 2001. “Clarifying Convergence: Striking Similarities and Durable Differences in Public Management Reform.” *Public Management Review* 3(4):471–492.
- Potter, Rachel A. 2019. *Bending the Rules: Procedural Politicking in the Bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roberts, Alasdair. 2019. “Shaking Hands with Hitler: The Politics-Administration Dichotomy and Engagement with Fascism.” *Public Administration Review* 79(2):267–276.
- Rosenbloom, David H. 2000. *Building a Legislative-Centered Public Administration: Congress and the Administrative State, 1946-1999*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Shipan, Charles R. 2004. “Regulatory Regimes, Agency Actions, and the Conditional Nature of Congressional Influence.” *American Political Science Review* 98(3):467–480.

April 5: Accountability of Public Administrators

- Required Readings

- Aberbach, Joel D. and Bert A. Rockman. 1988. “Mandates or Mandarins? Control and Discretion in the Modern Administrative State.” *Public Administration Review* 48(2):606–612.

- Koppell, Jonathan G.S. 2005. “Pathologies of Accountability: ICANN and the Challenge of “Multiple Accountabilities Disorder.”” *Public Administration Review* 65(1):94–108.
 - Krause, George A., David E. Lewis, and James W. Douglas. 2006. “Political Appointments, Civil Service Systems, and Bureaucratic Competence: Organizational Balancing and Executive Branch Revenue Forecasts in the American States.” *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3):770–787.
 - Miller, Susan M. 2013. “Administering Representation: The Role of Elected Administrators in Translating Citizens’ Preferences into Public Policy.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(4):865–897.
 - Pfiffner, James P. 1987. “Political Appointees and Career Executives: The Democracy-Bureaucracy Nexus in the Third Century.” *Public Administration Review* 47(1):57–65.
 - Romzek, Barbara S. and Melvin J. Dubnik. 1987. “Accountability in the Public Sector: Lessons from the Challenger Tragedy.” *Public Administration Review* 47(3):227–238.
 - Rourke, Francis E. 1992. “Responsiveness and Neutral Competence in American Bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review* 52(6):539–546.
 - Svava, James H. 2006. “Introduction: Politicians and Administrators in the Political Process—A Review of Themes and Issues in the Literature.” *International Journal of Public Administration* 29(12):953–976.
- Supplementary Readings
 - Bertelli, Anthony Michael. 2021. *Democracy Administered: How Public Administration Shapes Representative Government*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 - Dunn, Delmer D. and Jerome S. Legge, Jr. 2001. “U.S. Local Government Managers and the Complexity of Responsibility and Accountability in Democratic Governance,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(1):73–88.
 - Wise, Charles R. and Christian M. Freitag. 2002. “Balancing Accountability and Risk in Program Implementation: The Case of National Fire Policy.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(4):493–523.
 - Whitford, Andrew B. 2007. “Decentralized Policy Implementation.” *Political Research Quarterly* 60(1):17–30.

April 12: Ex Ante Controls, Credible Commitment, and Agency Design

- Required Readings
 - Bourdeaux, Carolyn. 2008. “Politics versus Professionalism: The Effect of Institutional Structure on Democratic Decision Making in a Contested Policy Arena.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(3):349–373.
 - Lewis, David E. and Jennifer L. Selin. 2015. “Political Control and the Forms of Agency Independence.” *The George Washington Law Review* 83(4/5):1487–1516.

- Macey, Jonathan R. 1992. “Organizational Design and Political Control of Administrative Agencies.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 8(1):93–110.
 - Miller, Gary. 2000. “Above Politics: Credible Commitment and Efficiency in the Design of Public Agencies.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2):289–327.
 - Moe, Ronald C. 2001. “The Emerging Federal Quasi Government: Issues of Management and Accountability.” *Public Administration Review* 61(3):290–312.
 - Moe, Terry M. 1985. “The Politics of Bureaucratic Structure.” In *Can the Government Govern?*, edited by John E. Chubb and Paul E. Peterson, pp. 267–329. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
 - Sinclair, Amber H. and Andrew B. Whitford. 2013. “Separation and Integration in Public Health: Evidence from Organizational Structure in the States.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(1):55–77.
- *Supplementary Readings*
 - Knott, Jack H. and Gary J. Miller. 1987. *Reforming Bureaucracy: The Politics of Institutional Choice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
 - Krause, George A. and James W. Douglas. 2013. “Organizational Structure and the Optimal Design of Policymaking Panels: Evidence from Consensus Group Commissions’ Revenue Forecasts in the American States.” *American Journal of Political Science* 57(1):135–149.
 - Lewis, David E. 2002. “The Politics of Agency Termination: Confronting the Myth of Agency Immortality.” *Journal of Politics* 64(1):89–107.
 - Lewis, David E. 2003. *Presidents and the Politics of Agency Design: Political Insulation in the United States Government Bureaucracy, 1946–1997*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
 - Miller, Gary J. and Andrew B. Whitford. 2016. *Above Politics: Bureaucratic Discretion and Credible Commitment*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 - North, Douglass C. 1990. “A Transaction Cost Theory of Politics.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 2(4):355–367.

April 19: Research Workshop II

April 26: Research Presentations

- Research Papers Due to Instructor and Discussant by 11:59pm on April 22
- Research Presentation Materials and Research Discussant Remarks Due Before Class