

Spring 2012
26:834:601:01 – Study of Public Organizations
School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA)
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark
WED 2:30 to 5:10, CPS 201

Professor Sanjay K. Pandey
Phone: 973-353-3678
E-mail: skpandey@andromeda.rutgers.edu
Office Hours: By appointment (please email for time)

NOTE: This syllabus is subject to change.

Course Description & Objectives:

There are numerous disciplinary and multi-/inter-disciplinary approaches to the study of organizations. Three approaches that you will hear about a lot are: Organization Behavior, Organization Theory, and Public Management. Organization behavior has its roots in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and primarily seeks to understand individual and small team behavior in organizational settings. Organization Theory has its roots in sociology and typically focuses on larger units of analysis than individuals and/or small teams. The public management tradition on the study of organizations came into its own in the 1980s and 1990s. J-PART, arguably the leading scholarly journal in public administration, is published by the society dedicated to advancing public management knowledge.

Given the fact that the study of public organizations -- as a field of inquiry -- draws upon so many sources, comprehensive coverage is impossible in a single course. So, my goal is not to be comprehensive in coverage. This seminar, however, aims to introduce you to key traditions of inquiry and some of the most vibrant and intriguing themes in the study of public organizations.

Specifically, this course has two key objectives:

1. Introduce you to some of the best scholarship in the study of public organizations and inculcate a sense of critical appreciation
2. Provide you with a rich “insider” perspective and experiences on scholarly research
3. Assist you in developing and honing the abilities and skills needed to be a successful researcher

Readings:

There is one assigned text for this course. A variety of readings, mostly articles from peer-reviewed journals, will be used. The instructor will make some of the readings available; you will be responsible for obtaining the rest.

Rainey, Hal G. 2009. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 4th Edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass (available at the Bookstore)

Course Policies:

1. Borrowing and building upon others' ideas is accepted in academia. What is not acceptable is presenting other's ideas as your own without acknowledging it as such. It is common for doctoral students to be 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, unblemished, and long scholarly career. It goes without saying, therefore, that all written work should have a bibliography using a standard format (APA style preferred).

Please see the following website for more details on academic integrity at Rutgers:
<http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/>

2. The University recognizes an obligation “to make all programs sponsored by Rutgers accessible to those with disabilities”. Within SPAA, you may contact Dean Gail Daniels for guidance and assistance. The University Office of Disability Services may be contacted at 973-353-5375. Further Information about disability services can be found at <http://robeson.rutgers.edu/studentlife/disability.html>. Please feel free to also contact me privately with regard to your needs in this course.

Course Requirements:

1) Readings and Participation (20% of the grade)

It goes without saying that your success as a scholar is determined partly by the breadth and depth of your reading. For some of the sessions, specific readings will be assigned and for others a discussion leader will be designated. You should go beyond the assigned readings if it helps you further your understanding. Every time you discuss readings in class, you are expected to prepare a report to share with others – this report should cite sources in APA format, summarize key arguments and discuss future directions. Your report should consider using tables or other diagrammatic representations.

Please note that if you use any of the authors' text in this report, it should be in quotes and the page # should be provided.

I expect everyone to come prepared to class having read (and also reflected over) the readings carefully.

2) Peer Review Exercise (10% of the grade)

It is important for a scholar to be familiar with the peer review process. In addition to doing a review on which you will receive feedback, guidelines about good reviewing practices will be shared. We will also discuss how one can successfully engage the peer review process as an author.

3) *Three “mini” papers (30% -- 10% each)*

Specific guidelines will be discussed in class. Each paper should be approximately 5-pages long (double-spaced). Additional pages should be used for references.

4) *Research Paper (40% of the grade)*

There is no length requirement for the final paper – ideally; however, your paper will be between 15 to 20 double-spaced pages, excluding the bibliography. Through a series of iterative steps (using peer and instructor feedback), your goal is to write a final paper that has the following key components:

- a. Clear and compelling introduction
- b. A theory section with
 - i. 3-4 hypotheses that are well argued and supported
 - ii. Thoughtful consideration of alternative explanations
- c. Conclusion that engages the value of testing the hypotheses laid out in the theory section and likely future directions

Research Paper FAQ:

1. *Can I do an alternate assignment such as writing an empirical paper (using data that I can submit post-haste for publication purposes)?*

Although I encourage you to think of and plan for publication opportunities, the answer is no. The purpose of this paper is to really engage and overcome the challenges of scholarly writing. I will be suggesting specific activities to help you succeed in this task so that what you write is clear and compelling to other public administration scholars.

2. *Will you tell me about the publication prospects of further developing the research paper I write for the course?*

Yes, I will be happy to give you my advice.

3. *Will you help me develop it by being a co-author after the semester is over?*

I am committed to your scholarly growth. You may have written a paper that is pretty close to publishable – in that case, I will not want to be a co-author but will give you my advice on how to get published and also be a “sounding board” as you engage the publication process. If you have written a paper that comports with my interests (and if my time commitments allow), we can explore how the possibility of co-authorship can help you.

4. *What is the secret of writing a great research paper?*

Reading, planning, reflection, writing, being responsive to “specific and non-specific feedback”, rewriting, rewriting and rewriting!

Course Calendar*

** Subject to change*

Week 1 (Jan 18) Introduction & Overview

- _Check Reviewing Guidelines at http://www.aom.pace.edu/amr/reviewer_guidelines.html
- _Practice Review Assigned

Week 2 (Jan 25) On Theory

Week 3 (Feb 1) On Method

- _Review Due

Week 4 (Feb 8) On Craft and Perspectives on Study of Public Organizations

Week 5 (Feb 15) What is Public?

Week 6 (Feb 22) Organizational Goals

Week 7 (Feb 29) Organizational Structure

- _Final Paper step 1 (“the hook”)

Week 8 (Mar 7) Political Context of Public Organizations

*****Spring Break *****

Week 9 (Mar 21) Motivation

Week 10 (Mar 28) Organizational Performance

- _Final Paper step 2 (theory & hypotheses)

Week 11 (April 4) Contracting

- _Final Paper step 3 (“rising up” to the critique)

Week 12 (Apr 11) Networks

Week 13 (Apr 18) Comparative Perspective

Week 14 (Apr 25) Final Paper (submission of written work and powerpoint presentation)

Readings for Seminar in Public Management

On Theory:

Bozeman, Barry. 1993. Theory, "Wisdom," and the Character of knowledge in Public Management: A Critical View of the Theory-Practice Linkage. In Barry Bozeman (ed.) *Public Management: the State of the Art*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass (pp. 27-39).

Merton, Robert K. 1968. On Sociological Theories of the Middle Range. In Robert K. Merton. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press (pp. 39-72).

Perry, James L. 1991. Strategies for building public administration theory. *Research in Public Administration*, 1: 1-18.

Lan, Zhiyong and Kathleen K. Anders. 2000. A Paradigmatic View of Contemporary Public Administration Research: An Empirical Test. *Administration & Society*. 32(2): 138-165.

On Method:

Brower, Ralph S., Mitchel Abolafia, and Jered B. Carr. 2000. On Improving Qualitative Methods in Public Administration Research. *Administration & Society*. 32(4): 363-397.

Jick, Todd D. 1979. Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4): 602-611.

Kritzer, Herbert. 1996. The Data Puzzle: The Nature of Interpretation in Quantitative Research. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(1): 1-32.

Merton, Robert K. 1968. The Bearing of Empirical Research on Sociological Theory. In Robert K. Merton. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press (pp. 156-171).

Wright, Bradley E., Lepora J. Manigault, and Tamika R. Black. 2004. Quantitative Research Measurement in Public Administration: An Assessment of Journal Publications. *Administration & Society*. 35(6): 747-764.

On Craft Aspects of Research and Perspectives on Public Management:

Bozeman, Barry and H. George Frederickson. 2006. On the Origins of Public Management Research Association. *Management Matters*. 4(1):1-7

Kulka, Richard A. 1982. Idiosyncrasy and Circumstance: Choices and Constraints in the Research Process. In Joseph E. McGrath, Joanne Martin and Richard A. Kulka (eds.) *Judgment calls in Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications (pp. 41-68).7

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.

Lynn, Laurence E. Public Management. Available at http://harrisschool.uchicago.edu/About/publications/working-papers/pdf/wp_01_24.pdf

Martin, Joanne. 1982. A Garbage Can Model of the Research Process. In Joseph E. McGrath, Joanne

Martin and Richard A. Kulka (eds.) *Judgment calls in Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications (pp. 17-39).

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1989. Reading with a purpose. In Wildavsky, Aaron. *Craftways: On the Organization of Scholarly Work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction (pp. 25-38).

What is Public?

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.

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.

Pesch, Udo. 2008. The Publicness of Public Administration. *Administration & Society*, 40(2): 170-193.

Salamon, Lester M. 1987. Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 16(1-2): 29-49.

*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., 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.

*Thoenig Jean-Claude (2006) Rescuing Publicness From Organization Studies
http://hal.inria.fr/docs/00/14/00/02/PDF/Rescuing_publicness.pdf

(Public Service) Motivation

Ambrose, Maureen L. and Kulik, Carol T. 1999. Old Friends, New Faces: Motivation Research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25, 3, 231-292.

Perry, James L. 1996. Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability

and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(1): 5-22.8

Wright, Bradley E. 2001. Public Sector Work Motivation: Review of Current Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model. *Journal of Public Administration and Research Theory*, 11(4): 559-586.

Wright, Bradley E. and Adam M. Grant. Unanswered Questions about Public Service Motivation: Designing Research to Address Key Issues of Emergence and Effects. *Unpublished working paper*

Organizational Goal Ambiguity

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.

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.

Simon, Herbert A. 1964. On the Concept of Organizational Goal. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(1): 1-22.

*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.

Performance

Heinrich, Carolyn J. 2007. False or Fitting Recognition? The Use of High Performance Bonuses in Motivating Organizational Achievements. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 26(2): 281-304

Moynihan, Donald, Sergio Fernandez, Soonhee Kim, Kelly LeRoux, Donald P. Moynihan, Suzanne J. Piotrowski, Bradley Wright, & Kaifeng Yang. (forthcoming) Performance Regimes amidst Governance Complexity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Quinn, Robert E., and John Rohrbaugh. 1981. A Competing Values Approach to Organizational Effectiveness. *Public Productivity Review*, 5(2): 122-40.

Radin, Beryl A. 1998. The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA): Hydra-Headed Monster or Flexible Management Tool? *Public Administration Review*, 58(4): 307-316.9

Bureaucratic Red Tape

Bozeman, Barry. 1993. A Theory of Government 'Red Tape'. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(3): 273-303.

Bozeman, Barry, and Patrick G. Scott. 1996. Bureaucratic Red Tape and Formalization: Untangling Conceptual Knots. *American Review of Public Administration*, 26(1): 1-17.

DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009. Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Rules. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 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.

*Kaufman, Herbert. 1977. *Red Tape: Its Origin, Uses and Abuses*. Washington, DC: Brookings.

Contracting

Brown, Trevor and Matt Potoski. 2003. Transaction Costs and Institutional Explanations for Government Service Production Decisions. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 13: 441-468.

Romzek, Barbara S., and Jocelyn M. Johnston. 2002. Contract Implementation and Management Effectiveness: A Preliminary Model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(3): 423-453.

Van Slyke, David M. 2007. Agents or stewards: using stewardship theory to understand the government-nonprofit social service contracting relationship. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17: 157-87.

Williamson, Oliver E. 2002. The Theory of the Firm as Governance Structure: From Choice to Contract. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(3): 171-195.

Networks

Brass, Daniel J., Joseph Galaskiewicz, Henrich R. Greve, and Wenpin Tsai. 2004. Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* 47 (6):795-817.

Powell, Walter W. 1990. Neither markets nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12:295-336.

Isett, Kimberley R., Ines Mergel, Kelly Leroux, Pamela Mischen, and Karl Rethmeyer. forthcoming. Networks in Public Administration Scholarship: Understanding where we are and where we need to go. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.10

Provan, Keith G., and H. Brinton Milward. 2001. Do Networks Really Work? A Framework for Evaluating Public Sector Organizational Networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4): 414-423.