



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Public Policy and Management: Foundations & Approaches

Public Affairs 8000

Autumn, 2016

Professor: Jos C.N. Raadschelders	Time: Wednesday, 9 – 12:00 pm
Office: 310D Page Hall	Location: 240 Page Hall
Phone: 688-4325	Office Hours: By Appointment

Course Description

This course traces the intellectual currents in the study of public administration and its more contemporary companions of public policy and public management. There are three primary crosscutting perspectives. First, a historical perspective that concerns the chronology and currency of ideas and the historical events propelling the development of the study in its intellectual and pragmatic manifestations. A second perspective is cultural, which illuminates how concepts are reflections of a distinctive set of values, ideology, and customs as well as preferred modes of reasoning. In this vein, understanding the epistemology and ontology of the field is key. The third perspective is analytical with an emphasis on the authority, justification, value, and "workability" of ideas; i.e., how they shape our thinking, both normatively and empirically and both intellectually and pragmatically.

Objectives

The purpose of this course is to introduce doctoral students to the historic intellectual conversations about the nature and scope of American public administration, public management, and public policy. This course provides you with an opportunity to:

- a. understand the major theoretical and practical issues in the study and some of the answers that have already been given;
- b. develop a "cognitive map" of the major contributors and their intellectual relationships;

- c. understand the main elements of the JGCPA doctoral curriculum and provide an integrative view through an historical approach;
- d. develop the ability to think critically, synthetically, and to develop new theory;
- e. learn the craft of writing academic papers by completing a literature review and critique in a student's area of interest;
- f. begin to develop important theoretical foundations for the student's research portfolio.
- g. begin preparation for the candidacy field question.

Required Readings

Students can access textbook information via the Barnes & Noble bookstore website: www.shopOhioState.com as well as from their BuckeyeLink Student Center. This information is disseminated by B&N to all area bookstores. You may buy from a store of your choice and/or shop for books (always use ISBN# for searches) on line.

1. Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde (2012, Seventh Edition). *Classics of Public Administration*. ISBN-13: 978-1111342746. Cengage Learning. (S&H)
2. Brian R. Fry and Jos C.N. Raadschelders (2013, Third Edition). *Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. ISBN-13: 978-1452240046. (F&R)
3. H. George Frederickson, Kevin B. Smith, Christopher W. Larimer, and Michael J. Licari (2015, Third Edition). *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. ISBN-13: 978-0813349664. (F)
4. Additional readings will be available on Carmen. (Carmen)

Optional readings are also provided and can provide additional explanation to the concepts discussed. Some of these optional readings may be useful in your preparation for the candidacy exam field question.

Course Requirements

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Weekly written critiques | 20% (weeks, 13 in total) |
| 2. Classroom participation | 20% |
| 3. Literature review paper | 20% (due November 2) |
| 4. Classic book report | 10% (due 2 days before presentation) |
| 5. Classic book presentation | 10% (one per week, starting week 7) |
| 6. State of the study paper | 20% (due December 5) |

1. Weekly Written Critiques

Prepare to discuss the readings for the session by writing a summary and critique of the week's assigned readings (20%). Each weekly summary and critique should consist of two parts.

The first part consists of a summary and critique of each required reading. Please limit this first part to five pages. The summary should be a brief factual description of the main

points of the readings. This does not involve any critique or judgment. Ideally, your description of what the authors are saying would be agreeable to both the supporters and opponents of this work. This will allow the reader to quickly identify the main contribution of the work. Please limit your use of direct quotes except where necessary. You can find some examples of critiques on the course website under "Organization": [Bozeman.rtf](#), [Knoke.rtf](#), [Lindblom.rtf](#), [Powell.rtf](#), [Taylor.rtf](#). Once you have summarized the work, you can then critique the work. Here are some questions that you may use to critique the work:

1. What is the essential thesis or argument? What is the implicit normative theory of governing? of management? of administration? What are the behavioral assumptions about people including elected and appointed officials, public servants, and citizens?
2. What is the underlying structure of the thesis or question? Is it logically derived? Is it empirical? Is it ideological?
3. How persuasive is the development of the case? Is it defensible? Is there evidence? Is it believable?
4. What is the pragmatic meaning of the work, i.e., if we believed what the author is saying what difference would it make to our existing stock of ideas, our working hypotheses, and to practice? Or, is the meaning unclear or undetermined, so that is not possible to connect it, or draw any conclusions from the work?
5. What literature or theory is cited? How is the preexisting theory utilized?
6. Where do you locate it in the larger context of the field?
7. What new questions does this work generate?

The second part of the week's critique consists of an assessment of the totality of the week's readings. Where it is possible for you to do so, please attempt to use one of the selected candidacy examination questions as the basis of your summary of the readings. If there is more than one candidacy exam question provided for that week, just select one of the questions. Please limit this part to two/three pages.

While the candidacy exam questions are designed to test knowledge of the literature upon the completion of doctoral coursework, many of the core ideas and critiques begin with the readings and discussions in this course. The goal in using these candidacy examination questions is to provide you with an opportunity to get you started on preparing for the candidacy exam from the beginning of your PhD career and to provide you with early practice on how to answer candidacy exam questions.

Summaries and critiques should be made available to the class by Monday, 9 p.m. so that we have enough time to read, think about, and formulate our questions during Tuesday before class on Wednesday morning. Each student will deposit their critiques in the appropriate Carmen drop box, which will be available to all students in the course.

Assignment of Lead Discussant for the Required Readings

While everyone is required to summarize and critique all of the week's readings, each week, every one will have the responsibility to lead the discussion on one of the assigned readings. These assignments will be based upon several criteria including, but not limited to, the interest of the student, how the class discussion develops along any number of important theoretical themes, or my judgment that someone could benefit from reading a work "that takes them out of their comfort zone". See Class Participation below for more information.

Please be aware that these summaries will be useful to you in your future research work, as the basic knowledge that a PhD should be able to communicate with her/his academic colleagues. More immediately, these summaries will be useful study aids as you prepare for the final examination in this class and your preparation for the PhD qualifying examination. I would suggest accumulating those summaries and critiques that you found most useful during the semester.

2. Class Participation

Your class participation grade (20%) depends upon how well you summarize, critique and present the article AND listen and react to the presentation made by your peers of their assigned articles. Class discussion will bring out the subtleties, connections to other works, and the relevance and power of these ideas for modern theory and practice. Your assignment includes reading others' critiques before the class, listening to their presentation, and providing your own critique of the literature. Most of the readings tend to be quite short but, nonetheless, compact and intense. Although one person will be responsible for leading the class discussion, I will ask others to comment about the reading.

Please do not read your critiques! You should understand the reading and your critique of the work sufficiently that you need only refer to your notes, not read from them.

3. Literature Review Paper

You are to write a literature review suitable for publication that traces the intellectual development of an important issue or field of specialization within public administration (20%). The purpose of this assignment is for you to begin gaining mastery over your particular subject area in public policy or management. This is a first and important step in beginning your dissertation work, and ultimately, your professional development as an academic.

The primary requirement is that this topic be of interest to you. This usually means that it has some relationship to your future dissertation topic. For example, one could trace the development of research issue in public policy and / or management and computers, public budgeting or management science.

The second requirement is that you are to prepare a publishable literature review for your target journals. It will not actually be publishable because of the limited number of articles you will be reviewing but the overall format and quality should be that of a draft manuscript that would be submitted for publication. The hope is that this assignment can be the basis for a future publishable article and for the literature review to be a first step in beginning your dissertation.

Many students are not sure on how to write this manuscript. Here is one set of suggested steps:

1. Identify potential areas of personal interest and the core theoretical issues in those areas of interest, while simultaneously...
2. ... scanning public administration, public management, and policy journals to get a feel for the kind of issues discussed, the methodologies employed, and the literatures cited (See a list of important journals below).
3. From steps one and two, identify an article that you find interesting and/or relevant to your dissertation.
5. Read that article and critique it just as we are doing in our class. Then find a second article either using the references in that first article (to look back), or online citation

databases (to look forward and see what articles have referenced the article you just critiqued) or by looking across the journal from which you retrieved your first article (or one of the other journals found in Steps 1 and 2).

6. Repeat Steps 1-5 until you have about seven to ten articles. You are one your way! I strongly encourage you to talk to me or to your classmates frequently about your ideas or doubts.

Here are the due dates:

1. September 14 (or earlier) (Week 4) - One paragraph description of your topic including an explanation of the issue, why it is important to study, how it fits in within your longer career goals; and the target journal (and secondary and tertiary journals should your article be rejected at the primary target journal). Include approximately five citations that will be included in your literature review.
2. October 19 (Week 9) - Rough draft of approximately five of the seven-ten articles you will eventually summarize and critique. Please use the same approach as we use in the preparation of summaries and critiques during our weekly sessions.
3. November 9 (Week 12) – Literature review paper in the appropriate dropbox.
4. December 5 (Week 16) – State of the study paper

Important Journals in Public Administration

Academy of Management Journal
Academy of Management Review
Administration and Society
Administrative Science Quarterly
American Review of Public Administration
Applied Economics
Evaluation Review
International Journal of Public Administration
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory
Journal of Public Policy
Journal of Law and Economics
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization
Management Science
Policy Analysis
Policy Sciences
Policy Studies Journal
Policy Studies Review
Public Administration Quarterly
Public Administration Review
Public Performance and Management Review
Public Policy
Public Productivity and Management Review
State and Local Government Review

4-5. *Classic book report and presentation*

Select a classic book in the study of public administration and write a five-page report on it. In the prescribed and optional literature for this class you will find plenty “classics”, but you are free to suggest another one. You are to discuss this book in about 15 minutes followed by 15 minutes of class discussion.

6. *State of the study paper*

The field question in the comprehensive exam invites the candidate to reflect upon the state of the study. This assignment encourages you to think independently and creatively about the state of the study, the direction in which you think the study should develop, and what you hope to contribute to that in the course of your career. Obviously, you are at the beginning of an academic career and it is not expected that you have the same overview of the study as a faculty with 30 years+ experience. Yet, it does not hurt to start thinking about the nature of the study early. This paper should be 20 pages and is due on December 5, and all students are expected to have read these before class on December 7.

Schedule

1. August 24 - *Introduction and the Big Questions of Public Administration*

- A. Purpose and Goals
- B. Syllabus
- C. Logistics and Process
 - i. Critiquing the Readings
 - ii. Summaries
 - iii. Class Sessions
 - iv. Assignment of Next Week’s Readings to Presenters
- D. Introductions - Statement of Research Interests
- E. Discussion of the readings

You are not responsible for summaries and critiques the first week of class.

Required reading

- F, Chapter 1, “Introduction: The Possibilities of Theory”
- Behn, Robert (1995). The Big Questions of Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, 55(4): 313-324. (Carmen)
- Kirlin, John J. (1996). The Big Questions of Public Administration in a Democracy. *Public Administration Review*, 56(5): 4116-423. (Carmen)

Optional

- Fredrickson, George (1989). Minnowbrook II, *Public Administration Review*, Mar/Apr 1989.
- Journal of Public Administration, (2011). Special issue on Research Issues in the Field: Minnowbrook III. http://jpart.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/suppl_1.toc .
- Marini, F. (ed.) (1971). *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.

- *Public Administration Review* Symposium on the Future of Public Administration in 2020; <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02241.x/full>;
- Waldo, Dwight (1978). What is Public Administration? In Jay Shafritz and Albert Hyde, *Classics of Public Administration*, Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company, Inc. (Carmen)
- Wamsley, Gary et al. (1990). *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park: Sage. (chapter 1 = "Blacksburg Manifesto").

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management Field # 2)

How would you characterize the state of research in public administration as it has progressed thus far? In what areas has research made the most progress, and in what areas is progress still at the fledgling stage? What are the major questions that should occupy public management researchers over the next 20 years? Why?

(Management Field # 4)

Some scholars argue that Public Administration as a field has not matured because it has not achieved a central research focus that unifies inquiry. Others argue that it has progressed precisely because it has achieved a diversity that allows it to be comprehensive in terms of covering the various components that exist in Public Administration. Engage this debate and provide conclusions as to where you think Public Administration is now in terms of its development. In order to do this you will need to discuss how American Public Administration has developed as a field of study over time. In the course of your answer, you will also need to discuss the theoretical approaches that have had an impact on the field and analyze their contributions (and their detriments) to the development of the field in terms of its maturity. You will also need to discuss major methodological and research approaches and analyze their benefits and detriments in terms of reaching a conclusion about the extent to which the field has or has not taken advantage of the right methodological approaches that allow it to reach maturity. If you find that Public Administration still has some distance to travel in order to reach maturity as a research field, discuss where the field must improve to do this. If you find that it is fully mature as a research field, discuss why you think so.

2. August 31 - *Intellectual Foundations*

Required reading

- F, Chapter 2, "Theories of Political Control of Bureaucracy"
- F&R, Chapters 1 and 2
- Goodnow, "Politics and Administration" (S&H, No. 2)
- Publius, (Alexander Hamilton) Federalist Papers 68, 70, 72, 76 (2003). In Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, New York: Signet Classic. (Carmen).

- Taylor, "Scientific Management" (S&H, No. 4)
- Weber, "Bureaucracy" (S&H, No. 6)
- Wilson, "The Study of Administration" (S&H, No. 1)

Optional

- Gerth, H.H. and C. Wright Mills (eds.) (1958). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gulick, Luther and Lyndall Urwick (eds.) (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Institute of Public Administration.
- Taylor, Frederick W. (1967). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy #2)

Policy analysis brings expertise in service to democracy. Yet, the earliest writings in public administration demonstrate that there are fundamental tensions between expertise and democracy. Trace the broad contours of this discussion and identify the major tensions. Have we adequately reconciled how expertise can truly be of service in a democracy? How is this manifest in practices and institutions?

3. September 7 - *Theories of Democracy*

Required reading:

- Barber, Benjamin R. (1998). Foundationalism and Democracy. In Benjamin Barber (ed.), *A Passion for Democracy: American Essays*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. (Carmen)
- Dewey, John (1954). *The Public and its Problems*. Chicago: Swallow Press. (Excerpts) (Carmen)
- Habermas, Jurgen (1996). Three Normative Models of Democracy. In S. Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. (Carmen)
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper. (Excerpts) (Carmen)

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy #5)

The norms and processes in science and democracy are, in some ways, similar and compatible. At the same time, some can see too much science as a threat to democracy and too much democracy in science as problematical as well. Since policy analysis adapts the social sciences to public policy problems, and integrates social knowledge from many disciplines, the positive and negative tensions between democracy and

science are also present within the policy analysis. Identify these tensions as they relate policy analysis and assess their implications for conducting useful policy analysis.

(This is a harder question for you to answer but we have to begin somewhere. You will have many opportunities in future classes to discuss what is “science” and “the science of Public Administration.” For now, just posit the main elements of how science works as understood in your high school; i.e., use of evidence, testing hypotheses in order to determine “true” propositions, community review of research and findings, etc. to begin the essay. In later classes, we will posit the “logical positivist” explanation of the scientific method as “science.” This chapter will provide some different theories of democracy with different views of the relative roles of the citizen, elected leaders and bureaucrats including their use of (social) science in governance. This should provide you enough material to write a first draft answer to this question. See how far you get.)

4. September 14 - *The “Golden Years” (?) of Public Administration*

Due: One paragraph description of literature review manuscript

Required reading:

- F&R, Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6
- Follett, Mary Parker (1926). "The Giving of Orders" (S&H, No. 8)
- Gulick, Luther (1937). "Notes on the Theory of Organization" (S&H, No. 9)
- Roethlisberger, Fritz J. (1941). "Foreword (by Mayo)" and "Road to Sanity" (Carmen)
- White, Leonard (1926). "Introduction to the Study of Public Administration" (S&H, No.7)

Optional

- Barnard, Chester (1938). "Informal Organizations and Their Relation to Formal Organizations" (S&H, No. 11)
- Bernard, Chester (1968). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Henry Metcalf and Lyndall Urwick (eds.) (1940). *Dynamic Administration, The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Mayo, Elton (1960). *The Human Problems of Industrial Civilization*. New York: Viking.
- Meier, Kenneth J. (2010). Governance, Structure, and Democracy: Luther Gulick and the Future of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 70(S1): S284-S291.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management #17) (This week and next week)

The classical theories of organizations (i.e. Weber’s bureaucratic theory; Taylor’s scientific management) argued that there is “one best way” to structure organizations.

Explain how organizational scholarship has evolved since these early approaches. What do we know at the beginning of the 21st century about how to best structure organizations?

(For this question, just identify the main assumptions and propositions of the early theory of organization design and management “one best way”. Next week, we will critique this theory.)

5. September 21 - *The Orthodoxy in Retreat*

Required

- F, Chapter 3 "Theories of Bureaucratic Politics"
- Appleby, Paul (1945). "Government is Different" (S&H, No. 15)
- Dahl, Robert (1947). "The Science of Public Administration" (Carmen)
- Simon, Herbert A. (1976). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Free Press. (Chapters 1-4). (Carmen)
- Waldo, Dwight (1948). *The Administrative State: Conclusion* (S&H, No. 17)

Optional

- Finer, Herman (1941). Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government. *Public Administration Review*, 1(4): 335-350. (Carmen)
- Friedrich, Carl (1940). Public Policy and the Nature of Administrative Responsibility. In Carl Friedrich and Edward Mason (eds.), *Public Policy*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. (Carmen)
- Lindblom, Charles (1965). *The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision-making Through Mutual Adjustment*. New York: Free Press.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management #17) (This week and previous week)

The classical theories of organizations (i.e. Weber’s bureaucratic theory; Taylor’s scientific management) argued that there is “one best way” to structure organizations. Explain how organizational scholarship has evolved since these early approaches. What do we know at the beginning of the 21st century about how to best structure organizations?

(Last week we identified the main assumptions and propositions of the early theory of organization design and management. This week we critique this theory.)

6. September 28 - *Theory about Theory: Logical Positivism and Postmodern Theory*

Logical Positivism

- Bredo, Eric and Walter Feinberg (1982). The Positivist Approach to Social and Educational Research. In Eric Bredo and Walter Feinberg (eds.), *Knowledge*,

Values in Social and Educational Research. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. (Carmen)

- Martin, Michael (1982). Explanation. In Eric Bredo and Walter Feinberg (eds.), *Knowledge, Values in Social and Educational Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. (Carmen)

Post-Modern Theory

- F, Chapter 6, "Postmodern Theory"
- Miller, Hugh and Charles Fox (2007) *Post-Modern Public Administration*. New York: M.E. Sharpe (Chapter 1). (Carmen)

Optional

- Kuhn, Thomas (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ostrom, Vincent (1973). *The Intellectual Crisis in Public Administration*. Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy # 11)

Compare and contrast the social constructionist and logical positivist contributions to Policy Analysis (Public Administration). Can we synthesize these approaches? Do they make differential contributions to different subfields or different components to the policy process?

(Policy # 16)

The behavioral revolution in the social sciences swept aside previous political science and sociological concerns about, among other things, social elites and power. While the behaviorists certainly had legitimate concerns about the kind of research was done, one consequence, is that concerns like "power" are less explicitly dealt with, and are really absorbed into concepts like information asymmetry or frameworks like "advocacy coalitions" or systems theory of politics. Should policy analysts and academics deal with "power"? What is the appropriate way to understand power from a policy analysis perspective?

(Management #16)

The study of organizations is dominated by positivist scholarship. More recently, feminism, post modernism and critical theory have challenged the notion that organizations can be studied in the "normal science" tradition. Take a positivist theory (i.e. contingency theory, transaction costs theory) and explain the methodological process a researcher would undertake under this theory to analyze an organizational question. Then, explain how one of the challengers to "normal science" would critique the research. Can the two viewpoints be resolved?

(Management #17)

The classical theories of organizations (i.e. Weber's bureaucratic theory; Taylor's scientific management) argued that there is "one best way" to structure organizations. Explain how organizational scholarship has evolved since these early approaches. What do we know at the beginning of the 21st century about how to best structure organizations?

7. October 5 – *Theory about Theory: Critical Theory, Argumentation, Interpretivist*

Critical Theory

Required reading:

- Rein, Martin (1983). Value-Critical Policy Analysis. In Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds.). *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum Press, pp. 83-111. (Carmen)
- Bredo, Eric and Walter Feinberg. (1982). The Critical Approach to Social and Educational Research. In *Conceptual Foundations of Educational Research*, pp. 271-291. (Carmen)

Optional

- Forester, John. (1993). *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press. (Carmen)
- Lather, Patti (1986). Research as Praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3): 257-275.
- Nielsen, Kai (1983). Emancipatory Social Science and Social Critique. In Callahan, Daniel and Bruce Jennings (eds.). *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum Press, pp. 113-157.

Argumentation

Required reading:

- Dryzek, John S. (1993). Policy Analysis and Planning: From Science to Argument. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press. (Carmen)
- Dunn, William N. (1993). Policy Reforms as Arguments. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Golden, J.L, G.F. Berquist and W.E. Coleman. (1992) *The Rhetoric of Western Thought*, Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co. Chapter 13: Stephen Toulmin on the Nature of Argumentation.

Interpretivist Approaches

Required reading:

- Paris, David C. and James F. Reynolds. The logic of policy inquiry. New York : Longman, 1983 Chapter 6: *Interpretive Policy Inquiry*, pp. 166-201. (Carmen)
- Lin, Ann Chin (1998). Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1): 162-180. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Bredo, Eric and Feinberg, Walter. (1982) The Interpretive Approach to Social and Educational Research. In *Conceptual Foundations of Educational Research*, 115-128.
- Bevir, M. and R A W Rhodes. (2002). Interpretive Theory in D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds.), *Theories and Methods in Political Science*. Second edition. London, Macmillan.
- Healy, Paul. (1986). Interpretive policy inquiry: A response to the limitations of the received view. *Policy Sciences* 19(4): 381-396. (Carmen)
- Jennings, Bruce (1983). Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis. In Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds.), *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum.
- Putnam, Linda L. (1983). The Interpretive Perspective: An Alternative to Functionalism. In Putnam, Linda L. and Michael E. Pacanowsky (eds.). *Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Torgerson, Douglas (1986). Interpretive Policy Inquiry: A Response to Its Limitations. *Policy Sciences*, 19(4): 397-405. (Carmen)
- Yanow, D. (1995). Built Space as Story: The Policy Stories that Buildings Tell, *Policy Studies Journal*, 23(3): 407-421.
- Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Qualitative research methods series.
- Yanow, D. (2003). Interpretive Empirical Political Science: What Makes This Not a Subfield of Qualitative Methods. *Qualitative Methods Section (APSA) Newsletter* 2nd Issue Fall 2003.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question: See Questions from Class 6.

8. October 12 - *Theory about Theory: Pragmatism, Narrative Theory, and Action Theory*

Pragmatism

Required reading:

- Miller, H.T. (2004). Why Old Pragmatism Needs an Upgrade. *Administration & Society*, 36: 243-249. (Carmen)
- Shields, Patricia (2003). The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration. *Administration & Society*, 35: 510-538. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Barber, Benjamin (1996). Foundationalism and Democracy in S. Benhabib (ed.) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dewey, John (1920/1948). *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. Boston: Beacon Press (Dover edition).
- Dewey, John (1929). *Quest for Certainty*. New York, NY: Minton, Balch and Co.
- Hildebrand, D.L. (2005). Pragmatism, Neopragmatism, and Public Administration. *Administration & Society*, 37: 345-359.
- Shields, P.M. (2008). Rediscovering the Taproot: Is Classical Pragmatism the Route to Renew Public Administration? *Public Administration Review*, (Mar. - Apr., 2008): 205-221.
- Shields, P.M (1996). Pragmatism: Exploring Public Administration's Policy Imprint. *Administration & Society*, 28: 390-411.

Narrative Theory

Required reading:

- Hummel, Ralph (1989). Stories Managers Tell. *Public Administration Review* 51(1): 31-41. (Carmen)
- Ospina S.M and J. Dodge (2005). It's about time: Catching Method up to Meaning – The usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research. *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 143-157. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Bruner, Jerome (1991). The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry* 18:1-21.
- Forester, John (1993). Learning from Practice Stories: The Priority of Practical Judgment. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 186-209.
- Krieger, Martin H. (1986). Big Decisions and a Culture of Decision Making. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 5(4): 779-797.
- Kaplan, Thomas J. (1986). The Narrative Structure of Policy Analysis. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 5(4): 761-778. (Carmen)
- McCance, T.V., H.P. McKenna and JRP Boore (2001) Exploring caring using narrative methodology: an analysis of the approach. *Journal of Applied Nursing*, 33(3): 350-356.
- Ospina S.M, J. Dodge and E.G. Foldy (2005). Integrating Rigor and Relevance in Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution Narrative Inquiry. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3): 286-300.
- Ospina S.M. and J. Dodge (2005). Narrative Inquiry and the Search for Connectedness: Practitioners and Academics Developing Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution. *Public Administration Review*, 65(4): 409-423.
- Roe, Emery (1994). *Narrative Policy Analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Chapter 2. What are Policy Narratives?
Chapter 3. Stories, Nonstories, and Their Metanarrative

Conclusion

- Wagenaar, H. and R. Hartendorp. (2000). "Oedipus in the Welfare Office: Practice, discourse and identity in public administration" in H. Wagenaar (ed.) *Government Institutions: Effects, Changes and Normative Foundations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer academic Publishers, pp. 147-177.

Action Theory

Required reading:

- Catron, Bayard L. and Michael M. Harmon. Action Theory in Practice: Toward Theory Without Conspiracy. *Public Administration Review*, September/October 1981, 535-541. (Carmen)
- Harmon, Michael M. "Decision" and "Action" as Contrasting Perspectives in Organization Theory. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 1989, 144-150. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Albert, Gert (2004). Pareto's Sociological Positivism, *Journal of Classical Sociology* 4(1): 59-86.
- Bunge, Mario (1998) The philosophical technologies, *Technology In Society*, 20: 377-383.
- Harmon, Michael A. (1981). *Action Theory for Public Administration*. Burke, VA: Chatelaine Press.
- Overview of Action Research
http://www.web.net/~robrien/papers/arfinal.html#_Toc26184651
- White, Jay D. (1980). Response to Michael Harmon. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 1989, 150-152.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question: See Questions from Class 6.

9. October 19 - *Broadening and Deepening of Public Administration*: (Research Issues)

Due: Rough draft of literature review with at least five articles summarized and critiqued and the beginning of an overall summary.

Required reading:

- F, Chapter 4, "Public Institutional Theory"
- Lynn, Laurence E., Sr. (1994). Public Management Research: The Triumph of Art Over Science. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 13(Spring): 231-259. (Carmen)
- Perry, James and Kenneth Kraemer (1990). Research Methodology in Public Administration: Issues and Patterns. In Naomi Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky (eds.), *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House Publishers. (Carmen)
- Raadschelders, Jos (2013) Chapter 2: Science or Wissenschaft, (pp. 40-42) and Chapter 6: Four Intellectual Traditions in the Study of Public Administration, in

Public Administration: The Interdisciplinary Study of Government. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Carmen)

- (Skim the readings assigned for August 24.)

Optional:

- Adams and Balfour, "In the Face of Administrative Evil" (S&H, No. 56)
- Bozeman, Barry and David Landsbergen (1989). Truth and Credibility. *Evaluation Review*, 13(4): 355-379. (Carmen)
- Dodge, Jennifer, Sonia M. Ospina, and Erica Gabrielle Foldy (2005). Integrating Rigor and Relevance in Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution of Narrative Inquiry. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3): 286-300.
- Durant, Robert F. (2010). Parsimony, "Error" Terms, and the Future of a Field. *Public Administration Review*, 70(b 1): S319-S320.
- Haverland, Markus and Dvora Yanow (2012). A Hitchhikers Guide to the Public Administration Research Universe. *Public Administration Review*, 72(3): 401-408.
- Meier, Kenneth J. (2005). Public Administration and the Myth of Positivism: The Anti-Christ's View. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 27(4): 650-668.
- Morgan, Douglas, Kent Kirwan, John Rohr, David Rosenbloom and David Schaefer (2010). Recovering, Restoring, and Renewing the Foundations of American Public Administration: The Contributions of Herbert J. Storing. *Public Administration Review*, 70(4): 621-633.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. (1999). A Coherent Framework for the Study of Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(2): 281-303.
- Riccucci, Norma M. (2010). Envisioning Public Administration as a Scholarly Field in 2020: Rethinking Epistemic Traditions. *Public Administration Review*, 70(Supplement 1): S304-306.
- Schroeder, Larry et al. (2004). Routes to Scholarly Success in Public Administration: Is There a Right Path? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1): 92-105.
- Spicer, Michael (2005). Determinism, Social Science and Public Administration. *American Review of Public Administration*, 35(3): 256-269. (Carmen)
- Ventriss, Curt (2001). The Relevance of Public Ethics to Administration and Policy. In Terry Cooper (ed.) *Handbook of Administrative Ethics*. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management # 2)

How would you characterize the state of research in public administration as it has progressed thus far? In what areas has research made the most progress, and in what areas is progress still at the fledgling stage? What are the major questions that should occupy public management researchers over the next 20 years? Why?

(This question asks you to summarize the state of research and would be much easier to answer once you have gone through all of the coursework. But the readings in this

session point out some of the generic research issues in PA (both in policy and management and are a good start in answering this question.)

10. October 26 - *Broadening and Deepening of Public Administration: (Policy Analysis)*

Required reading:

- F, Chapter 8, "Rational Choice Theory"
- DeLeon, Peter (2008). The Historical Roots of the Field. In Michael Moran, Martin Rein, Robert E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 39-57. (Carmen)
- Kingdon, John W. "How Does an Idea's Time Come?" (S&H, No. 44)
- Lasswell, Harold (1951). The Policy Orientation. In Daniel Lerner and Harold Lasswell (eds.), *The Policy Sciences*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. (Carmen)
- Pressman, "Implementation" (S&H, No. 34)
- Weimer, David and Aidan Vining. 2005. What is Policy Analysis? In *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practices*, 4th edition. 23-38. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Dror, "Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service" (S&H, No. 26)
- Hodgson, Geoffrey (1998). Institutional Economic Theory: The Old Versus the New. In David L. Prychitko (ed.) *Why Economists Disagree: An Introduction to the Alternative Schools of Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Klein, Rudolf and Theodore Marmor (2008). Reflections on Policy Analysis: Putting it Together Again. In Michael Moran, Martin Rein, Robert E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 890-910.
- Lipsky, "Street Level Bureaucracy" (S&H, No. 40)
- Meier, Kenneth J. (2009). Policy Theory, Policy Theory Everywhere: Ravings of a Deranged Policy Scholar. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1): 5-11.
- Smith, Kevin B. (2008). Economic Techniques. In Michael Moran, Martin Rein, Robert E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivlin, Alice. (1971). "Systematic Thinking for Social Action." In *Classics of Public Administration*, (S&H, No. 32).
- Weimer, David. (2002). Enriching Public Discourse: Policy Analysis in Representative Democracies. *The Good Society*, 11(1): 61-65.
- Wolf, Jonathon and Dick Haubrich (2008). Economism and its Limits. In Michael Moran, Martin Rein and Robert E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy # 1)

The early proponents of policy analysis had great hopes for how it could improve policy. Identify the early hopes for this new profession and whether these promises have been fulfilled. The early proponents were also cognizant of potential obstacles to how well policy analysts could accomplish their work and the degree to which policy analysis could have an impact on policy. Have these concerns proved correct? Have there been contributions or obstacles that were not anticipated by the early proponents of policy analysis?

(This question asks you to both lay out the core principles, objectives and activities of policy analysis as they were articulated by the early proponents of policy analysis. You are also asked to see if they have been realized and this may be a little harder to know without going through the policy seminar although you might have some insights.)

(Management # 1)

Discuss the trends that public management has gone through with respect to its development as a field of study. Some argue that public administration and public management are simply subsets of other fields such as political science or business management. Discuss the extent to which this is true/untrue. In the course of your answer, discuss the theoretical approaches that have had impact on the field and analyze their contributions (and their detriments) to the field. As a result of your evaluation, discuss where the field is going next and what you expect to come out of this next stage in the field's evolution.

(Policy # 2)

Consider the early contributors to the field of public policy, e.g., Lasswell, Lindblom, and Dror. Describe in detail the framework that each advocated for developing the field of public policy. Discuss the ways in which the field of public policy has advanced beyond these frameworks. In what ways are these frameworks still relevant to the field? Be sure to include as evidence for your characterizations recent policy scholarship.

11. November 2 - *Broadening and Deepening of Public Administration: (Management)*

Required reading:

- F, Chapter 5, "Theories of Public Management" and Chapter 7 "Decision Theory"
- Argyris, "Organizational Behavior" (Carmen)
- Bozeman, Barry (1987) *All Organizations are Public*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (Chapter 1) (Carmen)
- Lynn, Laurence E. (2007). Public Management: A Concise History of the Field. In Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn and Christopher Pollitt (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27-50. (Carmen)

Optional:

- Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman (1982). Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. In Daniel Kahneman, P. Slovic, and Amos Tversky. (eds.), *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. New York, Cambridge University Press. (Carmen)

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy #3)

Historically public affairs schools have separated the public policy field from the public management field. What do you think of this separation? Is there theoretical and/or practical overlap across the fields? How do policy studies inform management and vice versa? Be sure to include as evidence both historic and recent policy and management scholarship. Are the fields becoming one? Why is this a good or a bad idea?

12. November 9 - *Broadening and Deepening of Public Administration: The Influence and Inclusion of the Disciplines (Law)*

Due: literature review paper.

Required reading:

- Cooper, Phillip (1990). Public Law and Public Administration. In Naomi Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky (eds.), *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House Publishers. (Carmen)
- Landsbergen, David and Jan Orosz (1996). Why Public Managers Should Not Be Afraid to Enter the Gray Zone. *Administration & Society* 28(2): 238-265. (Carmen)
- Lynn, Laurence (2009). Restoring the Rule of Law to Public Administration: What Frank Goodnow Got Right and Leonard White Didn't. *Public Administration Review*, 69(5): 803-812. (Carmen)
- Rosenbloom, "Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers" (S&H, No. 43)

Optional:

- Christensen, Robert and Charles R. Wise (2009). Dead or Alive? The Federalism Revolution and Its Meaning for Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 69(5): 920-931.
- Cooper, Philip J. (2005). George W. Bush, Edgar Allan Poe, and the Use and Abuse of Presidential Signing Statements. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 35(3): 515-532.
- Moe, Ronald and Robert Gilmore (1995). Rediscovering Principles of Public Administration: The Neglected Foundation of Public Law. *Public Administration Review*, 55(2): 135-146.
- Moynihan, Donald (2009). 'Our Usable Past': A Historical Contextual Approach to Administrative Values. *Public Administration Review*, 69(5): 813-822.
- Newbold, Stephanie (2010). Toward a Constitutional School for American Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 70(4): 538-546.

- O'Leary, Rosemary and Charles R. Wise (1991). Public Managers, Judges, and Legislators: Redefining the New Partnership. *Public Administration Review*, 51(1): 1-12.
- Rohr, John (1986). *To Run a Constitution*. Lawrence, Kansas, University of Kansas Press.
- Sollenberger, Mitchell A. and Mark Rozell (2011). Prerogative Power and Executive Branch Czars: President Obama's Signing Statements. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 41(4): 819-833.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management #10)

Discuss the relationship between law and administration. Discuss the extent to which the public law has or has not influenced the development of the field of public administration and the extent to which knowledge of public administration has influenced the development of the field of public law. What are the causes of these conditions? What are the effects? Describe the factors that will affect the evolution of the relationships as they develop over time.

13. November 16 - *Comparative Public Administration*

Required reading:

- Fitzpatrick, Jody et al. (2011). A New Look at Comparative Public Administration: Trends in Research and an Agenda for the Future. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6): 821-830, (and three commentaries in same issue by Jos Raadschelders; Jamil Jreisat; and Kristen Andersson) (Carmen)
- Fritzen, Scott A. (2010). Envisioning Public Administration as a Scholarly Field in 2020: Toward Global and comparative Administrative Theorizing. *Public Administration Review*, 70(Supplement 1): S300-S301. (Carmen)
- Pollitt, Christopher and Geert Bouckaert (2003). Evaluating Public Management Reforms: An International Perspective. In Hellmut Wollmann (ed.). *Evaluation in Public-Sector Reform: Concepts and Practice in International Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 12-35. (Carmen)
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (2011). One-Way, Two-Way, or Dead-End Street: British Influence on the Study of Public Administration in America Since 1945. *Public Administration Review*, 71(4): 559-571. (Carmen)
- Wise, Lois R. (2002). Public Management Reform: Competing Drivers of Change. *Public Administration Review*, 62(5): 555-567. (Carmen)

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Policy #15)

One attempt to understanding the determinants of policy is the use of comparative studies among nations, states, or local governments. Why have some researchers pursued this approach? What, in the main, have been the contributions of this approach? What are the critiques of this approach?

14. November 23 – Thanksgiving

15. November 30 – *Theories of Governance*

Required reading:

- F, Chapter 9: “Governance” and Chapter 10 “Conclusion”
- Lynn, Laurence E., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. (2000). Studying governance and public management: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2): 233-262.

Optional:

- Heinrich, Carolyn J., Carolyn J. Hill, and Laurence E. Lynn. (2004). *Governance as an organizing theme for empirical research. The art of governance: Analyzing management and administration*, pp. 3-19.
- Lynn Jr. Laurence E., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. (2001). *Improving governance: A new logic for empirical research*. Georgetown University Press.
- Lynn Jr. Laurence E., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. (2000). *Studying governance and public management: Why? How. Governance and performance: New perspectives*, pp. 1-33.

Selected Candidacy Examination Question

(Management #4)

Some scholars argue that Public Administration as a field has not matured because it has not achieved a central research focus that unifies inquiry. Others argue that it has progressed precisely because it has achieved a diversity that allows it to be comprehensive in terms of covering the various components that exist in Public Administration. Engage this debate and provide conclusions as to where you think Public Administration is now in terms of its development. In order to do this you will need to discuss how American Public Administration has developed as a field of study over time. In the course of your answer, you will also need to discuss the theoretical approaches that have had an impact on the field and analyze their contributions (and their detriments) to the development of the field in terms of its maturity. You will also need to discuss major methodological and research approaches and analyze their benefits and detriments in terms of reaching a conclusion about the extent to which the field has or has not taken advantage of the right methodological approaches that allow it to reach maturity. If you find that Public Administration still has some distance to travel in order to reach maturity as a research field, discuss where the field must improve to do this. If you find that it is fully mature as a research field, discuss why you think so.

16. December 7 – *State of the Study*

Submit your state of the study paper on December 5, so that all have the chance to read it before class on the 7th. Class will be on the various elements in your papers. This should generate plenty of discussion.

Required reading:

Gill, Jeff, Kenneth J. Meier (2000). Public Administration Research and Practice: A Methodological Manifesto. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1): 157-199. (available on J-PART pages)

Durant, Robert F., David H. Rosenbloom (2016). The Hollowing of American Public Administration. *American Review of Public Administration*, online first ARPA.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-5-487, all instances of alleged academic misconduct will be reported to the department chairperson and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (<http://oaa.osu.edu/coam.html>).

Academic misconduct is grounds for failing the course and may be grounds for further sanctions. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, giving or receiving information during an examination and submitting plagiarized work for academic requirements. For additional information, download the Code of Student Conduct (PDF file).

If you have any questions or concerns, please discuss them with me.

Reasonable Accommodation Policy

Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated, and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office for

Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil

Avenue; telephone 292-3307; TDD 292-0901; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>.