

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Inspiring Citizenship, Developing Leadership

PUBAFRS 8040: Doctoral Seminar in Public Organization Theory & Behavior Spring 2016

Instructor: Russell S. Hassan, Ph.D.

Phone: 292-7423

E-mail: hassan.125@osu.edu

Office Hours: M: 3:00-4:00pm/by appointment

Credit Hours: 3

Time/Room: Monday 9:00 – 12:00/Page Hall 240

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The primary goal of this course is to provide students with an overview of the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in organizational research. Formal organizations and organizing processes are now ubiquitous in modern society. They dominate most facets of our social life including education, employment, family, recreation, religion, and politics. Organizational scholars have developed a set of theoretical approaches in an effort to explain how organizations form, survive, grow, change, compete, interact, influence, and address problems that are internal and external to their boundaries. The field of organizational theory and behaviour has a rich history and tradition but is also constantly changing as new developments challenge our understanding about how organizations function. Each session will provide students with an introductory exposure to classical and contemporary perspectives covering both theoretical and empirical work. Due to time limitations, we will touch lightly on many important topics, and neglect others entirely, especially those that are not so pertinent for the study of government and non-profit organizations. Also, given the focus is on theoretical matters, methodological issues will move to the background. Empirical material will be used to illustrate how knowledge is produced from a particular standpoint and trying to answer particular questions.

Because this is a doctoral level course, it is organized as a seminar. You are responsible for completing all assigned readings and being prepared for general discussions about the session topic and in-depth discussions about assigned articles. You will be required to submit discussion questions and weekly memos related to the readings for each week in advance of each class.

COURSE EVALUATION

Class Participation (10% of the grade)

This course is organized as a seminar. Therefore, your co-operation and willingness to participate actively are critical for creating the best learning environment. You must come to each class prepared to answer the following questions regarding each of the readings:

- What is the basic argument, and what are its strengths and weaknesses?

- If you disagree with the argument, what would it take to convince you?
- Under what circumstances and for what kinds of organizations is the argument meant to apply?
- What changes would be necessary to extend the argument to other empirical domains?
- What are the similarities and differences between this argument and others put forward by readings in the same and in previous weeks? and
- What, if any, alternative explanations could account for the empirical material?

One student will be assigned in each class session to make a brief presentation on the material for that week. The rest of us are responsible for asking probing questions of each presenter, identifying items that they have missed, and providing our thoughts on how best to apply the theory to the selected research question. Learning is a collective enterprise, so everybody will benefit from an engaged, intense, and constructive conversation.

Weekly Memos (20% of the grade)

Starting from Week 1, you will be required to write a concise memo relating to the reading for each week. The memos are due on each Saturday at 5pm and should be submitted through Carmen. The maximum length of the memos is five pages (Times New Roman 12 point font, double spaced, and one inch margin). Memos exceeding this page limit will NOT be graded.

In the memo, you need to develop a summary and critique of each required reading. The summary should provide 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. Once you have summarized the work, you will need to critique the work. Some questions that you may use to critique the work: (1) What is the essential thesis or argument of the paper, (2) What are the behavioral assumptions, (3) What is the underlying structure of the thesis/question, (4) Is it logically derived? (5) Is it grounded in empirical evidence? (6) Is it ideological, and (7) How persuasive is the development of the case.

I strongly encourage you to retain copies of the best memos of your classmates. These analyses and syntheses of the literature will be invaluable in preparation for the exam in this course as well as your Ph.D. qualifying exam.

Term Paper (40% of the grade)

You will need to write a paper on a topic of your interest. The topic must be related to one of the central research questions/areas of public management. The length of the paper should be between 30 and 40 pages (double-spaced, 12 point Times New Roman font, and one inch margin) including references, figures, tables and notes. You need to use APA guidelines for formatting references. Papers exceeding this page limit will be **NOT** be read and returned for revision. The paper can take any number of formats, including:

- A critical review of the literature on any theory or research topics discussed in the course
- A conceptual piece linking two or more of the theoretical frameworks and issues
- The theory/conceptual section of your dissertation proposal

You need to develop a short outline (2 pages, double spaced) describing the paper topic and goals. The outline is due on **September 23**. After submitting the outline (through Carmen), you are required to meet with me in person to discuss the paper topic during the week of **September 26**. You can schedule the meeting time during class on 9/26 or earlier through email. You will have an opportunity to receive feedback and revise your term paper before the final deadline. The deadline for submitting the working draft is **Friday, November 18**. The deadline to upload the final paper on Carmen is midnight **Friday, December, 2**.

Final Exam (30% of the grade)

The final exam for this class is designed to mirror your Ph.D. candidacy exam. We will collectively identify a set of potential exam questions at the end of the semester. I will modify and select a subset of those questions for the exam. You will be able to choose from this subset of questions as you write your exam (i.e. 2 from 4). You will have two hours to take the exam and will only be allowed a bibliography of citations. The exam will take place on Dec 12.

COURSE POLICIES

Academic Integrity

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term academic misconduct includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). Your work should be original. I will not accept excessive quotation and paraphrasing of other's work with or without citation. For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct (http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/info_for_students/csc.asp).

If you cannot deliver an assignment in person, you are responsible for submitting assigned material to me through some other means (Page Hall 350C, fax 292-2548 or email a Microsoft Word attachment to hassan.125@osu.edu). Informing me of your intention to be absent does not waive your obligation to submit assigned work. I will accept late work with a one-letter grade penalty each day that it is late.

Grade appeals

Your grades on assignments and exams are intended to reflect the overall quality of work you submit. If you think the grade does not reflect the quality of your performance on the assignment, you may appeal your grade on an assignment. To appeal a grade, submit a clear written explanation describing why you believe the assigned grade is inappropriate within one week after your work is returned. I will carefully consider all such appeals.

Disability Statement

“Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated. Students 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/>.”

Mental Health Statement

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student's ability to participate in daily activities. The Ohio State University offers services to assist you with addressing these and other concerns you may be experiencing. If you or someone you know is suffering from any of the aforementioned conditions, you can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the **Office of Student Life Counseling and Consultation Services (CCS)** by visiting ccs.osu.edu or calling 614-292- 5766. CCS is located on the 4th Floor of the Younkin Success Center and 4th Floor of the PAES Building. 24 hour emergency help is also available through the National 24/7 Prevention Hotline at 1-800-273-TALK or at suicidepreventionlifeline.org

COURSE OUTLINE (* Optional but highly recommended)

Week 0 (8/22): Background Readings/Preparation

Perry, James and Hal Rainey. 1988. The Public-Private Distinction in Organization Theory: A Critique and Research Strategy, *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 182-201.

Scott, W. & Davis, G. 2007. *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives*, Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall. Chapters 1-4 (pp. 1-106).

*Davis, G. F. 2015. Editorial essay: What is organizational research for? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60, 179-188.

*Barley, S. 2016. 60th anniversary essay: Ruminations on how we became a mystery house and how we might get out. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61, 1-8.

Week 1 (8/29): Agency Theory and Research on Bureaucratic Politics

Eisenhardt, Kathleen. 1989. Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 57-74.

Moe, Terry. 1989. *The Politics of Bureaucratic Structure*, Brookings Institution.

McCubbins, Mathew D., Roger G. Noll, and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 3,243-77.

Whitford, Andrew. 2002. Bureaucratic Discretion, Agency Structure, and Democratic Responsiveness: The Case of the United States Attorneys, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12, 3-27.

Yesilkagit, Kutsal. and Jørgen G. Christensen. 2010. Institutional Design and Formal Autonomy: Political versus Historical and Cultural Explanations, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 29, 53-74.

* Moe, Terry. 1984. The New Economics of Organization, *American Journal of Political Science*, 28, 739-777.

*Wilson, James. 1989. *Bureaucracy*, Basic Books.

Week 2 (9/12): Transaction Cost Theory and Research on Contracting

- Williamson, Oliver E. 1991. Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 269-269.
- Ouchi, William. 1980. Markets, bureaucracies, and clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 129-141.
- Ghoshal, S. & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 13-47.
- Trevor Brown and Matt Potoski. 2003. Transaction Costs and Institutional Explanations for Government Service Production Decisions. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 13, 441-468.
- Porcher, Simon. 2016. Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Concurrent Sourcing in Water Public Services, *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, doi: 10.1093/jopart/muw037.
- *Coase, R. 1937. The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4, 386-405.
- *Williamson, Oliver E. 1981. The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 548-577.

Week 3 (9/19): Resource Dependence Theory and Research on Organizational Collaboration

- Emerson, R. M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations*, pp. 113-187. New York: Harper and Row.
- Provan, K. G., Beyer, J. M., & Kruytbosch, C. 1980. Environmental linkages and power in resource-dependence relations between organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 200-225.
- Huan, K. & Provan. 2007. Resource tangibility and patterns of interaction in a publicly funded health and human services network. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17: 435-454.
- Ludin, Martin. 2007. Explaining Cooperation: How Resource Interdependence, Goal Congruence, and Trust Affect Joint Actions in Policy Implementation, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17, 651-672.
- * Hillman, Amy J., Michael C. Withers, and Brian J. Collins. Resource Dependence Theory: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6) 1404-1427.

Week 4 (9/26): Contingency Theory and Research on Organizational Design

- Thompson, J. 1967. *Organizations in action*. Chapters 3-5, pp. 25-65. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lawrence, P. R. & Lorsch, J. W. 1967. Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, 1-47.
- Child, J. 1972. Organizational Structure, Environment and Performance: The Role of Strategic Choice. *Sociology*, 6, 1-22.
- Walker, Richard. 2013. Strategic Management and Performance in Public Organizations: Findings from the Miles and Snow Framework, *Public Administration Review*, 73, 675-685.

Andrews et al. 2016. Organizational Capability in the Public Sector: A Configurational Approach, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 26, 239-258.

*Drazin, R. & Van de Ven, A. 1985. Alternative forms of fit in contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 514-39.

*Zajac, E. J. & Kraatz, M. S. 2000. Modeling the dynamics of strategic fit: A normative approach to strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(4): 429.

Week 5 (10/3): Institutional Theory and Research on Organizational Change

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48:147-160.

Stinchcombe, A. 1997. On the virtues of the old institutionalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 1-18.

Tolbert, P. S. & Zucker, L. G. 1983. Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22.

Kraatz, M. S. & Zajac, E. J. 1996. Exploring the limits of the new institutionalism: the causes and consequences of illegitimate organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 812-836.

Sosin, Michael R. 2012. Decentralization, Devolution, Financial Shortfalls, and State Priorities in Service Programs in the Early 2000s, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22, 701-730.

*Meyer, J & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.

*Powell, Walter W., and Paul J. DiMaggio. 1991. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, University of Chicago Press.

* Selznick, Philip (1949). *TVA and the Grass Roots: a Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization*. University of California Press.

Week 6 (10/10): Embeddedness Theory and Research on Alliances/Networks

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 481-510.

Gulati, R. & Gargiulo, M. 1999. Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 1439-1493.

Uzzi, Brian. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The Paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 35-67.

Provan, Keith, Kun Huang, and Brinton Milward. 2009. The Evolution of Structural Embeddedness and Organizational Social Outcomes in a Centrally Governed Health and Human Services Network, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 873-893.

Nowell, Brenda and Toddi Steelman. 2015 Communication under Fire: The Role of Embeddedness in the Emergence and Efficacy of Disaster Response Communication Networks, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25, 929-952.

*Burt, Ronald S. 1992. *Structural holes: the social structure of competition*, Harvard University Press.

*Granovetter, M. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360-1380.

Week 7 (10/17): Theories and Research on Organizational Decision Making

Graham Allison. 1969. Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis. *American Political Science Review*, 63: 689-718.

Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17: 1-25.

Nutt, Paul. 2006. Comparing Public and Private Sector Decision-Making Practices. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16: 289-318.

David Landsbergen, David H. Coursey, Stephen Loveless and R.F. Shangraw Jr. 1997. Decision Quality, Confidence, and Commitment with Expert Systems: An Experimental Study, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7, 131-158.

Avellaneda, Claudia N. 2013. Mayoral Decision-Making: Issue Salience, Decision Context, and Choice Constraint? An Experimental Study with 120 Latin American Mayors, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23 (3): 631-661.

*Simon, Herbert. 1947. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, Free Press.

*Bazerman, Max H and Don A Moore. 2008. *Judgment in managerial decision making*, Wiley.

Week 8 (10/24): Social Exchange Theory and Research on Employee Attitudes/Behavior

Cropanzano, Russell and Marie S. Mitchell. 2005. Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review, *Journal of Management*, 31,874-900.

Rousseau, Denise M. 1989. Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organizations. *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal*, 2, 121-139.

Coyle-Shapiro, Jacqueline A.-M. and Ian Kessler. The Employment Relationship in the U.K. Public Sector: A Psychological Contract Perspective, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13, 213-230.

Bottom, William P., James Holloway, Gary J. Miller, Alexandra Mislin, and Andrew Whitford. 2006. Building a Pathway to Cooperation: Negotiation and Social Exchange between Principal and Agent. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 29-58

Hassan, Shahidul and Hatmaker, Deneen. 2015. Leadership and Performance of Public Employees: Effects of the Quality and Characteristics of Manager-Employee Relationships, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25,1127-1155.

Jacobsen, Morten and Simon Calmer. 2012. Intensifying Social Exchange Relationships in Public Organizations: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32, 62-82.

*Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. NY: Wiley.

Week 9 (10/31): Social Identity Theory and Research on Employee Behavior

- Ashforth, Blake and Fred Mael. 1989. Social Identity Theory and the Organization, *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
- Hogg, Michael A. and Deborah Terri. 2000. Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts, *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 121-140.
- Dutton, Jane E., Janet M. Dukerich, and Celia V. Harquail. 1994. Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
- Dukerich, Janet M., Brian R. Golden, and Stephen M. Shortell. 2002. Beauty Is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Impact of Organizational Identification, Identity, and Image on the Cooperative Behaviors of Physicians, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 507-533.
- Palus, Christine K. and Susan Webb Yackee. 2016. Clerks or Kings? Partisan Alignment and Delegation to the US Bureaucracy, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, doi:10.1093/jopart/muw001.
- *Tajfel, Henry. 2000. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Cambridge University Press.
- *Tajfel, Henry. 1982. *Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.

Week 10 (11/7): Goal Setting Theory and Research on Work Motivation

- Locke, Edwin A. and Gary Latham. 2002. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57, 705-717.
- Bradley E. Wright. 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.
- Hrabluika, Coreen, Gary P. Latham, and Julie M. McCarthy. 2012. Does Goal Setting Have a Dark Side? The Relationship Between Perfectionism and Maximum Versus Typical Employee Performance. *International Public Management Journal*, 15, 5-38.
- 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, 211-225.
- Cun, Young Han and Hal G. Rainey. 2005. Goal Ambiguity and Organizational Performance in U.S. Federal Agencies, 15, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 529-557.
- *Locke, Edwin A. and Gary P Latham. 1990. *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hal
- *Bandura, Albert. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*, Prentice Hall.

Week 11 (11/14): Theories and Research on Performance Management

- Radin, Beryl. 2000. The Government Performance and Results Act and the Tradition of Federal Management Reform: Square Pegs in Round Holes, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10, 111 -135
- Carolyn Heinrich and Laurence Lynn. 2000. Means and Ends: A Comparative Study of Empirical Methods for Investigating Governance and Performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11, 109-138.

- 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, 421-439.
- Donald P. Moynihan and Sanjay K. Pandey. 2010. The Big Question for Performance Management: Why Do Managers Use Performance Information? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, 849-866.
- Oliver, James. 2011. Performance Measures and Democracy: Information Effects on Citizens in Field and Laboratory Experiments, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21, 399-418
- *Moynihan, Donald P. 2008. *The Dynamics of Performance Management: Constructing Information and Reform*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Week 12 (11/21): Theories and Research on Prosocial Motivation

- James Perry. 2000. Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10: 471-488
- James Perry and Wouter Vandenberghe. 2015. Public Service Motivation Research: Achievements, Challenges, and Future Directions, *Public Administration Review*, 75, 692–699.
- Grant, Adam. 2007. Relational Job Design and the Motivation to Make a Prosocial Difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 393-417
- Grant, Adam. 2008. Does Intrinsic Motivation Fuel the Prosocial Fire? Motivational Synergy in Predicting Persistence, Performance, and Productivity, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 48-58.
- Belle, Nicola. 2013. Experimental Evidence on the Relationship between Public Service Motivation and Job Performance. *Public Administration Review*, 73, 143-153.
- *Ritz, Adrian, Gene A. Brewer, Oliver Neumann. 2016. Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook, *Public Administration Review*, 76, 414–426.

Week 13 (11/28): Theories and Research on Managerial Leadership

- Yukl, Gary. 2012. Effective Leadership Behaviors: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention? *Academy of Management Perspectives* 26:66-85.
- Van Knippenberg, and Sim B. Sitkin. 2013. A Critical Assessment of Charismatic—Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board?, *Academy of Management Annals*, 7, 1-60.
- Page, Stephen. 2003. Entrepreneurial Strategies for Managing Interagency Collaboration, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13, 311-339.
- Ospina, Sonia and Erica Foldy. 2010. Building bridges from the margins: The work of leadership in social change organizations, *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 292–307.
- Hassan, Shahidul, Bradley E. Wright, and Gary Yukl. 2014. Does Ethical Leadership Matter in Government? Effects on Organizational Commitment, Absenteeism, and Willingness to Report Ethical Problems. *Public Administration Review*, 74, 333-343.

Belle, Nicola. 2014. Leading to Make a Difference: A Field Experiment on the Performance Effects of Transformational Leadership, Perceived Social Impact, and Public Service Motivation, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24, 109-136.

*Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*, Harper & Row.

*Yukl, Gary. 2013. *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice Hall.

*Selznick, Philip. 1957. *Leadership in Administration: a Sociological Interpretation*, Peterson.

*Bernard, Chester. 1938. *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press.

Week 14 (12/5): Representative Bureaucracy and Research on Workplace Diversity

Meier, Kenneth J. and John Bohte. 2001. Structure and Discretion: Missing Links in Representative Bureaucracy, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11, 455-470.

Keiser, Lael, Vicky Wilkins, Kenneth Meier and Catherine Holland. 2002. Lipstick and logarithms: Gender, institutional context, and representative bureaucracy, *American Political Science Review*, 96, 553-564

David Pitts. 2005. Diversity, Representation, and Performance: Evidence about Race and Ethnicity in Public Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15, 615-631.

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, 537-551.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Jill Nicholson-Crotty. 2015. Gender, Representative Bureaucracy, and Law Enforcement: The Case of Sexual Assault, *Public Administration Review*, 66, 850-860.

SAMPLE