

PA 8106, Research Seminar in Management, Leadership and Governance Fall Semester 2016

Mondays, 6:00 – 8:45 pm Humphrey 175	
Lead Instructor: John Bryson 237 Humphrey Center jmbryson@umn.edu 625-5888 Office Hours: 3:00 – 5:00 pm, and by appointment	Co-Instructors: Barbara Crosby, bcrosby@umn.edu Jay Kiedrowski, kiedr003@umn.edu Carrie Oelberger, coelberg@umn.edu Kathy Quick, ksquick@umn.edu Jodi Sandfort, sandf002@umn.edu Melissa Stone, stone039@umn.edu Jerry Zhao, zrzhaoy@umn.edu

This course surveys major frameworks, topics, and questions in the study of public and nonprofit management, leadership, and governance; helps students apply this knowledge to their own work; and helps students learn how best to relay this knowledge to scholarly and practitioner audiences.

Course Objectives

By the completion of this course, we expect that you will:

- Be conversant in key frameworks, topics, and questions in the study of public and nonprofit management, leadership and governance. Have a significant depth of understanding on the concepts of closest relevance to your own proposed research areas, and have sufficient familiarity with the field to recognize and be able to pursue other key issues.
- Be able to contextualize your own interests and research within the field of public and nonprofit management, leadership, and governance. Learn to operate successfully in a scholarly community deeply involved with questions of practical significance. To accomplish this objective, between Weeks 2 and 12 you will prepare weekly two-page reaction papers on relevant literature that also situate your research interests in that literature. For two other weeks you will prepare five- to seven-page reaction papers. In other words, over the course of the semester you will prepare nine reaction papers, seven two-pagers and two five-to-seven pagers.
- Engage effectively with academic literature, including being able to read key texts critically, identify and work with key concepts in the literature, perform an effective literature search, and skim productively. To accomplish these objectives, you will actively participate in class discussions.

- Be competent, constructive discussants of papers written by authorities in the field and your own peers. You will practice this through active participation in class dialogues and by providing feedback on others' work.
- Be transitioning successfully into being a member of this academic community. This objective will be accomplished through building connections with your peers, Humphrey School faculty, and other scholars through class discussions, and engagement with faculty and visiting scholars.
- Prepare and teach a module on a topic relevant to the course for a professional, masters-level student audience.

Topics

After the introductory week, the course is broken down into five main topic areas. In the first of these we address questions related to democracy and governance. This section of the course will revisit a number of concerns raised in PA 8003. In Weeks 3 – 6 organizational theory and behavior move to the fore, since most public and nonprofit leadership and management is organizationally and inter-organizationally situated. In Weeks 7 – 9 we focus on some key leadership and management processes and practices. In Weeks 10 - 12 we pull together and synthesize much of what has come before around the important integrative topics of cross-sector collaboration and implementation. In the final section of the course, in Weeks 13 – 14, we attend directly to the challenge of engaging both scholarly and professional audiences around the course topics.

Week	Date Topic	Topic	Lead Instructor
1	12 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to course • Organizing your semester's work in the course 	John
Democracy and Governance			
2	19 September	Democracy and governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic governance and accountability • Institutions • Public participation and civic engagement • Public values 	Kathy
Organizational Theory and Behavior			
3	26 September	Introduction to Organization Theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction and historical 	Carrie & Melissa

		<p>perspectives on organizations and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social constructionism and institutional theory • Culture and identity 	
4	03 October	<p>Relational Perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependence and power • Inter-organizational relationships, networks, and institutional fields 	Carrie & Melissa
5	10 October	<p>Cognitive Perspectives: Learning, Routines, & Sense-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning • Routines and change • Sensemaking 	Carrie & Melissa
6	17 October	<p>Individual Perspective: Workers & Their Employers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work in the “New Economy” • Strategic human resource management, diversity and retention • Work-life integration in the workplace 	Carrie & Jay
Leadership & Management Processes and Practices			
7	24 October	Leadership	Barbara
8	31 October	Strategic management	John
9	07 November	Public Budgeting & Finances	Jerry and Jay
Synthesis and Application			
10	14 November	Cross Boundary Collaboration	Melissa
11	21 November	<p>Institutions and Policy Design for Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytical frameworks for institutional design • Analytical frameworks for policy design 	Jodi

12	28 November	Implementation Dynamics	Jodi
Presenting to Scholarly and Practitioner Audiences			
13	05 December	Presenting Topics to Academic Audiences	All
14	12 December	Translation of Academic Knowledge to the practice of teaching professional degree students	All

Course Assignments and Grading

Course assignments are aligned with the course learning objectives. The assignments are as follows:

1. All students are asked to prepare brief memos (1-2 pages) during seven weeks of the seminar (weeks 2-12). You may choose the weeks during which you will prepare brief memos.

Formats may vary, but it is useful to include:

- ideas, concepts, arguments that you found stimulating, worth remembering and building upon,
- questions, concerns, disagreements with ideas encountered,
- connections, difficulties, contradictions, paradoxes, etc., between one idea or approach and another.

Memos are due by 5 pm Sunday before the class. Send them to the weekly instructor(s) via email, as indicated in the syllabus. **Twenty-five-percent (25%) of course grade will be based on the weekly short memos.**

2. For two of the weeks, students will prepare a more detailed memo (5-6 pages) assessing the weekly readings. You can choose which week's readings you wish to analyze, but you are expected to complete this assignment before the date that the topic is discussed in class. All memos, therefore, must be completed before the end of classes. *No memos will be accepted after the last day of class.*

The purpose of the longer memos is to help you grapple more deeply with the readings and respond with insights, questions, criticisms, and new ideas. Although the memos and class discussion will identify and clarify the major points made by the readings and criticize them where appropriate, the main thrust of *both* the brief and longer memos and the class discussion will be on developing promising ideas suggested by the readings. If you wish to use the memos as a vehicle for developing your own research ideas, that would be excellent. We recommend that when you choose to write a longer memo about a particular topic, you consult the additional readings for that week. **Forty-percent (40%) of the course grade is based on these longer memos.**

3. In order to help you practice making presentations to scholarly audiences, in Week 13 each student will select one of their more detailed memos and make a 8-10 minute *scholarly presentation* to the seminar. Each presentation will be by a panel of discussants who will offer a critique and constructive comments. Comments will focus on strengths of the presentation and suggested modifications that would improve it. **The scholarly presentation will count for ten-percent (10%) of the course grade.**
4. In order to build students' skills as teachers, each will be an observer in one session of a master's level class (in which the student is not enrolled) and discuss the teaching methods used with the course instructor. Each student will complete an observation form reporting on this session. The observation, conversation, and form should be completed before Week 14 of this seminar. This assignment will be checked, but not graded.
5. In Week 14, each student will assume the role of an instructor in a *practitioner-oriented masters-level class* and teach about the topic covered in their Week 13 scholarly presentation. At this session, each presenter will receive observational feedback. Shortly thereafter, each student will write a 1-2 page reflection paper that captures their observations and insights from this experience of teaching to a practitioner audience. **The practitioner-oriented presentation will count for ten-percent (10%) of the course grade.**
6. **Class participation counts for the final fifteen-percent (15%) of the course grade.**

Weekly Sessions in More Detail

Week 1 (12 September): Introduction (John)

This week's class sets the stage for the rest of the semester. A variety of issues will be addressed that involve:

- the importance of the public sphere, democracy and public value and values
- comparative strengths and weaknesses of different sectors or kinds of organizations, e.g., government, nonprofit organizations, businesses, the media, and communities
- macro and micro levels of analysis
- the connections between:
 - agency, structure, institutions, and fields
 - policy formulation and implementation at and across different levels
 - theory and practice
- the contributions and interplay of research, learning, education, and practice

Required Readings:

Bryson, Crosby and Bloomberg (2015) *Public Value and Public Administration*. Georgetown University Press, Chapter 1, Discerning and Assessing Public Value: Major Issues and New Directions, pp. 1 – 21.

Gray, Barbara, Jill M. Purdy, and Shahzad Shaz Ansani (2015) From interactions to institutions: Microprocesses of framing and mechanisms for the structuring of institutional fields, *Academy of Management Review* 40(1), pp. 115 – 148.

Feldman, Martha S., and Wanda J. Orlikowski. 2011. Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science* 22(5): 1240-1253.

Moulton, Stephanie. "Putting Together the Publicness Puzzle: A Framework for Realized Publicness." *Public Administration Review* 69, no. 5 (2009): 889–900.

Georges Romme (2003) "Making a Difference: Organization as Design," *Organization Science*, 14(5), pp. 558 – 573.

Van Tulder, Robert, and Stella Pfisterer (2016) *Creating Partnership Space*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University.

Additional Resources:

Frederickson, H. George, Kevin B. Smith, Christopher W. Larimer, and Michael J. Licari (2015) *The Public Administration Theory Primer, 3rd Edition*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Peters, B. Guy, and Jon Pierre (2012) *The SAGE Handbook of Public Administration, 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Powell, Walter. W., and Richard Steinbert, eds. (2008) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook, 2nd Edition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Raadschelders, Jos (2013) *Public Administration: The Interdisciplinary Study of Government*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Renz, David O. (2016) *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Democracy and Governance

Week 2 (19 September): Democracy and Governance (Kathy)

This week's class bridges between the Integrative Seminar in Public Affairs for all Humphrey School PhD students (PA 8003) and the Research Seminar in Management, Leadership and Governance (PA 8106, this class). You will recall that in PA 8003 we discussed what makes something a "public affairs" problem or object of scholarship, and explored some aspects of democratic governance contexts for public affairs. This week, we revisit some of those foundational readings and elaborate the connection between democracy and governance with organizations, management and leadership. Topics explored this week include the relationship of management or administration with democratic governance, representation, and politics.

Required readings:

Amsler, Lisa Blomgren. (2016) Collaborative Governance: Integrating Management, Politics, and Law. *Public Administration Review* (Published online before print, July 2016). DOI: 10.1111/puar.12605.

Cook, Brian J. (2014). Public administration as instrument and institution. In *Bureaucracy & Self-government: Reconsidering the Role of Public Administration in American Politics*, 2nd ed. Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 1-31 (chapter 1).

Disch, Lisa. (2012). Democratic representation and the constituency paradox. *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 599-616.

Hajer, Maarten (2003) A frame in the fields: Policy-making and the reinvention of politics, In Maarten Hajer & Hendrik Wagenaar (eds). *Deliberative Policy analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 88-112 (chapter 3).

Quick, Kathryn S., and Martha S. Feldman. (2011). Distinguishing participation and inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31(3): 272-290.

West, Cornel. (1990) The new cultural politics of difference. *The Humanities as Social Technology* 53: 93-109.

Also review reading notes from PA 8003:

- Ansell, Christopher. (2011). "Democratic governance in a pragmatist key" and "Problem-solving democracy" in *Pragmatist Democracy: Evolutionary Learning as Public Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, pp. 3-42 and 184-196.
- Carpini, Michael X. Delli, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: A review of the empirical literature." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 315-344.
- Dewey, J. (2012 [1927]). The search for the great community. In *The public and its problems: An essay in political inquiry*. University Park, PA: Penn State Press, pp. 143-184.
- Reich, Robert B. 1988. Policy-making in a democracy. In Robert B. Reich, ed. *The power of Public Ideas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 123-156.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2000. "Democracy and justice." In *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 16-51.

Organizational Theory and Behavior

Week 3 (26 September): Introduction to Organization Theory and Cognitive Perspectives (Melissa)

Modern organizations date back to the 17th century but theories about these organizations are far more recent. In this session, we will explore some historical roots of organization theory, including Weberian notions of bureaucracy and his ideal types. We will also explore how experiences *of* and experiences *in* organizations are changing. The session then takes on "cognitive" perspectives of organizations with the very influential work of Simon, March, Cyert, and Olsen. This work gained prominence in the middle part of the 20th century as a response to overly rationalistic views of people and people in organizations that dominated economic theory at the time. Our view is that these cognitive perspectives still offer profound insights today. We look forward to debating with you whether you agree!

Required Readings:

Introduction

Scott & Davis, 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Chapters 1-5, pp. 1-123.

Weber, Max. "The Types of Legitimate Domination," and "Bureaucracy," in *Economy and Society*, vol 1, University California Press, pp. 212-26, pp. 956-963.

Historical Perspectives on Organizations and Work

Thompson, E. P.. 1967. "Time, work discipline, and industrial capitalism," *Past and Present*, pp. 56-97.

Callahan, Raymond. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 6, and 10.

Cooper, Marianne. Chapter 1 in *Cut Adrift*. University of California Press

Bidwell, M., Briscoe, F., Fernandez-Mateo, I., & Sterling, A. (2013). The employment relationship and inequality: How and why changes in employment practices are reshaping rewards in organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 61-121.

Cognitive Perspectives

March, James and Johan Olsen. Chapters 1-4 of *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*, Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1976, pp. 10-68.

Raisch, Birkinshaw, Probst & Tushman, 2009. Organizational Ambidexterity: Balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. Intro to special issue in *Organization Science* 20: 685-695.

Additional Resources:

Introduction

Davis, G.F. & Marquis, C. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 16: 332-343.

King, B., Felin, T. & Whetten, D. 2010. Finding the organization in organizational theory: A meta-theory of the organization as a social actor, *Organization Science* 21: 290-305.

Aldrich & Ruef, 2006. *Organizations Evolving*. Chapter 1, pp. 1-15.

Adler, 2009. Introduction: A social science which forgets its founders is lost. Chapter 1 in Adler (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies*, pp. 3-19.

Thornton, 2009. The value of the classics, Chapter 2 in Adler (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies*, pp. 20-36.

Michels, R. (1915). "The Oligarchical Tendencies of Organization," in *Political Parties: A sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy*. Hearst's International Library Company. Pp. 333-363.

Bakken, T. (2003). Autopoietic organization theory: Drawing on Niklas Luhmann's social systems perspective. Copenhagen Business School Press, pp. 9-17. Skim chapters 2-5.

Cognitive Perspectives

March & Simon, 1958. *Organizations*. Chapter 6, pp.136-171

March, 1991. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2: 71-87.

Thompson, 1967. *Organizations in Action*, Chpts. 3-5, pp. 25-65.

Drazin, R., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1985). Alternative forms of fit in contingency theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 514-539.

Week 4 (3 October): Relational Perspectives (Melissa)

Here we take a different view from the cognitive perspective on organizations and push out to think of organizations *in relation to* many elements of their external environments, including other organizations, institutions, and so forth. Critical to this perspective is understanding power and dependence, especially as they are exercised by organizations over other organizations. We will examine the role of trust in inter-organizational (and interpersonal) relationships and, importantly, raise the question of boundaries between and among organizations. Think about the question Christine Oliver's article raises – Why do organizations work together?

Required Readings:

Emerson, 1962. Power-Dependence Relationships. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.

Hardy & Clegg, 1996. Some Dare Call it Power. Chapter 3.7 in Clegg, Hardy, & Nord, *Handbook of Organization Studies*, London: Sage, pp. 622-641

Inter-Organizational Relationships, Institutional Fields, and Networks

Oliver, C. (1990). Determinants of Interorganizational Relationships: Integration and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 241-265.

Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2011). Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields. *Sociological Theory*, 29(1), 1-26.

Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1998. Does Trust Matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science*, 9, 2: 141-159.

O'Mahony & Bechky, 2008. Boundary Organizations: Enabling collaboration among unexpected allies, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53: 422-459. (* Perhaps move to Week 10 on collaboration.)

Gulati & Sytch, 2007. Dependence Asymmetry and Joint Dependence in IORs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 32-69.

Additional Resources:

Dependence and Power

Pfeffer, J. & G. Salancik, 2003 (reissued). *External Control of Organizations*, Stanford: Chapters 1, 3, 4 & 10.

Casciaro & Piskorski, 2005. Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50: 167-199.

Clegg, S. 1989, Radical Revisions: Power, Discipline and Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 10, 1: 97-115.

Granovetter, 1985. Economic and Social Action: The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 3: 481-518

Collaboration and Networks

Kuwabara, 2011. Cohesion, cooperation, and the value of doing things together... *American Sociological Review* 76: 560-580.

Ring, P. S. & A. H. Van de Ven, 1994. Developmental processes of cooperative IORs. *Academy of Management Review*, 19; 90-118.

Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999. Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 5: 1439-93.

Zaheer & Soda, 2009. Network evolution: The origins of structural holes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 1-31.

Burt, 2007. Secondhand brokerage: Evidence on the importance of local structure for managers, bankers and analysts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 119-148.

Galaskiewicz, J. 1997. An urban grants economy Revisited: Corporate charitable contributions in the Twin Cities, 1979-81, 1987-89. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 445-471.

Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660-679.

Greve, Baum, Mitsuhashi & Rowley, 2010. Built to last but falling apart: Cohesion, friction, and withdrawal from interfirm alliances. *Academy of Management Journal* 53:302-322.

Dirks, Lewicki & Zaheer, 2009. Special issue on repairing relationships in *Academy of Management Review*, 34.

Kim, Dirks, & Cooper, 2009. The repair of trust: A dynamic bilateral perspective and multilevel conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 34:401-422.

Shapiro, 1987. The social control of impersonal trust. *AJS*, 93, 3: 623-58.

Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1998. Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science*, 9, 2: 141-159.

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 344-354.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 450-467.

McEvily, B., Perrone, V., & Zaheer, A. (2003). Trust as an organizing principle. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 91-103.

Week 5 (10 October): Cultural Perspectives: Social Constructionism, Institutional Theory, Identity, and Sensemaking (Carrie)

Cultural perspectives serve as a broad theoretical and methodological lens that focuses on collective meaning systems and shared values at multiple levels of analysis – group, organization, occupation, and industry/field. This week we will study how culture is socially and jointly constructed and forms the basis for shared assumptions about reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), often examined with interpretive and ethnographic methods (e.g., Barley 1983, Van Maanen 1979). Cultural materials are increasingly understood as a pragmatic resource that individuals and organizations can consciously deploy (Weber and Dacin 2011), such as a “cultural toolkits” (Swidler 1986), which signals both an understanding of cultural pluralism and a degree of agentic choice and strategy in using culture.

We will examine processes through which cultural vocabularies develop, focusing particularly on the study of sensemaking as a process by which people give meaning to experience (Weick 1995). In addition, we will examine some of the “outcomes” of cultural processes. For example, we’ll read about how when organizations create collective meaning systems, they define identities for themselves of “who they are as an organization” (Albert and Whetten 1985, Whetten 2006). Finally, we’ll move up from the individual and organizational to the institutional level, examining how field-level ideational processes and broader cultural rules and beliefs can lead to isomorphic organizational practices (DiMaggio and Powell 1991, Meyer and Rowan 1977).

Required Readings:

Berger & Luckmann, 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*, NY: Doubleday, pp. 47- 128.

Barley, S. R. (2008) “Coalface institutionalism.” Pp. 490-515 in R Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby and K. Sahlin-Anderson eds. *Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an Eye on the Mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 517-554.

Giorgi, S., Lockwood, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2015). The Many Faces of Culture: Making sense of 30 years of research on culture in organization studies. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 1-54.

Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in Organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 57-125.

Additional Resources:

Social Constructionism & Institutional Theory

Meyer & Rowan, 1977. Institutionalized orgs.: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *AJS*, 83: 340-363.

- Barley & Tolbert, 1997. Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18, 1: 93-117
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1984.
- Scott, 2001. *Institutions and Organizations*, Second edition, Chpts. 3 & 4, pp. 47-90.
- DiMaggio & Powell, 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *ASR*, 48: 147-160.

Culture and Identity

- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Hayagreeva Rao. 1997. Breaches in the boardroom: Organizational identity and conflicts of commitment in a nonprofit organization. *Organization Science* 8:593-611.
- Albert, S.A. & D. A. Whetten, 1985. Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7: 263-295.
- Weber & Dacin, 2011. The cultural construction of organizational life: Introduction to the special issue. *Organization Science*. 22:287-298.
- Ravasi & Schultz, 2006. Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal* 49:433-458.

Sensemaking

- Weick, 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Chpts. 1&2, pp. 1-62
- Rouleau, L., & Balogun, J. (2011). Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discursive competence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(5), 953-983.
- Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005. Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16, 4: 409-421.
- Fiss & Zajac, 2006. The symbolic management of strategic change: Sensegiving via framing and decoupling, *Academy of Management Journal* 49: 1173-1193.

Week 6 (17 October)

Individual Perspectives: Workers & their Employers (Carrie & Jay)

Despite the increasing use of technology to complete tasks that were formerly done by humans, people are still needed to do the work of organizations. This week we study those people, with attention to two different perspectives. First, we examine the HRM (human resource management) perspective, in which the organizational leadership views employees as one of the necessary resources to accomplish their objectives, focusing explicitly on managing performance and the impact of diversity. Second, we will turn the week upside down, and examine employees from their own perspective, as people whose work constitutes one of multiple settings in which they live out their lives. Here we will

focus on how people's non-work lives influence their work life, and vice versa, with explicit attention to how this influences motivation, wellbeing, and gender dynamics.

Required Readings:

From the Perspective of the Organization: Strategic Human Resource Management, Diversity, and Retention

Kang, S. C., Morris, S. S., & Snell, S. A. (2007). Relational archetypes, organizational learning, and value creation: Extending the human resource architecture. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 236-256.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229-273.

Heinrich, C. J. (2002). Outcomes-based performance management in the public sector: implications for government accountability and effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*, 62(6), 712-725.

From the Perspective of the Employee: Work-Life Integration and the Workplace

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J.. (1985). Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.

Blair-Loy, Mary (2003) Introduction (pp. 1-18) of *Competing Devotions: Career and Family among Women Executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Nippert-Eng, Christena (1995). Introduction (pp. 1-33) in *Home and Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goodwin, J. (1997). The libidinal constitution of a high-risk social movement: Affectual ties and solidarity in the Huk rebellion, 1946 to 1954. *American Sociological Review*, 53-69.

Additional Resources:

Cappelli, P., & Keller, J. R. (2014). Talent management: Conceptual approaches and practical challenges. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 305-331.

Jackson, S.E., Schuler, R. S., and Kaifeng, J. (2014). An aspirational framework for strategic human resource management, *Academy of Management Annals*, 8:1, 1-56.

Barley, S. R. (1989) "Careers, identities, and institutions: the legacy of the Chicago School of Sociology." Pp 41-65 in M. Arthur, T. Hall and B. Lawrence (Eds.) *The Handbook of Career Theory*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.

Reid, Erin. 2016. "Embracing, Passing, Revealing, and the Ideal Worker Image: How People Navigate Expected and Experienced Professional Identities." *Organization Science*, 26 (4): 997-1017.

- Correll, S. J., Kelly, E. L., O'Connor, L. T., & Williams, J. C. (2014). Redesigning, redefining work. *Work and Occupations*, 41(1), 3-17.
- Kelly, E. L., Moen, P., Oakes, J. M., Fan, W., Okechukwu, C., Davis, K. D & Mierzwa, F. (2014). Changing work and work-family conflict: evidence from the work, family, and health network. *American Sociological Review*, 79(3), 485-516.
- Nicole E. Gravina & Brian P. Siers (2011) Square Pegs and Round Holes: Ruminations on the Relationship between Performance Appraisal and Performance Management, *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 31:4, 277-287.
- Benz, M. (2005). Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction? Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms. *Kyklos*, 58(2), 155-176.

Leadership and Management Processes and Practices

In this section of the course we cover three key topics: leadership, strategic management, and public budgeting and finance. Each may viewed as a kind of process or processes or as a set of practices that are highly consequential for organizational and inter-organizational effectiveness.

Week 7 (24 October) – Leadership (Barbara)

Participants will explore ways that leadership has been theorized and implications for practicing leadership in government and nonprofit organizations as well as in cross-sector collaborations. Specific consideration will be given to leadership assessment, gender, race, and culture.

Required Readings:

- Goethals, G. R., & Sorenson, G. L. J. (Eds.). (2006). *The quest for a general theory of leadership*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. (Intro and Ch1)
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Van Wart, M. (2012). *Leadership in public organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis. (1-2 chapters)
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 459-474.
- Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2009). A critical review of race and ethnicity in the leadership literature: Surfacing context, power and the collective dimensions of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6), 876-896.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, February, 67.

Additional Resources:

- Crosby, B. C., and Bryson, J. M. (2012). Integrative leadership and policy change: A hybrid relational view In S. Ospina, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Relational leadership* (pp. 303-334). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Crosby, B.C. (2016). *Teaching Leadership: An Integrative Approach*. New York: Routledge. Preface.
- Crosby, B.C. The African American Leadership Forum. Hubert Project.
<http://www.hubertproject.org/hubert-material/257/>
- Quick, K. S. (2015). Locating and building collective leadership and impact. *Leadership*, 1-27.
- Ropo, A., Parvialnan, J., & Koivunen, N. (2002). Aesthetics in leadership: From absent bodies to social bodily presence. In K. W. Parry, & J. R. Meindl (Eds.), *Grounding leadership: Theory and research* (pp. 21-38). Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Assignment:

Take Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Week 8 (31 October) – Strategic Management (John)

Strategic management is concerned with the appropriate and reasonable integration of strategic planning and implementation across an organization (or other entity) in an ongoing way to enhance the fulfillment of mission, meeting of mandates, continuous learning; and sustained creation of public value. Strategic planning may be viewed as “a deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is, what it does, and why it does it” (Bryson, 2011). Implementation, on the other hand, encompasses the on-going efforts to realize in practice an organization’s mission, goals, and strategies; continuous organizational learning; and creation of public value.

Strategic management systems are organizational strategies for integrating planning, budgeting, implementation, and other organizational processes. They vary in how tight the organization is or can be, and how effective they area.

Required Reading:

- Bryson, John M. The Strategy Change Cycle: An Effective Strategic Planning Approach for Public and Nonprofit Organizations, *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations, 4th Edition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011, pp. 41-80.
- Bryson, John M., Barbara C. Crosby, and John K. Bryson, Understanding Strategic Planning and the Formulation and Implementation of Strategic Plans as a Way of Knowing: The Contributions of Actor-Network Theory, *International Public Management Journal*, 2009, 12(2), pp. 172 – 207, with supplemental materials available through the publisher’s website.
- Kroll, Alexander, and Donald Moynihan (2015) “Creating Public Value Using Performance Information,” in John Bryson, Barbara Crosby and Laura Bloomberg, eds., *Public Value and Public Administration*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 189 – 203.

- Rainey, Hal, and Patricia Steinbacher (1999) “Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(1), pp. 1-32.
- Osborne, Stephen, Zoe Radnor, Isabel Vidal, and Tony Kinder (2015) A Sustainable Business Model for Public Service Organizations?, *Public Management Review*, 16(2), pp. 165-172.
- Poister, Theodore, Lauren Edwards Hamilton, Obed Pasha, and Jason Edwards (2013) Strategy Formulation and Performance: Evidence from Local Public Transit Agencies, *Public Performance and Management Review*, 36(4), pp. 585 – 615.
- Hansen, Jesper, and Ewawn Ferlie (2016) Applying Strategic Management Theories in Public Sector Organizations: Developing a Typology, *Public Management Review*, 18(1), pp. 1 – 19.
- Walker , Richard (2014) Strategic Management and Performance in Public Organizations: Findings from the Miles and Snow Framework, *Public Administration Review*, 73(5), pp. 675–685.

Additional Resources:

- Andrews, Rhys, George A. Boyne, Jennifer Law, and Richard Walker (2012) *Strategic Management and Public Service Performance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Behn, Robert (2008) “Designing PerformanceStat,” *Public Performance and Management Review*, 32(2), pp. 206 – 235.
- Elbanna, Said, Rhys Andrews, and Raili Pollanen (2016) Strategic Planning and Implementation Success in Public Service Organizations: Evidence from Canada. *Public Management Review*, 18(7-8), pp. 1017 – 1042.
- Ferlie , Ewan and Edoardo Ongaro (2015) *Strategic Management in Public Service Organizations: Concepts, Schools, and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Jung, Chun Su (2014) “Extending the Theory of Goal Ambiguity to Programs: Examining the Relationship Between Goal Ambiguity and Performance,” *Public Administration Review*, 74(2), pp. 205 – 219.
- Moyihan, Donald P. (2013) *The New Federal Performance System: Implementing the GPRA Modernization Act*. Washington, DC: IBM Center for the Business of Government.
- Talbot, Colin (2010) *Theories of Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vining, Aiden (2011) Public Agency External Analysis Using the ‘Five Forces’ Framework, *International Public Management Journal*, 14(1), pp. 63 – 105.
- Voorberg, W. H., V. J. J. M. Bekkers, and L. G. Tummers (2014) A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the Social Innovation Journey. *Public Management Review*, pp. 1 – 25. Published online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505>

Walker, Richard, and Rhys Andrews (2015) Local Government Management and Performance: A Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(1), pp. 101 – 133.

Week 9 (07 November) – Public Budgeting and Finance (Jerry and Jay)

This topic concerns the scholarship about public budgeting and finance (PBF) as an important component of public affairs research. As an interdisciplinary field of study, PBF cares about the decision-making about governmental revenues and expenditures, the management of public financial resources, and their implications. We will start by introducing the big picture of PBF with a combination of political, economic, and managerial perspectives. Then we discuss three subtopics, each focusing on public budgeting (the political aspect), public finance (the economic aspect), and public financial management (the managerial perspective).

Required readings:

Caiden, Naomi (1985). The Boundaries of Public Budgeting: Issues for Education in Tumultuous Times. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 45(4): 495-502

Mullins, Daniel and Michael A. Pagano (2005). Local Budgeting and Finance: 25 Years of Developments. *Public Budgeting and Finance*. 25(4s): 3-45

Wildavsky, Aaron (1961). Political Implications of Budgetary Reform. *Public Administration Review*. 21(4): 183-190.

Mikesell, John (1970). Central Cities and Sales Tax Rate Differentials: The Boarder City Problem. *National Tax Journal*. 23(2): 206-213

Denison, Dwight, Wenli Yan, and Jerry Zhirong Zhao (2007). Is management performance a factor in municipal bond credit ratings? The case of Texas school districts. *Public Budgeting & Finance*. 27(4): 86-98.

Additional Resources:

Teresa Ter-Minassian (2016). Fiscal and Financial Issues for 21st Century Cities: Background and Overview. Brookings Institution. Available through url: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Fiscal-and-Financial-Issuesweb.pdf>

Bahl, R. W.; J.F., Linn and D.L. Wetzel (eds.), 2013: Financing Metropolitan Governments in Developing Countries, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Washington, DC. Available through url: https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/2216_Financing-Metropolitan-Governments-in-Developing-Countries

Oates, W. E. 1972: *Fiscal Federalism*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic.

Oates, W. E., 2005: "Toward a Second-Generation Theory of Fiscal Federalism" *International Tax and Public Finance*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 349–373.

Integration and Application

The penultimate section of the course will take an even more integrative approach than the previous sections. The Week 10 session will focus on collaboration across a variety of boundaries, including sector boundaries. The sessions in Weeks 11 and 12 will examine institutions and policy design for implementation.

Week 10 (14 November): Cross Boundary Collaboration (John, Barbara, and Melissa)

Andrews, Rhys, and Tom Entwistle. 2010. Does Cross-Sectoral Partnership Deliver? An Empirical Exploration of Public Service Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Equity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(3): 679–701.

Bryson, John M., Barbara C. Crosby, and Melissa M. Stone, Designing and Implementing Cross-Sector Collaboration – Needed and Challenging (2015) *Public Administration Review* 75(5), pp. 647–663.

Kirk Emerson & Tina Nabatchi (2015) Evaluating the Productivity of Collaborative Governance Regimes: A Performance Matrix, *Public Performance and Management Review*, 38:4, 717-747

Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. 2008. Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(2): 229–52.

Vangen, Siv, and Chris Huxham (2012) The Tangled Web: Unraveling the Principle of Common Goals in Collaborations, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22, pp. 731 – 760.

Ulibarri, Nicola (2015) Collaboration in Federal Hydropower Licensing: Impact on Process, Outputs, and Outcomes, *Public Performance and Management Review* 38, pp. 578 – 606.

Van Gestel, Kit, Joris Voets, and Koen Verhoest (2012) How Governance of Complex PPPs Affects Performance *Public Administration Quarterly* 36(2), pp. 140 – 188.

Sandfort, Jodi R. and H. Brinton Milward (2008) Collaborative Service Provision in the Public Sector, in by Steve Cropper, Mark Ebers, Chris Huxham, and Peter Smith Ring, eds., *Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 147-174.

Additional Resources:

- Bryson, John M., Fran Ackermann and Colin Eden (2016) *Discovering Collaborative Advantage: The Contributions of Goal Categories and Visual Strategy Mapping*. *Public Administration Review*. Early view access at: DOI:10.1111/puar.12608
- Emerson, Kirk, and Nabatchi, Tina (2015) *Collaborative Governance Regimes*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Koschmann, Matthew A., Timothy R. Kuhn, and Michael D. Pfarrer. 2012. A Communicative Framework of Value in Cross-Sector Partnerships. *Academy of Management Review* 37(2): 332–54.
- Huxham, Chris, and Siv Vangen (2005) *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. New York: Routledge.
- 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): 414–23.

Week 11 (21 November): Institutions and Policy Design for Implementation (Jodi)

The next two weeks of this seminar both examine how institutional and policy design influence the implementation of publicly supported programs and policies, and consider implementation dynamics in their own right. Implementation places a policy or program change at the center attention in implementation analysis, which is different from the way other seminar topics have been addressed. As a result, the questions implementation analysis stimulates focus on understanding how institutions, organizations, and people initiate policy or program changes or respond to them.

Required Readings:

Analytical Frameworks for Institutional Design

- Elmore, Richard (1979-80), “Backwards Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions,” *Political Science Quarterly* 94(4): 601-616.
- Hjern, Benny and David O. Porter (1981) “Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Implementation Analysis.” *Organizational Studies* 2(3): 211-227.
- Lynn, Laurence, Carolyn Heinrich, and Carolyn Hill (2001). “A Logic for Governance Research,” (chapter 2) *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- O’Toole, Laurence J. (2012). “Interorganizational Relations and Policy Implementation” in B.G. Peters and J. Pierre (eds.) *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage.
- Salamon, Lester (2002). “Introduction,” *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stone, Melissa M. and Jodi R. Sandfort. 2009. “Building a Policy Fields Framework to Inform Research on Nonprofit Organizations,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. December. 38(6), 1054-1075.

Analytical Frameworks for Policy Design

May, Peter J. and Ashley Jochim (2013) "Policy Regime Perspectives: Policies, Politics and Governing." *Policy Studies Journal* 41(3) (426-452).

Mettler, Suzanne and Mallory Sorelle (2014). "Policy Feedback Theory," *Theories of the Policy Process*, edited by Paul Sabatier and Christopher Weible. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 151-181.

Moynihan, Donald P. and Joe Soss (2014): Policy Feedback and the Politics of Administration. *Public Administration Review* 74 (3) (320-333).

Additional Resources:

Institutional Design

Jenkins-Smith, Hank, Daniel Nohrstedt, Christopher Weible, and Paul Sabatier, "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Foundations, Evolution, and Ongoing Research," *Theories of the Policy Process*, edited by Paul Sabatier and Christopher Weible. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 183-223.

Lynn, Laurence, Carolyn Heinrich, and Carolyn Hill (2001). *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ostrom, Elinor, Michael Cox, and Edella Schlager (2014). "An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework and Introduction of the Social-Ecological Systems Framework," *Theories of the Policy Process*, edited by Paul Sabatier and Christopher Weible. Boulder, CO: Westview Press: 267-306.

Simon, Herbert A. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial*, 3rd edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Policy Design

Sandfort, Jodi R., Sally C. Selden, and Jessica Sowa (2008): Do the Tools Used by Government Influence Organizational Performance? An Examination of Early Childhood Education Policy Implementation. *American Review of Public Administration* 38 (4): 412-443.

Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram (1997). *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas.

Yanow, Dvora (1996). *How does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Week 12 (28 November): Implementation Dynamics (Jodi)

Required Readings:

- Nilsen, Per et al., (2013) Never the Twain Shall Meet? A Comparison of Implementation Science and Policy Implementation Research, *Implementation Science* 8, no. 63 (January)
- Hill, Heather (2003). "Understanding Implementation: Street-Level Bureaucrats' Resources for Reform," *Journal of Public Administration, Research and Theory* 13(3): 265-282.
- May, Carl (2013) Towards a General Theory of Implementation. *Implementation Science* 8(1)1 - 18.
- Meyers, Marcia K. and V. Lehmann Nilsen (2012) "Street-Level Bureaucrats and the Implementation of Public Policy." In B. G. Peters and J. Pierre (eds.) *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage.
- Moynihan, D., Pamela Herd, P. & Hope Harvey (2014) Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.
- Winter, Soren C. (2012) "Implementation Perspectives: Status and Reconsideration" in B.G. Peters and J. Pierre (eds.) *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage.
- Moulton, Stephanie and Jodi Sandfort (2016) The Strategic Action Field Framework for Policy Implementation Research. *Policy Studies Journal*, Early view online.

Additional Readings

- DeLeon, Peter and Linda DeLeon (2002) What Ever Happened to Policy Implementation? An Alternative Approach, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(4): 467-92.
- Durlak, Joseph and Emily P. DuPre (2008) Implementation Matters: A Review of Research on the Influence of Implementation on Program Outcomes and the Factors Affecting Implementation., *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41(3-4: 327-50.
- Ingram, Helen (1990) Implementation: A Review and Suggested Framework," in Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky, eds. *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. Chatham NJ: Chatham House Publishers, 462-480.
- Lipsky, Michael (2010) *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, expanded 30th anniversary edition. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- O'Toole, Laurence (2004) The Theory-Practice Issue in Policy Implementation Research," *Public Administration* 82(2): 309-329.
- Mazmanian, Daniel and Paul Sabatier (1989) *Implementation and Public Policy*. Lanham, MA: University Press of America.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Mushcenko (2003) *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Services*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- May, Carl, et al (2009) Development of a Theory of Implementation and Integration: Normalization Process Theory, *Implementation Science* 4(29): 1-9.

May, Peter J. and Soren C. Winter (2007) Politicians, Managers and Street-Level Bureaucrats: Influences on Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19 (4): 453-476.

Roll, Stephen, Stephanie Moulton, and Jodi Sandfort. A Comparative Analysis of Two Streams of Implementation Research, *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs*. Forthcoming

Tabak, Rachel (2012) Bridging Research and Practice: Models for Dissemination and Implementation Research, *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*. 43(3): 337-50.

Presenting to Scholarly and Practitioner Audiences

In the final two sessions students will practice making presentations to scholarly and practitioner audiences.

Week 13 (December 5): Presenting Topics to Academic Audiences (All)

Students will make a 15 – 20 minute scholarly presentations based on one of their memos. There will be panel discussion of these presentations in which critiques and suggestions for improvement will be offered.

Week 14 (December 12): Teaching Management, Leadership and Governance (All)

Required Readings:

Huston, T. (2009). *Teaching what you don't know*. Harvard University Press. Pp. 56-81, 107-165

Additional Resources:

Bransford, John D., Ann L. Brown, and Rodney R. Cocking, eds. (2000) *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Fink, L. Dee (2003) *Creating Significant Learning Experience*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Guring, Regan A. R., Nancy L. Chick, and Aeron Haynie, eds. (2009) *Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.