Comparative Public Management
AY 2020/21: Block 2

Leiden University
Institute of Public Administration

Syllabus

Course Instructor: Dr. Kohei Suzuki
Office: WH 4.90
Office Hours: To be arranged via email
E-mail: k.suzuki@fgga.leidenuniv.nl
Class schedule:
- October 30, November 6, 13, 20, 27, December 4, 11
- 13:15-16:00

Place:
- Stichthage 13.13

1. Introduction

How do public managers in the Netherland, Spain, and Japan behave differently? More broadly, what explains variations in public managers' attitudes and behaviors across countries? Why do some municipalities perform better than others? The main purpose of this course is to understand how characteristics of public administration differ across countries (or across municipalities) and how they influence public managers' attitudes and behavior, management practices, organizational performance, and broader outcomes. Rather than internal management of public organizations, this course focuses on the impacts of environmental and institutional factors on public managers' attitudes, behavior, and policy and socioeconomic outcomes.

In recent years, scholars in the fields of public administration and political science have "rediscovered" the importance of public bureaucracies for understanding different levels of government performance (Olsen 2006). Recent studies show that meritocratically recruited, autonomous, and impartial public administration—so called "Weberian bureaucracy"—is associated with long-term economic development, improved health outcomes, reduced corruption, greater innovation, and higher government effectiveness. Furthermore, recent studies also show that demographic representation in public organizations affects organizational performance and policy preferences. However, the field of public management has been accused of neglecting the big questions (Roberts 2017, 9) and assumed that "all states are alike—that Mexico is just like the United States, for example" (Milward 2016, 312). This course aims to bridge this gap.

In this course, students are expected to not only study the related academic works, but also synthesize the findings of previous studies, critically evaluate and relate them to current policy debates and management issues, and suggest practical actions. Students can use this opportunity to begin or to further develop their master's thesis or independent research. This course does not focus on a specific geographic area. Instead, we will examine various countries in the world from a comparative perspective.

2. Learning objectives
Upon completion of the course, students should be able to:
- Explain varieties in administrative characteristics and management practices around the world;
- Understand to what extent different institutional features and management practices influence governance outcomes and public manager's attitudes and practices;
- Critically and constructively assess the existing studies;
- Practice research design skills and use the insights from the course to start or advance his or her own independent research or master's thesis.

Labour market
- This course will provide students with the understanding of the determinants of effective government from a comparative perspective and a chance to practice research design skills

3. Reading Materials
- The course does not follow a single text across all sessions. Instead, each class session will consist of 4-5 mandatory readings. Most readings are available for students via Leiden University Library or accessible websites.

4. Teaching Methods
This course will be taught through a mix of mini-lectures by the instructor, student presentations, group discussion, and class discussion facilitated by students.

5. Assessment Methods
- Students' performance is assessed based on the following table.

Required work	Percentage
Active class participation and in-class activities	20%
Group presentation and discussion leader	15%
Short assignment	20%
Final assignment	45%
Total	100%

Compensation of partial grades with other partial grades is not possible. Redoing the assignment is only possible if the assignment is submitted before the deadline and had a score lower than 5.5. All components need to be passed with a grade of 5.5 or higher in order to successfully complete this course. From 2020-2021 onwards, partial grades will not remain valid after the exam and the resit of the course.

Class attendance and participation
-Class attendance
- Students are expected to attend all the lectures and understand the lecture contents and assigned readings. If students are unable to attend a class for covid-19-related or other significant reasons, they are required to watch a video of the lecture to be uploaded to Brightspace

-Class participation (20%)
- This course takes **participatory approaches of teaching** rather than the classic lecture style approaches. Students are expected to **actively engage** in individual and group activity as well as class discussion and online discussion.

- The following is what class participation means in this class and class participation points are given based on this criteria:
  · Completing reading assignments in advance and being ready for class discussion
  · Preparing answers for "topics for discussion" and class activities
  · In class and small group discussions,
    o Attempting to answer a question (you do not need to answer correctly, but you need to make a serious attempt)
    o Proactively participating* in class discussion, sharing ideas, observations, and personal experience (*Proactive participation means that students are expected to participate before they get called on by the instructor).
    o Synthesizing and relating the ideas of others
    o Relating the class discussion to practical issues
    o Positively contributing to small group discussion
    o Helping others develop their views and ideas

- **Students taking courses via online will be required to do weekly assignments in Brightspace as part of their class participation**.
- **Students who have missed a class will be required to submit assignments for the week they have missed.**

Group presentation and discussion leader (15%)
- Each group (form groups of 2-3 students) is required to present a summary of the main ideas and arguments of the assigned readings with the class and lead a class discussion.
- **Students are expected to use a power point slide show or prepare a summary handout of your presentation.**
- Each student will select one session and form a group with other students and make a group presentation.
- Your group presentation should include the followings:
  a. A summary and synthesis of the main arguments of the assigned readings
  b. Constructive criticism of the assigned papers
  c. Discussion on how the assignment paper can be useful in solving real-world administrative management and policy problems
  d. Practical implications of the reading materials and key takeaways for management and policy practices
  e. 3-4 topics for class discussion

- The group presentation should take less than <u>10 minutes</u>
- After the presentation, the group should <u>lead the class discussion for less than 10 minutes</u>. In class discussions, presenters should try to make it easier for other students to participate in the discussion. The extent to which you have been able to <u>engage other students in the discussion will also be assessed</u>.
- Presentations are graded on <u>the clarity and conciseness of the presentation, the comprehension of the subject matter, and the student's participation in the discussion</u>.
- Each group should equalize contribution of each member
- The discussion questions include but are not limited to 1) how you can relate the concepts and ideas of the assigned readings to "real world" issues and policy and management debates, 2) practical implications of the readings, 3) critiques of research design and methods, 4) suggestions for further research questions.
- **Students participating in this class remotely via online should form a group with other online students to create a presentation video of the assignment and upload it to Brightspace.**

Short assignment (20 %)
- Each student is required to write <u>one</u> individual short written assignment (Max 1250 words including foot/end notes, but <u>excluding</u> references) regarding the assigned readings and class discussion.
- The purpose of this assignment is to have deeper understanding of the class readings and connect the theories or concepts of the readings to a specific real-world issue.
- Students will select <u>one specific conceptual argument or theoretical framework</u> from the class readings and discussions (e.g. "quality of government", "meritocracy", "representative bureaucracy", "active representation", "gender representation", "managerial capacity") and select <u>more than three readings</u> about the argument or theory you chose from the required or recommended reading list.
- Papers should focus on <u>the central arguments</u> under study and offer a discussion of key issues that arise in the readings rather than a summary of the readings. <u>Be selective, focused, and terse</u> rather than exhaustive.
- Students will select <u>one specific real-world event/case</u> which is related to the concept or theory of your choice. The case should <u>not be</u> from the course readings selected. Students should independently find such a case/event.
- Then, students will discuss how the case selected contributes to the development of the theories or concepts of your choice.
- For example, "How does the recent meritocratization in the Dutch public administration shed light on the issue of lack of representation which has not been discussed in previous studies on meritocracy? "To what extent does theoretical and empirical studies of political influence on bureaucracy explain the relative success (or failure) of some countries' governments?", "What are potential effects of the recent democratic backsliding on performance of bureaucracy?"
- The short essay should include:
  - o Main idea of the concept or theoretical framework of your choice
  - o Specific real-world issue or case of your choice
  - o Discussion of the relevance of the concept, etc. of your choice

- The assignment should be submitted via Brightspace.
- Deadline: Each student can <u>decide own essay deadline between November 13 and December 27.</u> Late assignments are accepted, but with a grade of 1.0 per day penalty.

Final paper (45%)
- Each student is required to write a systematic review paper (Max 4,000 words including foot/end notes, but <u>excluding</u> references).
- Students select <u>one key concept or topic which is related to the contents of this course</u> and write a systematic review paper on that concept.
- The purpose of this assignment is to give an opportunity for students to become familiar with theoretical and empirical discussions in comparative public administration and management and evaluate them in a systematic way.
- See systematic review paper guideline for the details of this assignment
- To give some flexibility in students' study schedule, the instructors do not set a fixed deadline for this assignment. Each student can decide own assignment deadline <u>between November 13 and December 27</u>. Further instructions on the flexible deadline policy will be provided in lecture or seminar.

6. Class Policies
- Students can use **laptop computers**, but they are not expected to use them for social media, e-mail, shopping, or other purposes that are not related to the class activities.
- A note on behaviour: If you have a disagreement about some aspect of the course proceedings the instructor kindly asks you to speak to me after the end of the class or send me an email.

- **Plagiarism** is an unacceptable. Assignments that include plagiarism will not be graded, and cases of plagiarism will be reported to the university.
  - o "Generally, plagiarism is understood as presenting, intentionally or otherwise, someone else's words, thoughts, analyses, argumentations, pictures, techniques, computer programmes, etc., as your own work. Most students will understand that cutting and pasting is not allowed without mentioning the source of the material, but plagiarism has a wider meaning. Paraphrasing someone else's texts, e.g. by replacing a few words by synonyms or interchanging some sentences is also plagiarism. Even reproducing in your own words a reasoning or analysis made by someone else may constitute plagiarism if you do not add any content of your own; in so doing, you create the impression that you have invented the argumentation yourself while this is not the case. The same still applies if you bring together bits of work by various authors without mentioning the sources".

  Please see Leiden University, How to avoid plagiarism
  https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/binaries/content/assets/algemeen/onderzoek/plagiarism.pdf

7. Weekly Overview

	Date	Time	Location	Topic	Readings
1	30-Oct	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Introduction, Historical Development of Public Administration and Management, and the Recent Critiques	skim Wilson (1887), Lynn (2009), Milward et al. (2016), Roberts (2018)
2	6-Nov	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Rediscovery of Bureaucracy, Quality of Government, and Governance Outcomes	skim Olsen (2006), Evans & Rauch (1999), Fukuyama (2013), Rothstein (2009), Rothstein & Teorell (2008)
3	13-Nov	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes I	Pardo (2011), Dahlström & Lapuente (2017)-Ch.1-3, Cornell (2014), Boräng et al. (2018)
4	20-Nov	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes II	Cooper (2018), Lapuente & Suzuki (2020), Oliveros & Schuster (2018), Suzuki & Hur (2019)
5	27-Nov	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Representative Bureaucracy I	Meier & Melton (2014), Kennedy (2014), Riccucci & Van Ryzin (2017), Jankowski et al. (2020)
6	4-Dec	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Representative Bureaucracy	Wängnerud (2012) , Stensöta et al. (2015), Hamidullah et al. (2015), Suzuki & Avellaneda (2018)
7	11-Dec	13:15-16:00	Stichthage 13.13	Managerial Capacity, Quality, and Organizational Performance	Meier & O'Toole (2002), Avellaneda (2009), Avellaneda (2016), Lapuente et al. (2020)

October 30, Session 1: Introduction, Historical Development of Public Administration and Management, and the Recent Critiques

Required readings
- (skim) Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political science quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.
- Lynn, L. E. (2009). Public Management: A Concise History of the Field. In E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn, & C. Pollitt (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*: Oxford University Press.
- Milward, B., Jensen, L., Roberts, A., et al. (2016). Is public management neglecting the state? *Governance*, 29(3), 311-334.
- Roberts, A. (2018). The Aims of Public Administration: Reviving the Classical View. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 1(1), 73-85.

Recommended readings
- Meier, K. J., & Hill, G. C. (2009). Bureaucracy in the twenty-first century. In E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn Jr, & C. Pollitt (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*: Oxford University Press.
- O'Toole, L. J., & Meier, K. J. (2015). Public management, context, and performance: In quest of a more general theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(1), 237–256.
- Peters, B. Guy. "The Politics of Bureaucracy after 40 years." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 21, no. 3 (2019): 468-479.
- Beagles, Jonathan E., Sabina Schnell, and Catherine Gerard. "Overcoming Parochialism in American Public Administration." *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* (2019).
- Bertelli, A. M., Hassan, M., Honig, D., et al. (2020). An agenda for the study of Public Administration in Developing Countries. *Governance*, 33(4), 735-748. doi:10.1111/gove.12520

November 6, Session 2: Rediscovery of Bureaucracy, Quality of Government, and Governance Outcomes

Required readings
- (skim) Olsen, J. P. (2006). Maybe it is time to rediscover bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1), 1-24.
- Evans, P., & Rauch, J. E. (1999). Bureaucracy and growth: A cross-national analysis of the effects of" Weberian" state structures on economic growth. *American sociological review*, 64(5), 748-765.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance*, 26(3), 347-368.
- Rothstein, B. (2009). Creating political legitimacy: Electoral democracy versus quality of government. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(3), 311-330.
- Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165-190.

Recommended readings
- Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., & Nasiritousi, N. (2009). Quality of government: What you get. *Annual review of political science*, 12, 135-161.
- Lee, S.-Y., & Whitford, A. B. (2009). Government effectiveness in comparative perspective. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 249-281.
- Van de Walle, Steven. 2009. "International comparisons of public sector performance: how to move ahead?" *Public Management Review* 11 (1):39-56.
- Cornell, A., Knutsen, C. H., & Teorell, J. (2020). Bureaucracy and Growth. *Comparative political studies*, 53(14), 2246-2282. doi:10.1177/0010414020912262

- Longo, F. (2008). Quality of Governance: Impartiality is not enough. *Governance*, 21(2), 191-196.
- Rotberg, R. I. (2014). Good governance means performance and results. *Governance*, 27(3), 511-518.
- Jindra, C., & Vaz, A. (2019). Good governance and multidimensional poverty: A comparative analysis of 71 countries. Governance, 32(4), 657-675. doi:10.1111/gove.12394
- Michener, G., Velasco, R. B., Contreras, E., et al. (2020). Googling the requester: Identity-questing and discrimination in public service provision. *Governance*, 33(2), 249-267.
- Suzuki, K., & Demircioglu, M. A. (2020). *Is impartiality enough? Government impartiality and citizens' perceptions of public service quality. Governance.* doi:10.1111/gove.12527
- Engster, D. (2020). A Public Ethics of Care for Policy Implementation. *American Journal of Political Science,* 64(3), 621-633.

November 13, Session 3: Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes I
Required readings
- Pardo, María del Carmen. 2011. "Civil Service." In *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*, edited by Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser and Leonardo Morlino, 255-259. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dahlström, C., & Lapuente, V. (2017). *Organizing the Leviathan: How the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats shapes good government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **(Chapters 1, 2, 3)**
- Cornell, A. (2014). Why bureaucratic stability matters for the implementation of democratic governance programs. *Governance*, 27(2), 191-214.
- Boräng, F., Cornell, A., Grimes, M., et al. (2018). Cooking the books: Bureaucratic politicization and policy knowledge. *Governance*, 31(1), 7-26.

Recommended readings
- Bersch, Katherine, Sérgio Praça, and Matthew M. Taylor. "State capacity, bureaucratic politicization, and corruption in the Brazilian state." *Governance* 30, no. 1 (2017): 105-124.
- Charron, N., Dijkstra, L., & Lapuente, V. (2015). Mapping the regional divide in Europe: A measure for assessing quality of government in 206 European regions. *Social Indicators Research,* 122(2), 315-346.
- Nistotskaya, M., Charron, N., & Lapuente, V. (2015). The wealth of regions: quality of government and SMEs in 172 European regions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 33(5), 1125-1155.
- Nistotskaya, M., & Cingolani, L. (2016). Bureaucratic Structure, Regulatory Quality, and Entrepreneurship in a Comparative Perspective: Cross-Sectional and Panel Data Evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 26(3), 519–534.
- Suzuki, K., & Demircioglu, M. A. (2019). The Association Between Administrative Characteristics and National Level Innovative Activity: Findings from a Cross-National Study. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 42(4), 755-782.
- El-Taliawi, Ola G., and Zeger Van Der Wal. "Developing administrative capacity: an agenda for research and practice." *Policy Design and Practice* (2019): 1-15.

November 20, Session 4: Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes II
Required readings
- Cooper, C. A. (2018). Encouraging civil servants to be frank and fearless: Merit recruitment and employee voice. *Public Administration*, 96(4), 721-735.

- Lapuente, V., & Suzuki, K. (2020). Politicization, Bureaucratic Legalism, and Innovative Attitudes in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*, 80(3), 454-467.
- Oliveros, V., & Schuster, C. (2018). Merit, tenure, and bureaucratic behavior: Evidence from a conjoint experiment in the Dominican Republic. *Comparative political studies*, 51(6), 759-792.
- Suzuki, K., & Hur, H. (2020). Bureaucratic structures and organizational commitment: findings from a comparative study of 20 European countries. *Public Management Review*, 22(6), 877-907.

Recommended readings
- Dahlström, C., Lapuente, V., & Teorell, J. (2012). The merit of meritocratization: Politics, bureaucracy, and the institutional deterrents of corruption. Political Research Quarterly, 65(3), 656-668.
- Hong, S., & Kim, Y. (2019). Loyalty or Competence: Political Use of Performance Information and Negativity Bias. *Public Administration Review*, 79(6), 829-840.
- Bach, Tobias, and Sylvia Veit. "The determinants of promotion to high public office in Germany: Partisan loyalty, political craft, or managerial competencies?." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 28, no. 2 (2017): 254-269.
- Meyer-Sahling, Jan-Hinrik, Christian Schuster, and Sass Mikkelsen. "Civil service management in developing countries: what works?: evidence from a survey with 23,000 civil servants in Africa, Asia, Eastn Europe and Latin America." (2018). Available from this link.
- Niklasson, B., Christiansen, P. M., & Öhberg, P. (2019). Speaking truth to power: political advisers' and civil servants' responses to perceived harmful policy proposals. *Journal of Public Policy*, 40(3), 492-512. doi:10.1017/S0143814X18000508
- Teodoro, Manuel P. 2009. "Bureaucratic job mobility and the diffusion of innovations." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1):175-189.

November 27, Session 5: Representative Bureaucracy I
Required readings
- Meier, K. J., & Melton, E. K. (2014). Bureaucratic Representation and Responsiveness. In D. L. Leal, T. Lee, & M. Sawyer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Racial and Ethnic Politics in the United States*.
- Kennedy, B. (2014). Unraveling representative bureaucracy: A systematic analysis of the literature. *Administration & Society*, 46(4), 395-421.
- Riccucci, N. M., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2017). Representative bureaucracy: A lever to enhance social equity, coproduction, and democracy. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 21-30.
- Jankowski, M., Prokop, C., & Tepe, M. (2020). Representative bureaucracy and public hiring preferences: Evidence from a conjoint experiment among German municipal civil servants and private sector employees. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Recommended readings
- Bishu, S. G., & Kennedy, A. R. (2020). Trends and gaps: A meta-review of representative bureaucracy. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(4), 559-588.
- Riccucci, N. M., Van Ryzin, G. G., & Lavena, C. F. (2014). Representative bureaucracy in policing: Does it increase perceived legitimacy? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(3), 537-551.
- Hong, S. (2017). Black in Blue: Racial Profiling and Representative Bureaucracy in Policing Revisited. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 27(4), 547-561.
- Fernandez, S., Koma, S., & Lee, H. (2018). Establishing the link between representative bureaucracy and performance: The South African case. *Governance*, 31(3), 535-553.

- Fernández, S. (2020). *Representative bureaucracy and performance : public service transformation in South Africa*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nicholson-Crotty, J., Grissom, J. A., & Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2011). Bureaucratic representation, distributional equity, and democratic values in the administration of public programs. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(2), 582-596.
- Baekgaard, M., & George, B. (2018). Equal access to the top? Representative bureaucracy and politicians' recruitment preferences for top administrative staff. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 28(4), 535-550.
- Portillo, S., Bearfield, D., & Humphrey, N. (2020). The Myth of Bureaucratic Neutrality: Institutionalized Inequity in Local Government Hiring. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(3), 516-531.

December 4, Session 6: Representative Bureaucracy II
Required readings
- Wängnerud, L. (2012). Why women are less corrupt than men. In S. Holmberg & B. Rothstein (Eds.), *Good Government: The Relevance of Political Science* (pp. 230–250). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Stensöta, H., Wängnerud, L., & Svensson, R. (2015). Gender and corruption: The mediating power of institutional logics. *Governance*, 28(4), 475-496.
- Hamidullah, M. F., Riccucci, N. M., & Pandey, S. K. (2015). Women in city hall: Gender dimensions of managerial values. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(3), 247-262.
- Suzuki, K., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2018). Women and risk-taking behaviour in local public finance. *Public Management Review*, 20(12), 1741-1767.

Recommended readings
- Chattopadhyay, R., & Duflo, E. (2004). Women as policy makers: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment in India. *Econometrica*, 72(5), 1409-1443.
- Johnston, K. (2019). Women in public policy and public administration? *Public Money & Management*, 39(3), 155-165.
- Lapuente, V., & Suzuki, K. (2020). The prudent entrepreneurs: women and public sector innovation. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1-27.
- Post, C., & Byron, K. (2015). Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Academy of management journal*, 58(5), 1546-1571.
- Stensöta, H., & Wängnerud, L. (2018). *Gender and Corruption : Historical Roots and New Avenues for Research*. Cham, SWITZERLAND: Springer International Publishing AG.
- Groeneveld, S., Bakker, V., & Schmidt, E. (2020). Breaking the glass ceiling, but facing a glass cliff? The role of organizational decline in women's representation in leadership positions in Dutch civil service organizations. *Public Administration*, 98(2), 441-464.
- Raaphorst, N., & Groeneveld, S. (2019). Discrimination and representation in street-level bureaucracies. In Research Handbook on Street-Level Bureaucracy. Edward Elgar Publishing. Available from this link

December 11, Session 7: Managerial Capacity, Quality, and Organizational Performance
Required readings
- Meier, K. J., & O'Toole Jr, L. J. (2002). Public management and organizational performance: The effect of managerial quality. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management: The Journal of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(4), 629-643.

- Avellaneda, C. N. (2009). Municipal performance: Does mayoral quality matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 19(2), 285-312.
- Avellaneda, Claudia N. 2016. "Government Performance and Chief Executives' Intangible Assets: Motives, Networking, and/or Capacity?" *Public Management Review* 18 (6):918-947.
- Lapuente, V., Suzuki, K., & Van de Walle, S. (2020). Goats or wolves? Private sector managers in the public sector. *Governance*, 33(3), 599-619. doi:10.1111/gove.12462

Recommended readings
- Johansen, Morgen. 2013. "The Impact of Managerial Quality on Employee Turnover." *Public Management Review* 15 (6):858-877.
- Andrews, Rhys, and George A Boyne. 2010. "Capacity, leadership, and organizational performance: Testing the black box model of public management." *Public Administration Review* 70 (3):443-454.
- Avellaneda, Claudia N, and Johabed G Olvera. 2018. "Chief executives' approval of immigrants: Evidence from a survey experiment of 101 Latin American and Caribbean mayors." *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration* 1 (1).