

Comparative Public Management AY 2022/23: Block 2

Leiden University
Institute of Public Administration

Syllabus

Course Instructor: Dr. Kohei Suzuki

Office: Wijnhaven 4.90

Office Hours: To be arranged via email

E-mail: k.suzuki@fgga.leidenuniv.nl

Class schedule:

- November 4, 11, 18, 25, December 2, 9, 16
- 13:15-16:00

Place:

- Wijnhaven 3.56

1. Introduction

How do public managers in the Netherlands, 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. All components need to be passed with a grade of 5.5 or higher in order to successfully complete this course. Students will be permitted to retake the individual assignment if an insufficient grade has been obtained using the first attempt. Active class participation and in-class activities cannot be retaken. 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.

-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,
 - Attempting to answer a question (you do not need to answer correctly, but you need to make a serious attempt)
 - 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).
 - Synthesizing and relating the ideas of others
 - Relating the class discussion to practical issues
 - Positively contributing to small group discussion
 - Helping others develop their views and ideas
 - Providing constructive feedback to the authors and other students
- **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 any other presentation format) 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
 - *Students are expected to present not only a summary but also a synthesis of the readings. Good synthesis typically includes identifying shared issues across the assigned readings, important similarities/differences in the readings, comparing key arguments across the readings. Synthesis means “[t]o integrate multiple details from multiple texts to generate a new, bigger thought” (watch this [link](#) for more details about summary vs synthesis).
 - b. Discussion on how the theories and perspectives addressed in the assigned readings can lead to a better understanding and solution of actual public administration and management problems.
 - c. Practical implications of the reading materials and key takeaways for management and policy practices
 - d. 3-4 topics for class discussion
- The group presentation should take less than 10 minutes
- After the presentation, the group should lead the class discussion for less than 10 minutes. 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 engage other students in the discussion will also be assessed.
- Presentations are graded on the clarity and conciseness of the presentation, the comprehension of the subject matter, and the student's participation in the discussion.
- 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) constructive critiques of research design and methods, 4) suggestions for further research questions.

Short assignment (20 %)

- Each student is required to write one individual short written assignment (Max 1250 words including foot/end notes, but excluding 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 one specific conceptual argument or theoretical framework from the class readings and discussions (e.g. “quality of government”, “meritocracy”, “representative bureaucracy”, “active representation”, “gender representation”, “managerial capacity”) and select more than three readings about the argument or theory you chose from the required or recommended reading list.
- Papers should focus on the central arguments under study and offer a discussion of key issues that arise in the readings rather than a mere summary of the readings. Be selective, focused, and terse rather than exhaustive.
- Students will select one specific real-world event/case which is related to the concept or theory of your choice. The case should not be 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:
 - Main idea of the concept or theoretical framework of your choice
 - Specific real-world issue or case of your choice
 - Discussion of the relevance of the concept, etc. of your choice
- The assignment should be submitted via Brightspace.
- Deadline: Each student can decide own essay deadline between November 18 and December 27. Late assignments are accepted, but with a grade of 0.5 per day penalty.

Final paper (45%)

- Students will write a policy brief paper as the final paper assignment (max word count 3000, including foot/endnotes, but excluding references).
- Final papers should be submitted via Brightspace.
- The instructor will provide the details of the final paper assignment in class.
- 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 between November 18 and December 27. 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 unacceptable. Assignments that include plagiarism will not be graded, and cases of plagiarism will be reported to the university.
 - “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	4-Nov	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Introduction, Historical Development of Public Administration and Management, and the Recent Critiques	Group A	Wilson (1887), Stillman (1997)
					Group B	O'Toole & Meier (2015), Milward et al. (2016), Schuster et al. (2020)
2	11-Nov	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Rediscovery of Bureaucracy and Good Governance	Group C	Olsen (2006), Meier & Hill (2009)
					Group D	Evans & Rauch (1999), Holmberg et al. (2009)
3	18-Nov	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Quality of Government and Governance Outcomes	Group E	Rothstein (2009), Rothstein & Teorell (2008), Fukuyama (2013)
					Group F	Nistotskaya (2020), Mungiu-Pippidi (2020)
4	25-Nov	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes I	Group G	Pardo (2011), Dahlström & Lapuente (2017)-Ch.1-3
					Group H	Halligan (2021), Cornell (2014)
5	2-Dec	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes II	Group I	Cooper (2021), Lapuente & Suzuki (2020)
					Group J	Oliveros & Schuster (2018), Harris et al. (2022)
6	9-Dec	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Representative Bureaucracy	Group K	Meier & Melton (2014), Riccucci & Van Ryzin (2017)
					Group L	Wängnerud (2012), Stensöta et al. (2015), Suzuki & Avellaneda (2018)
7	16-Dec	13:15-16:00	Wijnhaven 3.56	Managerial Capacity, Quality, and Organizational Performance	Group M	Meier & O'Toole (2002), Avellaneda (2009)
					Group N	Avellaneda (2016), Andrews et al. (2010)

November 4, Session 1: Introduction, Historical Development of Public Administration and Management, and the Recent Critiques

Required readings

- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political science quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.
- Stillman, R. J. (1997). American vs. European public administration: Does public administration make the modern state, or does the state make public administration? *Public Administration Review*, 332-338.
- 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.
- Milward, B., Jensen, L., Roberts, A., et al. (2016). Is public management neglecting the state? *Governance*, 29(3), 311-334.
- Schuster, C., Meyer-Sahling, J. H., & Mikkelsen, K. S. (2020). (Un) principled principals,(un) principled agents: The differential effects of managerial civil service reforms on corruption in developing and OECD countries. *Governance*, 33(4), 829-848.

Recommended readings

- Roberts, A. (2018). The Aims of Public Administration: Reviving the Classical View. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 1(1), 73-85.
- Beagles, J. E., Schnell, S., & Gerard, C. (2019). Overcoming parochialism in American public administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 2(4), 255-266.
- 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
- Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2022). Bringing political science back into public administration research. *Governance*.
- Andrews, M. (2010). Good government means different things in different countries. *Governance*, 23(1), 7-35.
- Peci, A., & Fornazin, M. (2017). The knowledge-building process of public administration research: a comparative perspective between Brazil and North American contexts. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(1_suppl), 99-119.
- Painter, M., and B. Peters, eds. (2010). *Tradition and Public Administration*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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.

November 11, Session 2: Rediscovery of Bureaucracy and Good Governance

Required readings

- Olsen, J. P. (2006). Maybe it is time to rediscover bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1), 1-24.
- Meier, Kenneth J, and Gregory C Hill. 2009. Bureaucracy in the twenty-first century. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E Lynn Jr and Christopher Pollitt: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., & Nasiritousi, N. (2009). Quality of government: What you get. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12, 135-161.

Recommended readings

- Meier, K. J., & O'Toole Jr, L. J. (2006). Political control versus bureaucratic values: Reframing the debate. *Public administration review*, 66(2), 177-192.
- Cornell, A., Knutsen, C. H., & Teorell, J. (2020). Bureaucracy and Growth. *Comparative political studies*, 53(14), 2246-2282. doi:10.1177/0010414020912262
- Vogler, J. P. (2022). Bureaucracies in Historical Political Economy. In J. A. Jenkins & J. Rubin (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Political Economy*. Available from this [link](#).
- Jindra, C., & Vaz, A. (2019). Good governance and multidimensional poverty: A comparative analysis of 71 countries. *Governance*, 32(4), 657-675.
- 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.
- Charron, N. (2021). Measuring the Unmeasurable? Taking Stock of QoG Measures. In A. Bågenholm, M. Bauhr, M. Grimes, & B. Rothstein (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Quality of Government*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

November 18, Session 3: Quality of Government and Governance Outcomes

Required readings

- 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.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance*, 26(3), 347-368.
- Nistotskaya, M. (2020). Quality of Government (QoG) as Impartiality: Review of the literature on the causes and consequences of QoG. *KIPA Public Policy Review*, 1, 25-49.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2020). The quality of government and public administration. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.

Recommended readings

- A. Bågenholm, M. Bauhr, M. Grimes, & B. Rothstein (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Quality of Government*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
 - Bågenholm, A., Bauhr, M., Grimes, M., & Rothstein, B. (2021). Introduction: Quality of Government: Why—What—How.
 - Bauhr, M., & Grimes, M. (2021). Democracy and the Quality of Government.
 - Ahlerup, P., Baskaran, T., & Bigsten, A. (2021). The Quality of Government and Economic Growth.
 - Dahlström, C., & Lapuente, V. (2021). Bureaucracy and Government Quality.
 - Fukuyama, F., & Recanatini, F. (2021). Corruption, Elites, and Power: An Overview of International Policy Efforts to Improve the Quality of Government.
 - Dietrich, S., & Winters, M. S. (2021). Foreign Aid and Quality of Government.
- Charron, N., & Lapuente, V. (2010). Does democracy produce quality of government? *European Journal of Political Research*, 49(4), 443-470.
- 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.
- Suzuki, K., & Demircioglu, M. A. (2021). Is impartiality enough? Government impartiality and citizens' perceptions of public service quality. *Governance*, 34(3), 727-764.

- Engster, D. (2020). A Public Ethics of Care for Policy Implementation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(3), 621-633.
- Møller, A. M., Pedersen, K. Z., & Pors, A. S. (2022). The bureaucratic ethos in street-level work: Revitalizing Weber's ethics of office. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 5(2), 151-163.
- Peeters, R., & Campos, S. A. (2021). Taking the bite out of administrative burdens: How beneficiaries of a Mexican social program ease administrative burdens in street-level interactions. *Governance*, 34(4), 1001-1018.
- Michener, G., Velasco, R. B., Contreras, E., et al. (2020). Googling the requester: Identity-questioning and discrimination in public service provision. *Governance*, 33(2), 249-267.

November 25, Session 4: 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.
- Halligan, J. (2021). Politicization of public services in comparative perspective. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- 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.

Recommended readings

- Breugh, J., & Hammerschmid, G. (2020). Understanding Public Servants from a Global Perspective. *The Palgrave Handbook of the Public Servant*, 1-20.
- Breugh, J., & Hammerschmid, G. (2021). Different systems, different civil service, different HRM: a comparison of HRM approaches in Anglo-Saxon and Rechtsstaat systems Research *Handbook on HRM in the Public Sector* (pp. 292-306): Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Smalskys, V., & Urbanovič, J. (2017). Civil service systems. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- Veit, S. (2020). Career Patterns in Administrations. In W. R. Thompson (Ed.), *Oxford research Encyclopedia of politics*: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Dahlström, C., & Lapuente, V. (2022). Comparative Bureaucratic Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 25(1), 43-63.
- Dietrich, S., & Winters, M. S. (2021). Foreign aid and quality of government. In A. Bågenholm, M. Bauhr, M. Grimes, & B. Rothstein (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Quality of Government*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, M. W., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., Yesilkagit, K., & Becker, S. (2021). Introduction: Populists, Democratic Backsliding, and Public Administration.
- Stoker, G. (2021). Public Administration: How to Respond to Populism and Democratic Backsliding. In B. G. Peters, J. Pierre, K. Yesilkagit, M. W. Bauer, & S. Becker (Eds.), *Democratic Backsliding and Public Administration: How Populists in Government Transform State Bureaucracies* (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- de Avila Gomide, A. (2021). Democracy and bureaucracy in newly industrialized countries: A systematic comparison between Latin America and East Asia. *Governance*.
- Bersch, K., Praça, S., & Taylor, M. M. (2017). State capacity, bureaucratic politicization, and corruption in the Brazilian state. *Governance*, 30(1), 105-124.
- Boräng, F., Cornell, A., Grimes, M., et al. (2018). Cooking the books: Bureaucratic politicization and policy knowledge. *Governance*, 31(1), 7-26.
- 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., & 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.
- Andersen, D., & Cornell, A. (2022). Voting for bureaucracy? Contestation, suffrage, and meritocracy. *European Journal of Political Research*.
- Nieto-Morales, F., & Ríos, V. (2021). Human resource management as a tool to control corruption: Evidence from Mexican municipal governments. *Public Administration*.

December 2, Session 5: Meritocracy, Politicization, and Governance Outcomes II

Required readings

- Cooper, C. A. (2021). Encouraging bureaucrats to report corruption: human resource management and whistleblowing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 1-25.
- 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.
- Harris, A. S., Meyer-Sahling, J. H., Mikkelsen, K. S., Schuster, C., Seim, B., & Sigman, R. (2022). Varieties of connections, varieties of corruption: Evidence from bureaucrats in five countries. *Governance*.

Recommended readings

- 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.
- Cooper, C. A. (2018). Encouraging civil servants to be frank and fearless: Merit recruitment and employee voice. *Public Administration*, 96(4), 721-735.
- Tobias, B. (2020). Top Officials' Careers and the Relationship Between Politics and Administration. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 13(2), 35-48.
- 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.
- Bach, T. (2020). Top Officials' Careers and the Relationship between Politics and Administration. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 13(2), 35-48.
- Schuster, C., Mikkelsen, K. S., Correa, I., & Meyer-Sahling, J.-H. (2021). Exit, Voice, and Sabotage: Public Service Motivation and Guerrilla Bureaucracy in Times of Unprincipled Political Principals. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1-20.

- Hong, S., & Kim, Y. (2019). Loyalty or Competence: Political Use of Performance Information and Negativity Bias. *Public Administration Review*, 79(6), 829-840.
- Teodoro, Manuel P. 2009. "Bureaucratic job mobility and the diffusion of innovations." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1):175-189.
- Christensen, Jørgen Grønnegård, and Niels Opstrup. 2018. "Bureaucratic dilemmas: Civil servants between political responsiveness and normative constraints." *Governance* 31 (3):481-498.

December 9, Session 6: Representative Bureaucracy

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*.
- 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.
- 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.
- Suzuki, K., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2018). Women and risk-taking behaviour in local public finance. *Public Management Review*, 20(12), 1741-1767.

Recommended readings

- Meier, K. J. (1975). Representative bureaucracy: An empirical analysis. *American political science review*, 69(2), 526-542.
- Kennedy, B. (2014). Unraveling representative bureaucracy: A systematic analysis of the literature. *Administration & Society*, 46(4), 395-421.
- 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.
- Headley, A. M., Wright, J. E., & Meier, K. J. (2021). Bureaucracy, democracy, and race: The limits of symbolic representation. *Public Administration Review*, 81(6), 1033-1043.
- 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.
- 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.
- Vinopal, K. (2020). Socioeconomic representation: Expanding the theory of representative bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(2), 187-201.
- 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*.
- Eckhard, S. (2021). Bridging the citizen gap: Bureaucratic representation and knowledge linkage in (international) public administration. *Governance*, 34(2), 295-314.

- Hemker, J., & Rink, A. (2017). Multiple dimensions of bureaucratic discrimination: Evidence from German welfare offices. *American Journal of Political Science*, 61(4), 786-803.
- Greenan, N., Lanfranchi, J., l'Horty, Y., Narcy, M., & Pierne, G. (2019). Do Competitive Examinations Promote Diversity in Civil Service?. *Public Administration Review*, 79(3), 370-382.
- Bhavnani, R. R., & Lee, A. (2021). Does affirmative action worsen bureaucratic performance? evidence from the indian administrative service. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(1), 5-20.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Yang, L. K., Connolly, L., & Connolly, J. M. (2022). Is There a Glass Cliff in Local Government Management? Examining the Hiring and Departure of Women. *Public Administration Review*, 82(3), 570-584.

December 16, 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.
- 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.

Recommended readings

- Johansen, Morgen. 2013. "The Impact of Managerial Quality on Employee Turnover." *Public Management Review* 15 (6):858-877.

- 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).
- O'Toole Jr, L. J., & Meier, K. J. (2010). In defense of bureaucracy: Public managerial capacity, slack and the dampening of environmental shocks. *Public Management Review*, 12(3), 341-361.
- Netra, S., Sørensen, P., & Hansen, C. N. (2022). Does Public Managers' Type of Education Affect Performance in Public Organizations? A Systematic Review. *Public Administration Review*.
- 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