

2001

# Challenges of (Dis) Connectedness in the 'Big Question Methodologies' in Public Administration

Richard Callahan

*University of San Francisco*, [rccallahan@usfca.edu](mailto:rccallahan@usfca.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.usfca.edu/pna>

 Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Callahan, R. "Challenges of (Dis) Connectedness in the 'Big Question Methodologies' in Public Administration". *Public Administration Review*. 2001. (61)493-499. DOI: 10.1111/0033-3352.00052

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Management at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public and Nonprofit Administration by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact [repository@usfca.edu](mailto:repository@usfca.edu).

**Richard F. Callahan**

*University of Southern California*

## Challenges of (Dis) Connectedness in the "Big Questions" Methodologies in Public Administration

*The "big questions" articles previously published in Public Administration Review found a widely divergent set of questions rather than a shared research agenda. This article applies the concept of layers of society to analyzing the author's starting points and developing questions that link the organizational and institutional levels. Connecting these levels offers the potential to overcome the limitations of problem solving on only one level. In addition, this framework explains the diversity of research in public administration as potentially productive and connected, rather than fragmented and in intellectual disarray. This article offers four researchable questions that connect the organizational and institutional levels. The proposed questions build on existing research and address practical problems in public administration. This framework provides a typology that expects diverse research questions and can productively connect researchers with each other and with the complex challenges of democracy.*

A series of *Public Administration Review* articles proposed big questions of public management and public administration. In a thoughtful approach to the value of developing shared research agendas, Robert Behn (1995) borrowed from physics to invite debate about the big questions of public management. The subsequent exchange (Kirlin 1996a; Neumann 1996) offered alternative perspectives on disciplined inquiry. However, the invitation to debate the big questions has not yet produced a shared research focus like that found in physics. The *PAR* discussion has yielded a total of 13 divergent big questions.

These authors' starting points account for the divergence. In asking the big questions, Behn begins at the organizational level, while Kirlin starts at the institutional level. The resulting differences present at least two alternatives for advancing the debate: One option is to slug it out, arguing for primacy of institutional or organizational questions in shaping research and noting the insufficiency of problem solving at only one level, whether organizational or institutional. A second option is to build on the discussions of Behn and Kirlin, to analyze their approaches, and to develop questions that link divergent starting points.

Developing questions that connect these levels offers the potential to overcome the limitations of problem solving on only one level. It is useful to build on the strengths of both big-question methodologies and on the specific

questions developed by Behn and Kirlin. Valuing both levels simultaneously rejects the primacy of organizational or institutional research as sufficient to respond to challenges of connectedness and cooperation in public affairs. These challenges in public administration include facilitation of constitutional democracy, responsible market economies, and social self-governance. Understanding varied levels of problems is essential to such endeavors.

Formulation of questions for inquiry need not subordinate either level of research. Rather, an integrative approach suggests the importance of extending each level of research to explore connections between organizations and institutions. For example, linkages are suggested in both Behn's concern for facilitating trust among elected officials and appointed public managers and Kirlin's concern for promoting societal learning.

Questions that connect organizational and institutional levels of analysis explore a territory that might be more theoretical than empirical at this point. This is perhaps analogous to physicists predicting a feature of the universe that experimental physics has not fully captured, but which

---

*Richard F. Callahan is the director of the Sacramento Center of the School of Policy, Planning, and Development of the University of Southern California. He serves on the ASPA Sacramento Chapter Board and the American Planning Association, Sacramento Chapter Board. He formerly served as director of a nonprofit, a township business administrator, and deputy to a Los Angeles County supervisor. Email: rcallaha@usc.edu.*

is suggested by theoretical and empirical work to date. Questions linking organizations and institutions include the following four, which are analyzed in this article:

1. What links institutions and public organizations to facilitate cooperation needed for collective problem solving?
2. What are the linkages between organizational and institutional levels that promote democratic self-governance and constitutionally empowered and limited government?
3. What features of public management facilitate public trust in public organizations and institutions?
4. What promotes institutional adaptation through organizational learning in the public sector?

Behn notes that physicists investigate big questions both theoretically and experimentally. This suggests that the big questions in public administration should incorporate theoretical and empirical findings on organizations and institutions. The need to understand organizational and institutional performance in relation to each other must be acknowledged. Theoretical and empirical research by multiple disciplines, using a variety of analytical tools at different levels and in different modes of inquiry, can draw together research characteristic of public administration. Linking varied research interests may address long-standing critiques of public administration as fragmented, irrelevant, and sometimes in crisis. The diverse array of research in public administration places a premium on shared research questions.

This analysis first applies the concept of layers of society to analyze divergent starting points in the big-questions debate. The second section argues that framing the big questions in terms of linking different levels connects research in a way that addresses critiques of public administration research. The third section relates each of the proposed big questions to contemporary research and practice challenges.

## Layers of Society

In looking at organizational theory, Dwight Waldo (1969) offers a map of human society. Waldo sees society as layered and uses the following designations: “individuals, primary groups, organizations, institutions, society or social systems” (11). As Waldo notes, this approach develops from Herbert Simon’s discussion of the unit in the context of organizations: “In such a nest of Chinese blocks the smallest multi-person units are primary groups; the largest are institutions (e.g., ‘the economic system,’ ‘the state’) and whole societies” (1952, 1130). Simon defines organizations in terms of size—that is, larger than primary groups and smaller than institutions, with organizations necessary because of the limits inherent in individuals (1134).

In the map outlined by Waldo and Simon, the institutional level is larger than the organizational. Institutions can be defined informally as “the rules of the game in a society,” or more formally as the “humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction” (North 1990, 1). Organizations are distinct from institutions, occurring within the context provided by institutions and taking advantage of opportunities created by them (North 1990, 4–7).

Using this map of human society, Behn’s (1995) starting point can be located at the organizational level. The choice of public management as a field of inquiry focuses on organizational concerns. Behn’s first question of micromanagement asks how to remove the distrust that inhibits organizational performance (416). His second question relates to the improvement of organizations in terms of individual motivation to achieve better organizational performance and improved outcomes through different approaches to motivation (319). Behn’s third question seeks to improve measurements of organizational performance, attempting to assign responsibility as a means to improve organizational achievement (321). His starting point for each of these questions is best located on the organizational level.

This map of a layered society provides a framework for contrasting Kirilin (1996a) with Behn (1995). The difference is not simply in the questions asked; it stems from Kirilin’s starting the questions and criteria for evaluating them at the institutional level. He writes: “Primary attention is focused on the important questions for public administration in a democracy, particularly the United States” (417). Kirilin’s criteria for evaluating the big questions of public administration are defined in terms of democratic polity, societal-level values, and learning, democratically addressing the complexity of instruments of collective action (417–9).

Kirilin’s discussion does not imply a lack of concern for organizational function and location in some questions. However, on balance, the approach offered by Kirilin starts with a focus on public administration’s big questions at the institutional level. Or, to place this in the terms suggested by North (1990), Kirilin’s questions might be seen as writing of the “rules of the game” that shape organizations.

## Connecting the Layers

New questions are not novel or unique challenges to the field of public administration. Abraham Lincoln referred to the big question of democratic governance as “The Perpetuation of our Political Institutions” (1837). More than 150 years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville found American politics to be changing, with new remedies needed for new disorders (135, 312). Contemporary researchers benefit as

much from framing the questions as they do from the data that is collected (Thompson 1999). The explanatory power gained by shifting the conceptual lens or frame for research questions can be seen in research on decision-making models (Allison 1971), understanding organizational metaphors (Morgan 1986), management (Bolman and Deal 1991) and public-sector leadership metaphors (Terry 1997).

In science, the failure of existing explanations is considered a prelude to the search for new theory, with “new sorts of questions” causing better understanding to emerge (Kuhn 1970, 3). Science writer James Gleick notes that Galileo’s advantage over the ancient Greeks in observing and explaining the movement of a pendulum was not that Galileo had better data, but that he had a theory with powerful explanatory capability (1987, 40).

Fundamental differences about the study of public administration are not limited to contemporary divergence in debating the big questions. A brief survey shows a litany of long-standing, perceived shortcomings as a noticeable feature in discussions about the field. Some perceptions include: lacking qualities of a science (Dahl 1947, 11); conceptually confused (La Porte 1971); intellectually in crisis (V. Ostrom 1974); appearing to observers as irrelevant (Brown 1989); fragmented (Lan and Rosenbloom 1992, 535); in an identity crisis (Riggs 1994, 470); not asking, “intellectually interesting questions” (Wilson 1994, 667); isolated from current research in organizations and democratic theory (March 1997, 692); retreating from the research that initially energized the field (Radin 1999); not respected as a discipline (Kettl 1999); and suffering “from the idea that its representatives are not able to gather all research and theory together in a coherent and unified body of knowledge” (Raadschelders 1999, 284).

Recognizing the multiple layers in public administration research and practice addresses some of the field’s perceived limitations. Ambiguity and speaking past each other can be avoided by explicitly understanding varied levels of analysis and the big questions that link them. Frustration with limits at one level invites big questions that “climb a ladder of abstraction” (Sartori 1970, 1041) to extend knowledge in public administration. Furthermore, explicit identification of the levels of analysis helps to prevent stumbling into problems of misplacement of theories (Ramos 1984, 61).

## Research of Connectedness

The proposed big questions that link organizational and institutional performance address contemporary challenges in research and practice. Considering examples suggests ways the questions can develop into research agendas to link findings from a variety of disciplines. Considering actual problems in the practice of public administration

suggests connections that advance problem solving by public administrators.

1. *What links institutions and public organizations to facilitate cooperation needed for collective problem solving?*

A challenge for public administration as a field has been research and practice of an inherently difficult proposition: cooperation in a democracy. Cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations fundamentally challenges public administration each day. Some examples of the issues involved are the concerns of social science with how people get along (Wilson 1993); of elected officials seeking a “willingness to treat another person of any race with the respect you show for a brother or a sister” (Bradley 1992), and of public managers in “creating public value” (Moore 1995).

At the organizational level, cooperation is important in an institutional arrangement predicated upon “a multiplicity of interests” (Madison 1789, 324). Competing interests, varied agendas, and differing goals have led to a situation in which the “search for coordination has long been the Holy Grail of public management” (Kettl and Milward 1996, 1). Public management attempts to deal with the multiplicity of interests from the starting point of the “power of persuasion” (Lynn 1996). A research focus on the linkages between public management and institutional levels of analysis addresses Lynn’s thoughtful critique of public management research on the need to move from storytelling to theory building. Another set of linkages between institutions and public management is developed in terms of understanding cooperation in designing public organizations and raising questions of whether public agencies are designed to fail (T. Moe 1990, 230). Study of the institutional arrangements that promote cooperation suggests a variety of roles for public agencies, such as facilitating the administrative and legal frameworks needed to allow parties to come to agreement (E. Ostrom 1990, 134), fact finding of resource levels (Blomquist 1992), and comprehensive responsibility for protection of resources (Gibson 1999).

The frustration with the politics–administrative dichotomy can be understood as the public manager not simply addressing organizational-level concerns. Public-service frustration, often under the guise of realism or cynicism, may reflect an inability to effectuate change at an institutional level. In reinterpreting the politics–administration dichotomy, Montjoy and Watson (1995) convincingly show that city managers approach public management by employing an organizational perspective in avoiding particularism and an institutional perspective in promoting accepted professional norms of action. More recent empirical research on city managers and elected officials demonstrates that appointed officials are not con-

strained to only administrative matters (Svara 1998) and elected officials' interests extend into administration (for example, Lee 1999). Institutional failure becomes the foundation of the public manager's organizational responsibility to lead (Behn 1998).

2. *What are the linkages between organizational and institutional levels that promote democratic self-governance and constitutionally empowered and limited government?*

Issues raised in terms of institutional path dependence (North 1990) and the strong correlation between civicness and perceptions of effective government (Putnam 1993) link organizational performance to institutional features of democratic government. Institutional aspects of governance are implicit in the ideas of creating the value of place (Kirlin 1996b) and in the concept that public managers create public value by managing outward and upward (Moore 1995). Similarly, the World Bank has shifted its funding toward projects that enhance social capital, seeking to facilitate civil society, responsible markets (Hirschler 1996, 11), and transparency in governmental actions as conditions of successful governance (World Bank 1997).

The organizational focus encouraged in the choice of big questions by Behn and Neumann might also be seen as disarming public administration when confronted by the challenges or criticisms of efforts such as Vice President Gore's (1993) National Performance Review (NPR). The emphasis on performance and measurement encouraged by Behn's big questions appears consistent with the initial analysis of the NPR. However, an institutional-level critique of the NPR argues there is a long intellectual tradition in public administration of protecting rights and freedoms through the use of public law (Moe and Gilmour 1995, 135). Abandoning the institutional level leaves public administration without "the principles [that] not only protect the citizenry from an overbearing, arbitrary and capricious use of government power but also permit substantial public involvement in the process of developing rules and regulations" (143). This argument is consistent with a perspective in public administration that looks not only to protect the democratic process but also to enhance equity (for example, Frederickson 1997).

In the context of the big questions, the NPR can be seen as attempting to answer the big questions, but at a limited level. A result of this misplacement can be found in a General Accounting Office (1993) report that concludes from reviews of agencies for the past decade that the processes, systems, and staffs have not been in place to support the types of improvements suggested by the NPR. The narrow, disconnected focus on the organizational level has ignored reductions in resources resulting from institutional-level political choices.

An example from a local government that contrasts the emphasis on the organizational with the institutional level

is the ongoing difficulties of one of America's poorest cities, Camden, New Jersey, characterized by *The Economist* as "a bedraggled place with only 87,000 people ... [with an] electorate so unworldly and apathetic that the city's controversies are barely known to them" (1996, 23). Camden is described in the New Jersey state treasurer's report as the fifth-poorest city in the nation, with a per capita income of \$7,276 (1996, 1). Against this backdrop, city government operates with numerous allegations of "contract award improprieties, the disappearance of city funds received by staff, vendor payments to political operatives in exchange for government work" (1-2).

If the big questions of public administration are questions of management and measurement, then the State of New Jersey's response to the plight of Camden should work. The state's report exclusively focuses on reforming the city's bureaucracy, with recommendations like verification of receipt of items purchased, better payment documentation, and improved contracting procedures (4). However, applying the concept of linking organizations and self-governance to institutions suggests that an organizational focus does little to improve the situation in Camden, either from the perspective of the residents or in terms of developing the social capital needed to sustain effective governance.

The shortfall of organizational-level big questions in situations such as Camden's presents public administration with the options of either abdicating an important role or searching for better answers by asking more pertinent questions. Formulating the big questions of public administration should provide answers to issues raised in local, state, national, and international arenas. Locating the big questions strictly on the organizational or the institutional level fails to provide insights applicable to the more pressing problems of public administration.

3. *What features of public management facilitate public trust in public organizations and institutions?*

One feature of current research that links trust with government agencies and institutional design is transparency of action. In its search for models of effective governance for developing nations, the World Bank (1997) emphasizes the role of transparent government actions as a means of reducing incompetent, or other inappropriate rent-seeking behaviors, and as a means for improving the participation needed for more inclusive governance.

Related to an open process of government, facilitating trust in the administration of public goods, services, and choices is an important role for public administrators. Trust in government is ultimately important because the absence of trust leaves "countries unable to accomplish some vital ends" (Nye, Zelikow, and King 1997, 280). Elected officials are increasingly distanced from governance and are "impelled to crowd their schedules with their own

fundraising, to run errands for (and listen to) contributors, and to invest substantial staff time in constituency services. Legislating necessarily comes last” (Neustadt 1997, 185). The public’s skepticism of the political process and elected officials’ reluctance to continue to run for congressional office suggests that “failed trust runs in two directions” (Newland 1997).

Related to trust in government agencies and institutions is research on facilitating authentic participation in the democratic processes (for example, King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Frederickson 1997). Understanding the political origins of public organizations (T. Moe 1990) helps researchers focus on the mechanisms, incentives, structures, and symbols that link performance on the organizational level with the goals of political institutions. Public trust in organizations and political institutions is particularly important as public administration faces increasing political corruption: “Corruption is not just a fact of life, it is also a worldwide phenomenon. In recent years it has reached unprecedented levels” (Ofosu-Amaah et al. 1999, vi). Abundant evidence shows that corruption is not diminishing (Heywood 1997, 417). Widespread corruption—with its implications not only for ineffective democratic governance, but also for the movement toward totalitarianism—heightens the importance of transparency and trust. This question addresses the importance of open deliberation in linking public management and institutions with transparency of governmental actions as an important feature.

4. *What promotes institutional adaptation through organizational learning in the public sector?*

Public management can be viewed as facilitating societal learning. At the most basic level, future public administrators can provide the institutional memory that can serve as a countervailing force to the self-deception that Barbara Tuchman describes as the “wooden-headedness . . . that plays a remarkably large role in government” (1984, 7). An ongoing role in the dialogue of democratic government for public administration can be seen as filling the challenge in democratic government of framing the questions. The formulation of the right questions and ways of understanding the evaluation of complex policies and organizations will constitute an important part of the future of public administration, providing reflective systems that facilitate the opportunity to learn from experience (Kaufmann 1986, 24) and a process of inquiry central to sustaining a self-directed society (Lindblom 1990). This role does not place public administration in the position of elites providing answers, but as providing the institutional frameworks and organizational learning that facilitate dialogue, provide relevant research, and contribute to societal learning.

Devaluation of government in the United States has led to a need to relearn the fact that cultures and institutions *matter* in the redesign of state systems in the emerg-

ing democracies of Central and Eastern Europe (Newland 1996, 385). Civil society is an important partner in learning. In addition, the values of democratic governance require a forum for expression that can translate into action. In many ways, this can be seen not only as respecting the democratic process, but also facilitating the deliberative processes essential for coming to public judgment (Yankelovich 1991).

## Conclusion

Finding variety in research currently advancing the big questions of public administration is not surprising. The big-questions methodology in such a broad field must explicitly start with the strengths and limits of existing research to frame the subsequent series of questions. Like the proof of Fermi’s last theorem, the big questions of public administration should link current research to solve long-standing unknowns. Robert Behn significantly contributes to a framework that looks for shared questions. Kirlin advances that contribution by shifting the starting point from organizational-level concerns to institutional-level starting points for questions. Building on their work and beginning with a recognition of the complex layers of society inherently involved in democratic governance, big questions are suggested that link organizational and institutional research. These sorts of questions can connect research and practice in public administration. This framework provides a typology that expects diverse research questions, but which can productively connect researchers with each other and with the complex challenges of democracy.

---

## Acknowledgments

---

I am very appreciative of the thoughtful comments of three anonymous reviewers of this manuscript. I am also grateful for the discussion with and help of Denise Dias Callahan formerly with the U.S. General Accounting Office, as well as Ross Clayton and Cathy Horiuchi of the University of Southern California, Sacramento Center, for help during the preparation of this manuscript.

---

## References

---

- Allison, Graham T. 1971. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Behn, Robert. 1995. The Big Questions of Public Management. *Public Administration Review* 55(4): 313–23.
- . 1998. What Right Do Managers Have to Lead? *Public Administration Review* 58(3): 209–21.
- Blomquist, William A. 1992. *Dividing the Water: Governing Groundwater in Southern California*. San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.
- Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 1991. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, And Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradley, Bill. 1992. Speech on the Rodney King Verdict given to the U.S. Senate. April 30. Washington, DC.
- Brown, Brack. 1989. The Search for Public Administration: Roads Not Followed. *Public Administration Review* 49(2): 215–6.
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7(1): 1–11.
- deTocqueville, Alexis. 1956 [1835]. *Democracy in America*, edited by Richard D. Heffner. New York: Mentor.
- Frederickson, H. George. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson, Clark C. 1999. *Politicians and Poachers: The Political Economy of Wildlife Policy in Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gleick, James. 1987. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gore, Albert. 1993. *From Red Tape to Results: Creating A Government That Works Better and Costs Less*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Heywood, Paul. 1997. Political Corruption: Problems and Perspectives. *Political Studies* 45(Special Issue): 417–36.
- Hirschler, Richard. 1996. The World Bank Invests in Social Capital: Interview with the Head of the Social Task Group. *Transitions: The Newsletter about Reforming Economies* 7(9/10): 11–12.
- Kaufmann, Franz-Xavier, ed. 1986. *The Public Sector—Challenge for Coordination and Learning*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kettl, Donald F. 1999. The Future of Public Administration. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 5(2): 127–34.
- Kettl, Donald F., and H. Brinton Milward, eds. 1996. *The State of Public Management*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, Kathryn M. Feltey, and Bridget O'Neill Susel. 1998. The Question of Participation: Toward an Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 58(4): 317–34.
- Kirlin, John J. 1996a. The Big Questions of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(5): 416–22.
- . 1996b. What Government Must Do Well: Creating Public Value for Society. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1): 161–85.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lan, Zhiyong, and David Rosenbloom. 1992. Public Administration in Transition? *Public Administration Review* 52(6): 535–7.
- La Porte, Todd R. 1971. The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organizations. In *Toward A New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, edited by Frank Marini, 17–48. Scranton, PA: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Lee, Mordecai. 1999. Looking at the Politics–Administration Dichotomy from the Other Direction: Participant Observations by a State Senator–Ph.D. Presented at the 1999 national conference of the American Society for Public Administration, April 10–14, Orlando, Florida.
- Lincoln, Abraham. 1993 [1837]. Speech Before the Young Men’s Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois. In *The Essential Abraham Lincoln*, edited by John Gabriel Hunt, 8–17. Portland House.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1990. *Inquiry and Change: The Troubled Attempt to Understand and Shape Society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. 1996. *Public Management as Art, Science and Profession*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.
- Madison, James, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay. 1961 [1789]. *The Federalist Papers*. New York: New American Library.
- March, James. 1997. Administrative Practice, Organizational Theory, and Political Philosophy: Ruminations on the Reflections of John M. Gaus. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(4): 689–98.
- Moe, Ronald C., and Robert S. Gilmour. 1995. Rediscovering Principles of Public Administration: The Neglected Foundation of Public Law. *Public Administration Review* 55(2): 135–46.
- Moe, Terry. 1990. Political Institutions: The Neglected Side of the Story. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organizations* 6(Special Issue): 213–53.
- Moore, Mark. 1995. *Creating Public Value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Montjoy, Robert S., and Douglas J. Watson. 1995. A Case for Reinterpreted Dichotomy of Politics and Administration as a Professional Standard in Council-Manager Government. *Public Administration Review* 5(3): 231–9.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1986. *Images of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neumann, Francis X. 1996. What Makes Public Administration a Science? Or Are Its “Big Questions” Really Big? *Public Administration Review* 56(5): 409–15.
- Neustadt, Richard E. 1997. The Politics of Distrust. In *Why People Don’t Trust Government*, edited by Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Philip D. Zelikow, and David C. King, 179–201. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- New Jersey Department of the Treasury. 1996. *Local Government Budget Review: City of Camden*. Trenton, NJ: Department of Treasury.

- Newland, Chester A. 1996. Transformational Challenges in Central and Eastern Europe and Schools of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(4): 382–9.
- . 1997. Realism and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 57(2): ii–iii.
- . 1999. Public Administration's Struggle for Civilizing Connectedness. Presented at the 1999 national conference of the American Society for Public Administration, April 10–14, Orlando, Florida.
- North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr., Philip D. Zelikow, and David C. King, eds. 1997. *Why People Don't Trust Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ofosu-Amaah, W. Paatii, Raj Soopramanien, and Kishor Uprety. 1999. *Combating Corruption*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, Vincent. 1974. *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Raadschelders, Jos. 1999. A Coherent Framework for the Study of Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(2): 281–303.
- Radin, Beryl. 1999. Forging Alliances. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 5(2): 163–6.
- Ramos, Alberto Guerreiro. 1984. *The New Science of Organizations: A Reconceptualization of the Wealth of Nations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Riggs, Fred W. 1994. Bureaucracy and the Constitution. *Public Administration Review* 54(1): 65–72.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics. *The American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033–53.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1952. Comments on the Theory of Organizations. *The American Political Science Review* 46(4): 1130–9.
- Svara, James H. 1998. The Politics–Administration Dichotomy Model As Aberration. *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 51–8.
- Terry, Larry D. 1997. Public Administration and the Theater Metaphor: The Public Administrator as Villain, Hero, and Innocent Victim. *Public Administration Review* 57(1): 53–60.
- The Economist*. 1996. The Odd Couple: Camden, New Jersey and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. August 10, 23.
- Thompson, Frank J. 1999. Introduction: Symposium on the Advancement of Public Administration. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 5(2): 119–26.
- Tuchman, Barbara. 1984. *The March of Folly*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- United States General Accounting Office. 1993. *Management Reform: GAO's Comments on the National Performance Review's Recommendations*. Washington, DC: GAO.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1969. Theory of Organization: Status and Problems. In *Reading on Modern Organizations*, edited by Amitai Etzioni, 8–26. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wilson, James Q. 1993. The Moral Sense. *American Political Science Review* 87(1): 1–9.
- . 1994. Reinventing Public Administration. *Political Science and Politics* 27(4): 667–73.
- World Bank. 1997. *World Development Report: The State in a Changing World*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yankelovich, Daniel. 1991. *Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.