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Change was the political buzzword of the 2008 election season. But change is more than a slogan. In public administration, change is status quo. What once was reality and standard practice for public administrators is no longer the case. The 21st-century world of public administration is one not of static relationships, hierarchies, and orders, but one that includes a new global world where traditional boundaries are being challenged, rearranged, or eliminated. Where public administrators once saw a world in black and white, with public-private distinctions and a politics-administration dichotomy, the world they now live in is multicultural, multisectoral, and multinational. This reality demands new skill sets in cultural competency, collaboration, and management across sectors, as well as a new definition of leadership.

As the world of public administration changes, so must the teaching of the subject. One of my teachers once stated that the appropriateness of a research method is defined by the object of inquiry. How we study something is determined by what we study, and not vice versa. The same is true for public administration education. As the practice of public administration changes, so too must the content and technique of what is taught. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* scholarship reflects this pedagogy, serving as a forum to examine the interconnections among the practice of public administration, the content of classes, and how the material is taught. Exploring these interconnections is the purpose of this journal, especially so for the articles in this issue of *JPAE*. The articles explore both the changing subject matter of public administration and how course content needs to reflect that change, or they report on new teaching methodologies and instructional techniques.

Mark McBeth and Randy Clemons’ article, “Public Policy Pedagogy: Mixing Methodologies Using Cases,” confronts an important dilemma in the teaching of public policy. There is the more traditional (at least by recent history) positivist or Modernist approach replete with assumptions about rationality, objectivity, and economics. So to speak, this is the scientific approach to policy analysis, but in clashes with a postpositivist or postmodern orientation grounded in politics, subjectivity, and democracy. Many courses approach policy analysis from an either-or perspective, addressing the subject from one of these two competing perspectives. McBeth and Clemons argue for a blending of approaches, reporting on a class-tested case study that did just that.

The Naim Kapucu et al. piece, “Social Network Analysis (SNA) Applications in Evaluating MPA Classes,” offers a fascinating way to study and facilitate student collaboration. The researchers used social network analysis (SNA) to measure student and faculty interaction. At a time when collaboration is being emphasized as a practical skill, fostering it in the classroom is often difficult. SNA is one way to map how students work and learn from one another, and also to determine how the results can be used to foster a richer learning environment. The article reports on the use of SNA in the classroom.
What it means to be a leader, and the types of skills expected of public administrators, are the background issues for Rosemary O’Leary et al. in “Teaching Collaborative Leadership: Ideas and Lessons for the Field.” If collaboration is central to the new practice of public administration, faculty need to understand what it is and how to teach it. This article reports on a Maxwell School course facilitating collaborative leadership, emphasizing its role in fostering governance, promoting civic engagement, and working across governmental agencies.

Tony Carrizales’ “Exploring Cultural Competency Within the Public Affairs Curriculum” reflects upon another new reality in public administration: changing demographics, increased diversity, and a need to alter service delivery in light of both phenomena. If American democracy is supposed to reflect the consent of the governed and serve their needs, public administrators must know their new public. Thus, cultural competence is an imperative. Carrizales explores the different ways to bring the teaching of cultural competence into the classroom, offering four conceptual frameworks professors can implement in courses.

Along with Carrizales’ article on cultural competency, Laura Hand examines the subject in her book review of the second edition of Mitchell F. Rice’s Diversity and Public Administration: Theory, Issues, and Perspectives. Hand points out the multiple meanings attached to this concept, along with the difficult questions and issues attending to attaining cultural competency and implementing it in the workplace. Her review of the Rice book provides important perspective on the meaning of diversity and what educators should consider as they address it in the classroom.

Sheila Kennedy’s “The Pedagogy of Governance” explores the significance in the shift from talking about government to governance. The former term reflected the formal institutional branches of government and what it meant to be a public administrator within the traditional walls of executive, legislative, and judicial power exercised by state actors. But governance signifies something broader; it reflects a world where public services are often delivered by private or nonprofit actors, and the role of public administrators is contract management and supervision of these nongovernmental players. Kennedy’s essay argues for recognition of this new world with altered boundaries and for an adjustment in both the content of what is taught and how it is taught if our students are to be trained adequately for the future.

Since at least the early 1990s, demands that “government should be run more like a business” have been offered. Backing this statement has been the assumption that government can learn from business; and, perhaps, that if government programs were run by business elites and MBAs, performance and efficiencies would be enhanced. In “What Business Schools Can Learn From Public Management—and Vice Versa,” Reginald Shareef offers a different perspective. In light of the Wall Street scandals of recent years, many are calling for a revamping of business (MBA) education programs. These demands critique the assumption that the sole objective of business is efficient maximization of shareholder value. They also question the lack of attention to ethics. While acknowledging
that public administration can stand to learn from business programs, this article contends that many of the normative assumptions of the former might address failings of contemporary business education.

Charlene M. L. Roach serves as the international correspondent in this issue. In “Reflections on Evolution in the Use of Information Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning: From The University of the West Indies, to the United States, and Back Again,” she examines her career from undergraduate student to professor from the unique perspective of one who was trained or taught across international borders. Her focus is on the use of information technology (IT) to enhance teaching and learning. Roach sees multiple virtues in the expansion of IT pedagogies in the classroom. First, IT skills are a must to being an effective administrator; and second, IT can be a powerful alternative to traditional talk and lecture classes, especially in its capacity to reach out and engage students from different cultures. IT thus may well serve as an important tool to enhance cultural competencies and collaboration among students.

Sunil Tankha and Des Gasper’s “Trees and Water: Mainstreaming Environment in the Graduate Policy Analysis Curriculum” is a powerful reminder that skills and substantive subject matter knowledge are connected. One does not simply have knowledge or skills, but knowledge about something and the skill to do something. They contend that the teaching of public policy by assigning a substantive major project or paper—here on environmental issues—both gives students subject matter expertise and allows them to exercise and enhance skills they need to develop as professionals. The article offers good advice on how to incorporate this type of project into classes.

Mario A. Rivera, one of JPAE’s previous editors, also examines cultural competence in “Diversity, Continuity, and the Journal of Public Affairs Education,” where he reflects on this topic, on his tenure as editor, and on the journal after 15 years. Despite JPAE’s different formats over the years, Rivera makes a strong case for how the journal has not only stayed relevant with the changes in public administration but has served as a leader in publishing scholarship recognizing the connections between the world and what public officials do, what is taught, and how.

Overall, this issue of JPAE provides a diverse forum exploring the interconnections between the classroom and practice of public administration. The scholarship invites intellectual and pedagogic challenge, with the goal that as readers we will become more reflective about our craft.

With this issue I take the helm of JPAE as editor in chief, along with Kristen Norman-Major as the managing editor. The journal moves from the hot climate of Phoenix and Arizona State University to the cooler if not occasionally arctic environment of St. Paul, Minnesota, and its new host institution, Hamline University. Despite change in institutions and contrasting climates, my hope is that JPAE will continue to flourish and serve as an important voice and forum for public affairs education.
Physicist and mathematician extraordinaire Isaac Newton once penned about himself: “If I have seen further it is by standing on the shoulders of Giants.” I feel much the same in assuming the mantle of *JPAE* editor. I follow a fine tradition of previous editors, most recently Heather Campbell, who have forged a strong foundation for the journal. I am lucky to have inherited such a legacy from these giants who have come before me. I look forward to working with authors—new and returning—in seeing the view from the broad shoulders of their scholarship. I invite all readers to contact me anytime with ideas or suggestions.

— **David Schultz**  
Editor-in-Chief  
Hamline University  
dschultz@hamline.edu
Diversity, Continuity, and the Journal of Public Affairs Education

Mario A. Rivera
The University of New Mexico

When Heather Campbell invited me to share some thoughts as a former editor in chief, on the occasion of the 15-year anniversary of the Journal of Public Affairs Education, I was honored, as in the past, to be part of a roster that includes Founding Editor George Frederickson, one of the giants in the field of public administration; James Perry and Ed Jennings, renowned scholars themselves; and Heather, an important editor who has put an indelible stamp of scholarship on the journal herself. I thought a great deal about how to approach the present task. I considered writing a kind of retrospective taking the reader back to the journal’s founding, albeit a review centered on certain topics of personal and scholarly priority, particularly those of diversity and social equity. However, on reading James Perry’s elegant essay, “Reflections on the Journal of Public Affairs Education at 15: Changing NASPAA and the Field” (JPAE, 16(2), 119–122), I realized that no retrospective could match the at once intimate and expert sweep of that piece. I am pleased that James has taken us back to the beginnings of the journal and given us rich detail about critical junctures in its growth and development. I am left, therefore, with the option I will advance here—thoughts on the closely linked themes of diversity and social equity, as I see them not only as a former editor but also as a 20-year veteran of service with NASPAA, most recently as a member of the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA) and the Executive Council.

At the end of 2008, the School of Public Administration of the University of New Mexico (SPA/UNM) reached the 3-year mark as the journal’s editorial home. With that benchmark, it fulfilled its commitment to NASPAA’s Executive Council, administration, and membership to edit and produce the journal for that duration, consistent with the length of tenure of previous editors and editorial teams. Ten issues (including two double issues) were completed under our editorial sponsorship, which began with the winter (February) 2006 issue.

One of my first efforts as we readied to take the journal’s reins was to take it through a complete graphic and format redesign. In the ensuing three calendar years, the UNM team, which I came to lead by mid-2006 following Bruce Perlman’s brief (but critical) turn at the helm, successfully took the journal from strictly print version to on-demand print publication and Portable Document Format (PDF) web posting. The NASPAA Executive Council approved this
change in March 2007 and reconfirmed it by vote at the October 2007 NASPAA Annual Conference. As a consequence of our joined efforts—those of successive NASPAA presidents, the NASPAA executive director, and the UNM editorship—a redesigned JPAE webpage at the NASPAA website began to provide Internet access for members and subscribers beginning with the Spring/Summer 2007 issue (vol. 13, no. 2). Web posting was a first for the journal, the culmination of a joint commitment undertaken with the Executive Council’s approval of the original 2005 SPA/UNM proposal for JPAE.

As editor in chief and previously as editor, I was responsible for about 100 peer-reviewed articles in those 10 issues, a substantial increase in the number of articles per issue and articles total for any comparable period in the journal’s past. This was accomplished while maintaining the high quality previously established with respect to pedagogical and scholarly research articles. Longer issues, a redesigned format and cover, and web posting would have the combined effect of raising the journal’s profile and extending its reach. JPAE became an ever more global journal, drawing a wider international readership as it went online.

Hallmarks of the new—redesigned, expanded, and more widely accessible—journal included greater attention to comparative and international administration and greater attention as well to the aforementioned issues of diversity and social equity. Both were consistent with the legacy of Ferrel Heady at the University of New Mexico and with the UNM/SPA 2005 proposal for the journal. The Winter 2007 issue was the first ever devoted entirely to diversity and equity as closely entwined themes (previously addressed as fairly distinct concerns in JPAE). It should be noted that every one of the first nine issues either had a single organizing theme or symposium focus, again consistent with the original SPA/UNM proposal.

The Spring 2008 issue was the second to serve as a symposium on the dual concerns of diversity and social equity. Distinguished by a lead article by George Frederickson, it drew considerable attention and particularly favorable comment from JPAE readers. Heather Campbell continued the unprecedented focus on these concerns, which have long been defining commitments for NASPAA as an organization, with new symposia.

In an article featured in the Winter 2007 symposium, entitled “Teaching Diversity in Public Administration: A Missing Component,” Barbara Hewins-Maroney and Ethel Williams reported on their analysis of the contents of both Public Administration Review and JPAE for coverage of diversity during the period 2001–2005, inclusive. They found that PAR had run 10 germane articles to JPAEs 11, for a total of 21 articles in those 5 years, a record they characterize as “quite scant,” and not unrepresentative of the importance given to the subject in Public Administration journals and scholarship generally. In the four years since Barbara’s and Ethel’s article, JPAE has exceeded that combined record considerably, featuring diversity and equity consistently, in both national and international contexts, not only in dedicated symposia but
also in other issues dedicated to service learning, third-party government, civic engagement, and kindred concerns. I would point to this accomplishment as the most personally gratifying in recent years. However, a strengthened web presence and electronic dissemination of the journal and the continued movement toward strong disciplinary and pedagogical scholarship under Heather Campbell’s direction are also among numerous notable attainments since 2006.

In summary, I am confident that in most significant respects NASPAA and the two successive University of New Mexico and Arizona State University editorial teams accomplished what we set out to do—a significant increase in readership, sustained quality of scholarship, and the casting of JPAE as an electronic and multimedia, international journal. As Heather, James, Ed, George, and I can attest, along with several interim and managing editors, especially Danny Balfour and Bruce Perlman, stewardship of JPAE is a very demanding but also very rewarding experience—literally (trite though the phrase may be) a labor of love. Everyone involved, from NASPAA administrators to Executive Council and Editorial Board members, and former editors in the Editors’ Council, have labored with great dedication to preserve and grow the journal. As with most everything else at NASPAA, JPAE is largely a volunteer effort, the product of dedicated service; and though there is occasional contentiousness, we are all invested in the same way and to the same extent in service to the journal and association.

To return to the dual concerns of diversity and social equity, and in so doing to round out this essay, these are for me the very reason for two decades of service with NASPAA. Diversity is not a self-defining term—for some, like James Perry in the previously cited essay, it is as much a matter of intellectual diversity as demographic diversity. As a Hispanic American (or Latino) faculty member long involved in civil rights advocacy and related scholarship, however, for me the critical value is that of advancement of representation of faculty as well as students of color in public affairs education.

I know that there is a multiplicity of views on the subject, particularly as to how best to advance diversity and equity in our ranks. From my first involvement with NASPAA, beginning with the 1991 Annual Conference in Salt Lake City, as a member of the Undergraduate Section Committee through more recent service at executive levels of the association, and as journal editor, my driving commitment has been to diversity values, uppermost. Whether in debates on new standards or in editorial policy meetings, diversity in the specific meaning of advocacy for inclusion and equity has been my singular, overriding focus in serving NASPAA. I hope that it has been a position well taken.

What is clear, and most gratifying to me, is that the connection between the journal and the exploration and advancement of attendant issues has remained strong under Heather Campbell’s leadership. And, to be fair, it is far more important that these concerns be explored openly, honestly, and incisively in the journal’s pages and in the halls of NASPAA than to have any one advocacy position (mine included) prevail.
I will presume to join with my predecessors, with whom (to repeat) I am honored to be counted as JPAE editor in chief, in wishing Heather Campbell and the journal well in the years ahead. All of us continue to stand ready to work diligently in its service and in NASPAA’s.

Widely published on the subjects of diversity, social equity, and public ethics, Mario Rivera is Regents’ Professor of Public Administration in the School of Public Administration at the University of New Mexico; he is former editor in chief of the Journal of Public Affairs Education and current senior associate editor of the Canadian American Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal/ La Revue de l’innovation.
Public Policy Pedagogy: Mixing Methodologies Using Cases

Richard H. Foster
Fort Lewis College

Mark K. McBeth
Idaho State University

Randy S. Clemons
Mercyhurst College

Abstract
Over the past two decades, public policy professors have been confronted with a choice to teach either from the traditional positivist approach grounded in rationality, objectivity, and economics or from a postpositivist approach grounded in politics, subjectivity, and democracy. Yet, such a choice is both false and limiting. Instead, we argue that it is possible to teach a practical public policy analysis course based on mixed methodologies that stems from both the positivism and postpositivism camps. At the pedagogical center of this approach is the case method. Our approach is grounded in both the belief and experience that the combination of an approach that is pragmatic, yet infused with politics, and a stimulating case also serves to increase student interest. In this article, we present a class-tested case study ready for use by faculty members in courses in public policy analysis, public policy, and, introductory public administration. Along the way, we provide guidance on how to use the case and how it fits into a mixed methodological approach.

Professors of public administration, when asked to teach public policy analysis, seemingly have a choice between two alternative approaches. They can
use the traditional approach, grounded in microeconomics and other quantitative methodologies, found in such excellent texts as Weimer and Vining (2004), Munger (2000), and Dunn (2004); or, they can use a more political and policy process approach, found in such excellent books as Birkland (2005) and Anderson (2006). In fact, Romero’s 2001 article, “The Policy Analysis Course: Toward a Discipline Consensus,” found that the vast majority of policy analysis syllabi used either an “outsider” line of attack based primarily on the stages model of policy theory or a “limited insider” line of attack grounded in welfare economics. Despite a wealth of clever, important, and insightful critiques of the traditional positivist approach, only a small percentage used an “in-depth insider” approach that explored a “broader epistemology” combining political insight, value conflict, subjectivity, and ambiguity with other skill development. This situation revealed a problem that needed to be solved.

In this article we seek to introduce our method of teaching public policy analysis, a middle-way method designed to incorporate the critiques of positivism into it (rather than discard it or ignore the critiques) and to make the alternative approach more significant, applicable, and teachable. We first review some of the debate surrounding both the teaching and practice of policy analysis. We then present the mixed methodology approach, grounded in the development and teaching of cases, that informs our pedagogy as well as the public policy textbook *Public Policy Praxis: A Case Approach for Understanding Policy and Analysis* (Clemons & McBeth, 2009), which is coauthored by two of the three authors of this article. We provide a new policy analysis case ready for use in the classroom, arguing that the combination of a mixed methodology approach and the case method is extremely valuable, and then conclude by explaining how we would teach this case.

**Policy Analysis and the Pedagogical Trade-Offs**

Historically, professors of public policy analysis have been confronted with a sort of Hobson’s choice. On one hand, they could teach rational, quantitative-based analysis where rigor is imposed simply by applying the typical positivist techniques of analysis. While this dominant approach certainly has appeal and importance, lost in it is the essence of politics, power, and nonrationality that has dominated the past two decades of public policy literature (e.g., Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Stone, 2002) and that proves very interesting to students. Moreover, as Layzer writes (2006) after discussing the rational-comprehensive model:

Most political scientists eschew this model as a description of reality, however. Contrary to its predictions, policy making is rarely a linear process of identifying problems and devising optimal solutions; instead, solutions often go in search of problems, and decision
makers typically take action only in response to a crisis or some other political opportunity. (p. 60)

Thus, with the rational approach, we are teaching our students to try to impose a rational structure on a political system that is far more dynamic and less orderly than the principles of traditional policy analysis assert.

On the other hand, professors could take the more political approach to analysis, demonstrate its nonrationality, and emphasize the centrality of power and the power of language. Yet, as an exclusive approach, it too has limitations. Students may be trapped in relativism or fail to see how their ability to analyze the political basis of public policy provides them with the necessary analytical skills they need to secure and perform jobs as public administrators and analysts.

The positivist-postpositivist debate that dominated the 1990s literature on policy analysis (e.g., Danziger, 1995; Fischer, 1998; Lynn, 1999a) can be summed quickly. Positivist policy analysis (including rational choice analysis) is grounded in microeconomics, quantitative methods, and rationality. It is a method found in such prominent texts as Dunn (2004) and Weimer and Vining (2004). Postpositivist policy analysis, on the other hand, is grounded more in political science, power, language, and the social construction of reality. The debate between positivist and postpositivist critics raged in the 1990s within academia. We argue in this article that the debate is largely over, and that out of this ivory-tower-based squabble has developed a new type of policy analysis, practical but based in theory, sophisticated yet eminently teachable.

In the late 1990s, Laurence Lynn published an article, “A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice” (1999a), in which he argued that postpositivist criticisms of traditional policy analysis were “ideological rather than analytical” and “detached from the inconvenient realities of policy making and management.” Lynn instead presented traditional policy analysis as being “fueled by intuition, argument, and ethical prompting; clearly engaged with the world of political action; and often identified with interests and values otherwise unrepresented at the table.” He then concluded that postpositivists have much work to do before they can be considered relevant to the “practical challenges of democratic governance that arise in the many roles that working policy analysts perform” (Lynn, 1999a, p. 411).

Our approach to policy analysis both agrees and disagrees with him. First, we agree that postpositivists can easily caricature positivism (just as positivists can easily caricature postpositivism). Second, we agree that postpositivism needed to become more practical so it could play a daily role in governance. Third, we also agree that practicing analysts understand subjectivity, values, and interests. But we disagree with the idea that the typical approach to the teaching of policy analysis adequately prepares future analysts for dealing with the subjectivity, values, and interests that are prevalent.
in the field. Thus the pure positivist approach fails to prepare analysts for politics or to facilitate democracy.

A key concern of postpositivist policy analysis (PPA) involves increasing meaningful participation of citizens in the formation of problem definitions, the generation of policy alternatives, and the eventual determination of policy. PPA is highly critical of the proceduralism and legalism of contemporary American democracy and instead attempts to tap into the view of American democracy rooted in Tocqueville and Jefferson. Cunningham and Weschler (2002), writing in Public Administration Review, make the point that public administration education has failed individuals who must deal with the hustle and bustle and complexity of policymaking. In making the case for the education of line managers, they argue:

Effective line managers must pick a technically appropriate and politically feasible solution from an array of policy options, understand social relationships, anticipate and respond to questions extemporaneously, handle emotionally challenging situations with ease, and interpret issues that are just appearing on the agency’s radar screen. Although they are effective in finding win-win solutions to complex problems involving multiple stakeholders and its calming interpersonal conflicts within the organization, line managers may not be able to explain or understand the technical aspects of a program or policy. (pp. 105–106)

Though arguably better for democracy, our approach is primarily driven by the desire to build a practical (not ideological) foundation for policy analysis that—reflecting the best of the discipline—practically combines the best from both positivism and postpositivism. For example, students taught in the positivist-rational approach learn the rational choice model and public choice theory, microeconomic concepts, statistical analysis, discounting, cost-benefit analysis, extrapolation, and other tools. This general approach is useful because it provides a tangible methodology for future analysts, and it may earn them a place at the table. It is also rather easy to teach in the classroom because there are specific steps and methods to learn. While used extensively in public policy education, the positivist method is less dominant in the field, and it is of questionable value for democracy and in the political system where policy is determined. Most often the complex models and mathematics of the positivist approach do not parallel the even more complex world of democratic policymaking. To paraphrase the advice the quintessential realist Hans Morgenthau offers foreign policy analysts, the first lesson students of public policy must learn is complexity (1993, pp. 22, 45).

Most important, many issues policy analysts deal with are political issues that involve normative values. Positivism is most useful when political issues are framed as technical questions such as: “Will removing dams in Eastern Washing-
ton restore salmon runs on the lower Snake River?” It is seldom true that “technical issues” can be neatly and cleanly separated from normative and political ones. All analysts, regardless of their positivist or postpositivist orientation, must struggle with incorporating these values.

Policymaking is political. Thus, narrow training focusing on the positivist tools alone, and ignoring politics, is not only less interesting but also leaves the analyst significantly lacking in his or her ability to grasp the complexity of politics. The positivist approach to policy analysis often emphasizes efficiency (which is obviously important) at the expense of democracy. The positivist approach is also tied to bureaucratic decision making with its emphasis on calculability, generalizability, stability, rationality, and proceduralism. Peter deLeon (1997, p. 81) writes that the most important problem with positivism is that it falsely presents an appearance of “truth.” It does so by assigning numbers to a variety of decision-making criteria and producing what appear to be definitive answers to political questions. It does so because of the bureaucratic imperative to reduce emotional and conflict-ridden political questions to neutral, scientific, and technical ones. Positivist approaches do invariably have to deal with normative issues and subjectivity. Dunn (2004, p. 237), for example, recognizes that cost-benefit analysis stresses efficiency over equity and that the assigning of prices to nonmarket costs and benefits is highly subjective and “may simply be arbitrary expressions of the values of the analysts.” Bureaucracies are structured to deal with nonpolitical issues and reduce subjectivity and political questions like equity. Once political questions and issues enter into the bureaucracy—as they inevitably do—the bureaucracy deals with them by utilizing methods designed to ensure efficiency, facilitate procedure, and create predictability. As a result, all too often, stakeholder views and demands are ignored. In the positivist classroom, such normative and subjective issues are likewise easily set aside in favor of technique. The positivist method of policy analysis is very much part of bureaucratic culture and is not going anywhere, anytime soon.

Although significant changes are under way, virtually all the evidence suggests that professors in both graduate and undergraduate classrooms predominantly continue to teach positivist techniques. For example, Lawlor (1996) emphasized that

Mainstream policy analysis has not kept pace with advances in relevant social science. Many curricula and texts seem frozen in intellectual time, circa 1970, with heavy emphasis on straight cost-benefit analysis, decision analysis, and public choice. (p. 111)

Fischer (1998) reemphasized the point, arguing that policy analysis classrooms are “still dominated by an outmoded conception of scientific epistemology, the social and policy sciences ill equip their students (especially doctoral stu-
dents) for the world they are sent out to confront” (p. 143). Buttressed by other criticisms, these clarion calls for changes in policy analysis pedagogy rang true.

With those who follow the predominant approach, we heartily applaud efforts to make policymaking more careful, more reasoned, and less haphazard and sloppy. However, we also see the policy process as inherently political, messy, not meticulous, subjective, and not scientific. Still, somewhat ironically, the critique of the postpositivists that positivism was neither realistic nor useful seemed equally applicable to postpositivism. Being relevant is at least as important as being right. Nor was it adequate for positivists to nod their heads toward the extensive and important criticisms and then continue unabated. What was needed, what is needed, is synthesis and praxis.

When policy analysis students enter the real world of politics and policymaking, they find not a tidy and orderly world but a world inhabited by political actors driven by a “win at all cost” attitude. Fox and Miller (1996) first presented these ideas to a mainstream public administration audience with the publication of their book, *Postmodern Public Administration*. The authors did not argue that public administrators should necessarily engage in postmodern decision making; rather, they presented the world in which the administrator practiced as a confusing one full of marketing slogans, symbols, and popular culture. Miller (2002) later followed with *Postmodern Public Policy*, in which he argues that “the public discourse has taken a peculiar shape in the era of mass communication and mass marketing” (p. xi). As Miller argues, public policymaking becomes little more than an exercise in marketing. Thus even decisions involving war, and therefore life and death, are marketed to citizens as “shock and awe,” and “mission accomplished.” It is the world that our students must enter and conduct analysis in, and it is this world that should be the focus of our teaching efforts.

A careful reading of the literature shows that in the last decade, since the first edition of Clemons and McBeth’s *Public Policy Praxis* and its second edition in 2009, the ivory-tower debate was resolved along the lines we advocated. Though classroom lessons may lag behind, today it seems clear that an approach reflecting the settled debate—that is, reflecting the insights and methods from both camps—is best. Thus, we teach policy analysis by a method that encourages students to grapple with ambiguity and complexity by offering six different analytical approaches to policy analysis: the rational approach, the political approach, the pragmatic approach, the postpositivist approach, the democratic approach, and the quantitative approach. Emphasizing mixed methodologies, students are encouraged through the use of cases to synthesize the different models into a workable and practical model of applied policy analysis. In addition to these analytical models, in our courses and text, we provide specific tools of policy analysis, such as stakeholder mapping, report writing, content analysis, group facilitation, narrative analysis, cost-benefit analysis, futuring, and survey analysis. While each case might emphasize a single analytical approach, the incomplete-
ness of the approach soon becomes apparent to the student. For example, a case using the rational approach reveals to the students the strengths of that approach (a methodology) as well as its limitations (how to deal with subjectivity, lack of democracy, etc.). Similarly, a case that uses the postpositivist approach would reveal its strengths and weaknesses. As the class progresses, students learn to incorporate more and more of the analytical approaches to each case. Some cases lend themselves more to one approach or a combination of approaches. Importantly, students learn that there is not necessarily one dominant approach but rather that a mixed and pluralistic approach is best suited to most analysis problems.

Further, students are given the opportunity to try out these analytical models and tools in varied case settings (county, city, federal, urban, and rural) while facing wide-ranging topics (expansion of human services, health care access, economic development, an inner-city drug program, and an environmental controversy) that capture the diversity of public policy and the intergovernmental nature of politics.

We believe that policy analysis requires a combination of knowledge and skills. Students need to learn about the politics of the policy process as well as how to do policy analysis. Along with teaching “how to,” we discuss the limitations of, the practical political problems with, and the ethical problems associated with different techniques and methodologies. Pedagogically, we rely heavily on a case approach. Tactically, we rely on mixed methodologies.

**The Case Method and Teaching**

Using teaching cases is one, often underused, tool professors have in their pedagogical toolbox; it is useful for stimulating critical thinking (Helms & Biggs, 2007) and achieving (at least simulated) praxis in the classroom. By *praxis*, we mean simply “theory guided action,” which in turn simply means that we write cases that promote active learning and critical thinking. Furthermore, cases in public administration are seen as essential in developing unique skills needed by administrators in the field (Rivenbark, 2007). We want our students to be able to describe theory as well as apply it and critically analyze it. Many teachers use at least some version of case study analysis. Whether it is telling stories as part of lectures or through formal cases, educators have long realized the magic of a good story line in engaging their students. The teaching case is a story, a narrative if you will, usually based on actual events and told with a definite teaching purpose. It does not have a correct answer or obvious solution, relying instead on the nature of the real world where answers are difficult to come by and solutions are always contested. Students are introduced to the need to think carefully, to listen to the points made by others and to evaluate those arguments, to review alternative courses of action and their efficacy, and to interpret real-world experience.

Harvard Law School is often credited with beginning the case study pedagogy in 1870, and by 1910 most law schools used cases as the dominant peda-
gogy. Case study methodology was adopted by the Harvard Business School after World War I, followed by schools of public administration in the 1930s and 1940s. In the years since, case teaching has spread throughout higher education and even to secondary schooling (Lynn, 1999b, pp. 3–15). In fact, good teachers have always used stories, recognizing that they are often more effective for engaging students than are point-by-point arguments and carefully explained conclusions (Noddings, 1997, p. 20). Noddings (1997) identifies five categories of stories: historical and biographical stories, fictional stories, personal stories, humorous stories, and stories of discovery (pp. 20–33). She argues that they contribute to cultural literacy, they enliven a presentation, they help expand interests while helping students connect to other fields, and they relate difficult concepts to problems of everyday living (pp. 20–33).

Stories and case pedagogy have more than mere classroom discussion value. They can also be vehicles for research. While some research cases may have limited pedagogical value because they have already reached conclusions (Lynn, 1999b, pp. 5–16), it is also true that students may be set to work doing the research to write or present a case study that will deepen their skills and understanding. Writing a case is an exercise in storytelling. Cases provide immediacy whether they are presented as discussion prompts in the classroom or as a research and writing assignment. In either circumstance, they are intended to promote active problem solving and enhance critical thinking skills (Millis & Cottell, 1998, p. 159) even as the cases themselves present a political story for analysis. It is at this point that narrative analysis and case study pedagogy intimately connect with one another.

There are different types of cases. Cases can be either fictional or real life. First, fictional cases are often appropriate to illustrate concepts for which a real-life case example is unavailable. Though the cases are fictional, case writers draw upon their experiences and knowledge when writing the case so that realism is at least simulated.

Second, real-life cases are what academics typically think of. In short, the case author carefully documents a real-life example of policy in action. The advantages of real-life cases are that (a) obviously, they provide the student with something that is tangible and real; and (b) the student can see that what is talked about in the classroom applies to what occurs in the normally messy, real world of politics.

Cases may be used to illustrate a process or theory, or they may provide a decision dilemma in the form of a problem to be solved. For example, a case concerning the decision by the United States to invade Iraq in 2003 could be used to illustrate Kingdon’s (1995) multiple streams theory. Such cases are valuable because they help students reinterpret their familiar world in unfamiliar ways. In this example, students would see September 11, as a focusing event, they could analyze changes in the public mood, and they could see policy solu-
tions (often preexisting ones) that have been floating in the political system being “attached” to the newly perceived problem being floated in the political system. Other cases, what we term “problem solving” cases, allow the student to work at solving a problem. For example, students might be presented with a case that presents a unique policy controversy and then asked how they would respond to various directives.

The key to these cases is not to make them easy enough that there is a single, correct answer. Beginning policy analysis students want the answer, but one important lesson from a good case is that complexity and political reality make the answer unavailable. We like dilemmas that present what the public administration ethics literature terms “right versus right” dilemmas (Cooper, 1998). These are the really hard real-life dilemmas. Choices between right versus wrong alternatives are the easy ones to make. But public policy dilemmas that array one set of values against another, and that also require choices from among value-driven alternatives that are all “right” but mutually exclusive, are more like the difficult ones faced by policy analysts in the fabled real world.

We tend to think of cases as being similar to models, wherein the standard of verisimilitude is key. Teaching cases must provide the most important information, including enough background to provide a complete picture of the policy issue and participants, while not providing so much detail that the policy dilemma is made obscure. Effective cases describe circumstances, provide facts, and communicate policy issues in a manner that gives the reader access to the situation as a nearly omniscient observer. Students must know the players and be able to distinguish between major and minor characters, and the case must provide a peek into their strategies, goals, and tactics. The students must get a feel for the differing dimensions of the issues involved. They need to be able to perceive complexity and conflict in the situation. There should be a dilemma, conflict, competing solutions, and a decision to be made under time pressure and in the absence of perfect information.

In the next section, we present a problem-solving case that was initially inspired by several real-life events but is presented as largely fictional (names, new characters, geographic locations, events, and elements of the decision dilemma have been changed or added to the original events). The assignment pulls the student into the case by assigning a fictional role. Cases often represent examples of situations that occur geographically close to their authors and that may also be familiar to students. Accordingly, there is a chance that professors and students from the real geographic location will be defensive, emotional, and uneasy about discussing controversial issues in their hometown. Fictionalizing a real case avoids this. Accordingly there is an advantage in, for example, taking an event that occurs in Portland, Oregon, and moving it to Buffalo, New York. Other advantages also accrue from fictionalizing the case, including the ability to add, or make evident, complexity, balance, and relevance. (Please note that the case as
presented is fully usable—that is, complete, including the assignment, how it can be taught, and a discussion setting forth examples of the types of issues it lends itself to covering.)

Case: The Flags and the Garbage Can

October 15 is a beautiful day; the ground is covered with fresh snow from an early fall storm as you drive down the highway and through several mountain passes in your brand-new state automobile. After recently graduating from the Master of Public Administration (MPA) program at Capitol State University, you are now working as a policy analyst for the State Department of Education (DOE) located in Capitol City. You are making a 250-mile trip (a drive time of 3 hours and 53 minutes, according to your Google map search) to the town of Eastview. As you leave the highway, drive into town, and stop and go through the town’s series of stoplights, you are curiously reminded of your favorite scene from the movie The Milagro Beanfield War when a state law enforcement bureaucrat played by Christopher Walken intentionally wrecks his new state car in an attempt to “fit in” with local culture. Yet, the locals in Milagro immediately figure out that the car is driven by, as one character says to another, “a cop.” Perhaps the locals already know that you are the newly hired DOE policy analyst—and indeed, as you get out of your car in your professional business clothes, the locals seem to stare at you in wonder.

Your first major assignment is to conduct an analysis for the Eastview School District. Walking up the sidewalk of the School District Building (at three stories, the largest building in the city), you have to question how you ended up with this job. Instead of sitting behind a desk from 9 to 5, you will often have to make overnight trips to communities throughout the state. You wonder why you ever changed your accounting major years ago and how your life might be different if you had not. Yet, you have always liked research and public policy, and you really liked your public policy analysis class at State U. So here you are in a town of 18,400 people in the middle of nowhere, about to engage in your first external assignment.

The assignment, you think, is a fairly technical one; and you always excelled in technique during your graduate program. You enjoy studying politics, but you were always a little uneasy about the role that politics plays in policymaking. Your policy analyst professor at Capitol State U always stressed that politics and technique cannot totally be separated. You understood what the professor meant, but you hope that this first assignment will be more technique and less politics. Your task is to help the Eastview School District plan for an $11 million project to provide a gymnasium, pool, and locker room facilities at Eastview High. This project is needed to provide equal facilities for both boys and girls physical education courses and athletic teams, as required by Title IX of the Civil Rights Act. Eastview has not been in compliance, and the superintendent has been desperate to bring the school in line with the law.
You meet the School District Superintendent, Bob Sharpornot, and begin a discussion about the high school and the district’s needs. Eastview High is a city high school of about 1,400 students in Grades 10–12. The district is considered one of the poorest in the state. As you drive to the high school for a tour, Superintendent Sharpornot tells you that he would appreciate an analysis of public support for new facilities at the high school, some understanding of the costs involved, some options on how to fund things, and so on. You tell him that you would like to conduct a survey of residents as well as conduct a simple cost-benefit analysis of the project. Sharpornot seems impressed, and you smile as you realize that your job (at least) should be fairly easy. You enter the high school’s current gym and quickly notice the retired number 25 jersey of a former Eastview High All-American girl’s basketball player in 1983, along with championship banners from the school’s volleyball teams. You also notice that the gym is small, things are crowded, and the place smells bad. Several physical education classes are being run at the same time, and the team’s baseball team is taking indoor batting practice in a makeshift batting tunnel. You notice the diversity in the student body and observe some apparent self-segregation in student groups.

You meet history teacher and Assistant Athletic Director Howard Eaton, a big burly man and former college football player. Eaton shows you dilapidated locker room facilities, leaky pipes, and even bleachers that are closed for safety reasons.

Upon returning to your hotel that evening in the nearby town of South Mountain, you sketch a plan of action. You will continue to interview stakeholders and use their input to draft a mail survey. You’ve rejected using either focus groups or town-hall meetings as too slow and costly as well as possibly politicizing what you see as primarily a cut-and-dried, rational decision-making situation. Then you will work up a cost-benefit analysis, prepare some options, and wrap up your assignment. You figure that all of this will take 3–6 months, and you expect to make the 250-mile trip many times during the upcoming months.

The next morning, you meet with the school board and present your plan. The president of the board, banker Hal Morris, likes your plan but wonders if it would be smarter to do the cost-benefit analysis first. Morris states, “If your CBA shows more benefits than costs, then that information might be helpful in prompting support that will be measured by your survey and then the survey results will further influence public opinion and build support for funding the new facility.” You are surprised and chagrined at Morris’s bold statement advocating a premature attempt to influence survey results and public opinion, but you also note that other board members nod their heads in apparent agreement with Morris.

Two Weeks Later

You sit in your office with your cost-benefit analysis plan spread out on your desk. The costs seem easy to quantify. First, there are the construction costs (somewhere around $11 million). Renovation and construction of the recreation
facilities would take place on school property, so there doesn't seem to be any of what your policy analysis professor called those “pesky” environmental or social costs to deal with. Then again, there are opportunity costs. In your stakeholder interviews, you found that many individuals would rather see the school district spend money on purely academic facilities rather than athletic and recreation facilities. One stakeholder argued that this was a zero-sum situation: Because money was needed at the middle school for construction of a new academic building, building the gym and recreational facilities would mean that money would not be spent on more important academic matters. You are uncertain how to factor such opportunity costs into your analysis. The benefits are still more difficult to quantify. Certainly, the high school students will benefit from new facilities; and certainly, physical education and sports activities are an important part of a student's development and health. Yet, one person’s benefit might be another person's cost. That is, construction of the gym might mean that the middle school does not get its academic building. Thus a perceived benefit to those who support the high school construction might be a perceived cost to those who support spending money on an academic building for the middle school.

As you look over your interviews, you note that supporters of the recreation project contend that the new facilities would bring in new revenue to the community—thus suggesting that it might be a variable-sum situation. That is, these supporters believe that Eastview could host swim meets, basketball and wrestling tournaments, and even some cultural events in their new facilities. In your mind, you can almost hear the school board president telling you to shape the cost-benefit analysis to make it look more positive.

After a long lunch and some time to think, you ask yourself whether you are getting ahead of yourself. That is, perhaps you need to conduct the survey to get a wider view of stakeholders. Again, the school board president’s comments about using survey results to positively influence public opinion sticks in your head. You write a quick survey using the principles of survey construction learned in your MPA program. For example, you remember to avoid leading questions, double-barreled questions, biased questions, and questions that lead to uninformed responses. You also remember to not ask “motherhood and apple pie” questions (questions without costs or trade-offs that everybody is going to agree with). Your five questions (with additional demographic questions) look good, and you think the survey is technically correct. You then fax it to key stakeholders and head for home, thinking you have the bulk of your work in Eastview well in hand.

You spend the next morning on the road, working on a project for another school district. Upon arriving after lunch at your office, you are surprised to see seven faxes on your desk. You are even more surprised that each fax is from an individual stakeholder who is demanding additional new questions or rewritten questions. Some of the revised surveys (like the one submitted by School Board
President Hal Morris) are clearly trying to frame questions in ways that will produce results favorable to the project. Others do the opposite, and still others want to use the survey for other purposes (like testing economic development policies). Some stakeholders even take a hostile, in-your-face tone in their faxes, accusing you and your survey questions of bias (one way or the other). You are surprised at how angry these accusations make you. You remember your professor telling you that survey construction is political, and you remember Miles’ Law (where you stand depends upon where you sit), but somehow you weren’t emotionally prepared for seeing politics in action. You know that your survey is technically correct (although after reading the critical faxes, you are starting to question yourself), but you also know that you have to please multiple stakeholders. You wonder if you have failed as an analyst; and you now worry about your return trip to Eastview, scheduled for December 9.

What Happens Next

On December 6, Rafael Juarez walked into an Eastview High School classroom with a Mexican flag in his hand. Rafael, a Hispanic student in his senior year at Eastview, had received the flag at “Mexico Cultural Appreciation Days,” an event sponsored by a local business group. Eastview High history teacher Howard Eaton took the flag from Juarez. The events after this are disputed. Juarez claims that Eaton made fun of him after taking the flag, saying, “I don’t want to see any Mexican flag in my classroom” and then throwing it in the garbage can. Eaton, on the other hand, admits “placing” the flag in the garbage can; but argued that he was doing so “to keep the classroom environment safe and productive.” Hispanic students in the class were apparently shocked at Eaton’s action. About 40% of Eastview High School is Hispanic.4

Eastview, an agricultural (tomatoes, squash, lentil beans) and industrial community (former home of an auto parts plant), has a long history of attracting and hiring immigrant farmworkers and, more recently, blue-collar workers from Mexico. In the 1960s and 1970s, these workers (including their families) lived in “migrant camps” on the Eastview plain. The plain is “hot and humid” country. The houses in these camps had plywood walls, and the migrants sometimes experienced heat of over 100 degrees without any air conditioning. In the 1990s, these camps were torn down and replaced with better seasonal housing. Overwhelmingly, these immigrant farmworkers lived in Eastview during the agricultural growing season (May through October) and then returned to Mexico for the winter months.

Over time, however, many workers decided to stay in Eastview, and their children (born in the United States) are American citizens. By 1990, over 15% of Eastview was Hispanic; their share of the population had increased to over 25% by the year 2000. This led to a great deal of racial tension in the town. Fear of “Mexican gangs,” “drug dealers,” and even “Satanism” was, and is, rampant among many of Eastview’s Anglo residents.
The flag incident ignited simmering tension between Anglos and Hispanics. When some Hispanic students in an art class prepared posters of the Mexican flag and posted them in the school’s hallways, some Anglo students responded by tearing the posters down and waving the U.S. flag in a protest. In an effort to reduce tensions, a diverse group of Anglo and Hispanic students marched together in front of the school carrying both American and Mexican flags and prepared diversity posters for the school’s gym and for display at a boy’s basketball game. A rumor circulated that a male Anglo student was going to bring a gun to school, heightening fears among students and parents and leading to a decision to let the high school students out early. Recognizing the potential for rapidly escalating racial and cultural conflict, the high school principal sought to defuse the volatile situation by suspending teacher Howard Eaton and launching a full-scale investigation. The school district’s superintendent stated, “While it is our opinion that the actions of Mr. Eaton were insensitive and inappropriate, we also believe that the student should not have interrupted a history class by waving a Mexican flag, so an investigation is under way.”

Two days after the flag incident, another teacher, Paul Napoli, was placed on suspension when, according to school district officials, he “burned an American flag in the school’s courtyard.” Napoli, who taught mathematics and is the faculty advisor for the school’s Hispanic club, apparently went into the school’s courtyard and invited the media and some students to watch him burn an American flag. He is currently being prosecuted by county officials for public mutilation of an American flag, a violation of a state law that may not be constitutional based on multiple Supreme Court rulings about free speech and the First Amendment. (His flag-burning episode was videotaped and was popular on YouTube before being removed after a month because of racially charged comments).

News of the initial flag incident and ensuing events soon spread to the local, regional, and national media. A local Hispanic cable television station tried to organize a protest at the school, and the expanding story was picked up and quickly spread through the media. Soon, Eastview was being discussed on newspaper and blogs in cities like Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Dallas. National anti-immigration groups picked up the story, and soon Juarez (an American citizen) was being portrayed as the “typical illegal alien, complaining about how mean Americans are.” Liberal blogs such as the Daily Dose have run daily accounts of the issue. Furthermore, conservative talk radio shows, including the nationally syndicated Louie O’Loudmouth show, have seized on this case as an example of how patriotic Americans are constantly being sacrificed on the altar of “liberal-fascist” support for illegal immigration.

In fact, both the blog and O’Loudmouth have become active players in this controversy. The Daily Dose is considered the most influential liberal blog, and activists writing under pseudonyms have used the blog to raise money for political candidates, fund recount efforts, and organize protest movements. In
this case, a blogger with the user name of “The Truth” has used the Eastview flag incident to bring awareness to racial tensions. The Truth is raising money to buy all Eastview Hispanic students cell phone video cameras and encouraging them to record any racial comments or behaviors so that they can be posted on YouTube as well as the *Daily Dose*. The Truth is offering a $5,000 reward for the most “viral” video clip of racism at the school.

Conversely, Louie O’Loudmouth (or LO’L as he is known locally) is something of a celebrity in Eastview. He grew up in Eastview, and his family owns the town’s grocery store. Not surprisingly, O’Loudmouth’s show is a staple of the most popular AM radio station in Eastview. Anyone taking a morning stroll through downtown Eastview is frequently within range of O’Loudmouth’s strident voice as it wafts from open shop doors and the open windows of passing cars.

Similarly, those who are supportive of immigration rose to the defense of Juarez and castigated Eastview as “full of inbreds, imbeciles, and hillbillies.” Following is a sample of the Internet buzz from both local and national sources. (Note: These quotes are purely fictional, though based on quotes from a real incident.)

**Local**

- “Eastview citizens R always the bad guys, why was there a Mexican Appreciation Day, why not an American Appreciation Day?” (Frank, Eastview)
- “Louie O’Loudmouth and local announcers are liars. They make up stories about Hispanics and call us illegals and welfare cheats.” (Bonita, Eastview)
- “Napoli’s burning of the American flag should lead to capital punishment, but I don’t care about the Mexican flag, it is not the USA of American flag.” (Hal, Eastview)

**National and International**

- “This is typical American provincialism. As a citizen of Italy, I am amazed that the U.S. is afraid of different ways of life. In most countries, different cultures are more accepted.” (Agata, Italy)
- BTW, hey can you imagine a teacher like Eaton throwing away a British flag from a British student on a British holiday like Boxing Day? No, this is just plain wrong, and u know it.” (Joe, Forth Worth, Texas)
- “This is another example of why we need Tea Party Patriots, not tepid patriots. Send them and all there [sic] flags back to Mexico.” (Sarah, Phoenix, Arizona)
The Analyst Returns

After reading about the flag incident, you wondered if the whole project would or should be scrapped. But you got word from your supervisor that the director of the DOE has talked directly with the governor and that you are to remain engaged in the Eastview project.

It is now three days after the initial flag incident. After an exhausting drive, you arrive at Eastview and decide to stop in at school district offices before registering at your hotel. As you enter the office, you are surprised to see the office staff gathered around listening to the Louie O’Loudmouth show. After reintroducing yourself to some, you ask the obvious question: Why is everyone listening to LO’L? The story comes out as a disjointed rush of words with everyone speaking at the same time. Finally, you get the whole story.

It seems that LO’L has taken a particular interest in this controversy at his alma mater and has decided to raise the stakes while further making a name for himself. He has offered to personally contribute $2 million to the fund set up last winter by the superintendent to raise money for the desperately needed gymnasium, pool, and locker room facilities at Eastview High. You know that the project is expected to cost the district about $11 million, funds that are simply unavailable to a relatively poor district like Eastview. You learn that not only has LO’L offered to pony up $2 million dollars of his own money for the fund, but he has also offered to use his radio show to raise the rest of the money from his nationwide base of listeners.

O’Loudmouth’s overly generous offer, however, is not without certain conditions. These conditions are designed to appeal to the political prejudices of his listeners while also presenting the school district with a difficult choice. The first condition is that the investigation of the Mexican flag incident and of teacher Howard Eaton be ended and Eaton exonerated of any wrongdoing. O’Loudmouth’s second condition is that teacher Paul Napoli’s suspension be continued until the burning of the American flag charges have been resolved and, if he is convicted, that he be fired and the Hispanic Club disbanded. Third, the school district needs to sponsor an American Appreciation Day. Finally, LO’L demands that an American flag be installed in a “place of honor” in the cafeteria, in the new gymnasium, in every classroom, in every office, and at every prominent entrance to the campus.

You are appalled by his gall, and surprised by these developments; but you are also confident that the district will reject his demands out of hand, thus allowing you to go about your work for the DOE. When you arrive at the superintendent’s office for your scheduled meeting with him the next morning, however, you get quite a surprise. Superintendent Sharpornot tells you he is seriously considering O’Loudmouth’s offer—and, further, he has asked the school board to meet in emergency session tonight to discuss the offer and maybe make a decision. Superintendent Sharpornot hastens to assure you, and through you the director of the DOE, that he is not a small-town insular racist but a progressive educator.
Sharpornot believes he can negotiate with L’OL to maximize the most innocuous of his conditions (flags in all “places of honor”) while minimizing the most objectionable ones (the American Appreciation Day and disbanding the Hispanic Club). He hopes to get the school board to authorize naming the new gymnasium complex after O’Loudmouth to sweeten the pot for him and his followers. Sharpornot also points out that for making mostly symbolic concessions to O’Loudmouth, the district would get actual and badly needed bricks and mortar, finally providing the gender-equal facilities long required by federal law. In Sharpornot’s view, it is a no-brainer.

As you leave Sharpornot’s office, you overhear parts of conversation from a group of Hispanic parents gathered on the sidewalk outside the office. Words and phrases you hear include “pack the meeting,” “protest,” “disrespect,” and most ominously, “I don’t know if we can control the hotheads.” In addition, you remember that the *Daily Dose* is waiting to pounce on this story once again, and you think about what would happen if camera phones were indeed being universally used throughout the school. No one wants cameras everywhere, and short clips on YouTube can be misleading (because they are often taken out of context). In addition, Sharpornot clearly does not believe that racism is deep in his school. In fact, he believes strongly that people with racist views are a small minority at Eastview High.

You sit at a local sandwich shop by Eastview Lake, and in your briefcase is your cost-benefit analysis plan as well as your original survey with stakeholder comments attached. You feel that you have lost control (or perhaps never had it) and that you should not get involved with the political maneuverings. You are a policy analyst, not a political advisor. You once again remember, though, your professor at State U telling you that the line between analysis and politics is often narrow. You wonder if you can somehow develop a process to get things back on track or whether this whole project is a lost cause.

**Questions to Consider**

1. Early in the case, you (as the analyst) see your job mainly in technical terms. Returning to the time before December 6, how would you describe your performance? Do analysts have to play politics when conducting such “technical” exercises? Should they play politics?
2. For the period before December 6, write five good survey questions that you think would help you gain needed information. Then outline a process to conduct the cost-benefit analysis.
3. How did the events of December 6 and later change this policy problem? What do you tell your director when you make your late-morning phone call to her office? That is, what is your recommendation? The governor wants you working on this case but has not
offered detailed policy guidance. How do you walk this political and policy tightrope while maintaining your professional stance in making recommendations to your boss?

4. Assuming you stay on this case (either by choice or by order of the DOE director), an obvious key question is, who are the stakeholders and what are their views? (Is the Eastview community being railroaded by O’Loudmouth and his followers? Is the Daily Dose simply using its powerful national following to manipulate local officials? If so, can anything be done about it?) Complete a stakeholder analysis identifying the multiple interests and players in this case. As you work on this, note that competing interest groups and individuals frequently present alternatives in strategically convenient language. How does each group define the problem? What stories are they telling? How does this reflect their values, interests, and power? (Keep this simple; you don’t need a large, formal stakeholder analysis.)

5. Is this case a good illustration of how a mixed method approach might be especially useful for the policy analyst? Think about how the case combines identification of key facts, cost-benefit analysis, surveys, focus groups, and a policy process model focusing on the politically charged environment within which policy analysis happens. How does the mixed method approach provide the analysis with appropriate armamentaria to operate in these figurative political battlefields?

6. How do you work in such a charged environment? Do you think the media and message board examples are illustrative of what stakeholders think about this situation, or do you think there is more moderation among larger groups? How would you find out this information, and how do you mobilize moderation? Is it unusual for analysts to have to work in such complex and highly political environments?

7. Does the advent of technology make your decision making more difficult? In other words, how do you contain this issue when it is now on blogs, talk radio, YouTube, and cable news? Are you surprised at the emotion and the anger illustrated in this case? Where does this emotion and anger come from? What role do elites play in promoting such emotion and anger, and what role could elites play in defusing such situations?

8. Is this all happening too fast? After all, no serious analysis has been done by Sharpnot or you. Will acquiescence to O’Loudmouth’s demands further inflame the Hispanic community? Will acquiescence to the Daily Dose (The Truth) show that the school district is weak and can be played by outside forces? Is this a right versus right dilemma? Or are there clearly right and wrong policy options?
9. How about the Hispanic parents and kids? Who is looking out for them, and who is including them in the community? And, if they feel rejected and “disrespected” by the school board’s ultimate decision, what implications does this have for the community and education?

10. If, at the school board meeting tonight, the board were to turn to you as an expert policy analyst and ask your advice for both the short- and the long-term way of defusing the situation while also providing the best education for the community in the long term, what will you propose? Can you successfully return the dialogue to a survey and the cost-benefit analysis?

**Teaching Cases**

In our classrooms, we use cases like this as an opportunity not only to stimulate student discussion and interest but also to allow them to learn by doing. The case can be used in a variety of ways. For example, you could turn the case into a formal writing assignment for which the student has to answer the questions in the form of a memo to a hypothetical decision maker (the director of the DOE, in this case). Alternatively, you could use the case as an informal writing assignment and have students prepare thorough answers to the questions (or merely jot down ideas in response to them) that lead to a class discussion. Finally, you could use the case strictly for discussion—perhaps building on group discussions of each question, or simply discussing the case as a whole after students read through it. Professors obviously also can choose how to teach the case in regard to reading material. This case could be very profitably used at the end of the semester, after students have read and dealt with the differing analytical approaches to policy analysis. Yet, the case could also be used at the beginning of the semester as a way of quickly introducing students to the messy and political world of policy analysis. When we introduce a case early in the semester, besides using it as a touchstone while moving through new material, we normally return to it at the end of the semester so that students can see for themselves their own increased analytical sophistication.

A key principle of case teaching is that students often learn from mistakes. For example, students frequently try to solve the problem without understanding it or paying attention to process and the social and human dimensions at play. Our students are much like the analyst in the case. They understand and appreciate politics, but part of the learning process is to learn technique before learning political sophistication. That is, they most often prefer rationality to politics. Yet, when put into situations involving cases like this, they clearly understand the difficulties of a purely rational approach. Even before the December 6 flag incident, this dilemma is not one in which a purely rational approach will work, due to the nature of the problem. We would discuss it as a wicked problem
(Rittel & Webber, 1973) and therefore one that calls for a wide range of voices to be invested in deriving a solution and owning the ultimate policy. Still, some students will insist on a straightforward determination of who is right and who is wrong and further insist on imposing a solution that favors the “right” side in this controversy.

For us, as professors, this is a teaching moment; for the students, it is a learning one. Gently prodding students to think about how this dispute symbolically threatens values of both the Hispanic and Anglo communities and thus heightens policy conflict may lead most of them to recognize that both sides have a point. This realization is the first step toward their maturation as policy analysts rather than political partisans. When this happens, students discover on their own the necessity to bring all community members into respectful discussions seeking a policy solution.

Several of the questions for the example case tap into another issue student analysts often struggle with, and it is one that practicing analysts regularly face as well. Namely, the temporal problem—usually characterized by the existence of both short- and long-term factors. Moreover, not only may the seemingly best solution for one factor contradict the seemingly best course of action for the other, but managers and leaders so frequently (if understandably) may fall victim to the tendency to put out the fire in an immediate tree without recognizing the long-term danger of losing the entire forest to a fire. Alternatively, because public administration students are typically trained as staff managers, they might pursue the opposite inclination. That is, they might spend time with grandiose long-term plans without dealing with the immediate crisis.

Cases like the one just presented also become a launching pad to discuss the (more short-term) topic of problem definition—and the fact that different definitions as the cause of the problem will translate into different solutions—and the (more long-term) topic of utilizing a four- to six-step model so as to not miss key factors while trying to determine criteria, generate alternatives, or “do” policy evaluation and selection.

Another avenue to pursue in the classroom is related to several of the case questions. Cases like this one reflect directly on the question of who the analyst works for, their views of democracy and power, and ethical concerns. Other topics we cover in our text and classes that this case lends itself to discussing include Kingdon’s three streams theory (how this issue is a focusing event, and policy entrepreneurs are using it to attach solutions and shape the public mood); and issue expansion à la Schattschneider (1960; policy entrepreneurs are taking this single issue and wrapping it in larger national issues), including the use of the mass media plus narrative (or story) analysis.

In particular, the example case lends itself to this kind of analysis because of O’Loudmouth’s involvement. Students quickly identify with how this policy entrepreneur has used his available national stage to put immigration on the agenda.
nationally while simultaneously presenting his alma mater with a difficult dilemma. In chess, this is the equivalent of putting the opponent’s king in “check.” For the school district, the governor, and the student analyst, the question is how to escape “check,” avoid “checkmate,” and take advantage of their own offensive capabilities. Certainly there are other topics as well, topics covered in the textbooks utilized and in our classrooms, that can be worked into a discussion or into the feedback professors provide in response to a writing assignment based on these questions. As with the questions themselves, our discussion of how to use the case in class is meant to be suggestive and inclusive, not exclusive.

However, we do contend that a pedagogical approach utilizing cases—when presented to students trained with a mixed approach that combines knowledge and skills—is far more likely to produce both increased student interest and analysts better able to address complex issues than will either training students using only a rational model approach or using only a purely postmodern approach. Yet, we must recognize that case teaching doesn’t allow us, or our students, to reach tidy solutions based on professional consensus. The real world just doesn’t work that way, and case studies are most effective when they confirm the messiness of politics and policy analysis for students.

In addition, when teaching a controversial and emotional case such as this, there is always the worry that controversy in the case will spill over to the classroom. A case study like this—one that is balanced, complex, and a true dilemma—can stimulate significant interest, strong feelings, and vigorous debate. This response requires a professor who can be a fair and neutral discussion leader on the topic, who is comfortable with a lively classroom debate, and who understands that he or she is responsible for student feelings as well as educational outcomes. In short, the professor has to model the facilitation skills used by policy analysts in heated real-world events like those discussed in the example case.

As teachers, we know our cases and case discussions with students are most successful when students still want to argue about process and detail at the end of class; when everyone leaves a little dissatisfied; when students leave class still confronting one another about the case; and even when the professor leaves class wishing that somehow the solution students came up with had been just a little more clearly defined.
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2 In November 2002, one of the coauthors participated in a roundtable discussion with Larry Lynn and Michael Munger at the Southern Political Science Association Conference in Savannah, GA. The discussion, organized by Francine Sanders Romero, focused on different approaches to policy analysis and was a pleasant and instructive exchange of ideas.

3 This discussion of case teaching is designed for readers not familiar with the approach. More experienced readers may want to skip or browse this section.

4 Clearly, many of the so-called Anglos are not just of English heritage; but the non-Hispanic whites in Eastview tend to view themselves as Anglo Americans and have incorporated very little, if any, heritage from their other European (primarily) backgrounds into their identities. They are proudly “non-hyphenated” Americans. For this reason, we use their term *Anglo* to designate the non-Hispanic white population of Eastview.
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Abstract
This paper examines how social network analysis (SNA) methods and tools can be used to evaluate instruction and teaching methods in an MPA program. With a unique way of collecting and analyzing data—both statistically and visually—SNA tools enable public affairs educators to (a) identify patterns of interaction among students, (b) identify characteristics of student friendships and advice networks, (c) design teaching methods and interventions to facilitate student interaction, and (d) develop students’ interpersonal skills so they can learn in collaborative environments. The case study in this paper provides an example of how SNA was used to evaluate changes in student interactions and collaborative learning during an MPA class at the University of Central Florida (UCF).

Social network analysis (SNA) is a unique methodology with its own version of data collection, statistical analysis, and presentation of the results. Its most important tenet is that it enables researchers, practitioners, and educators to see how “actors are located or ‘embedded’ in the overall network” (Hanneman, 2001, p. 3). This way of thinking creates an advantage of multilevel analysis. Its methodology enables the analysis of relationships between individuals, groups, teams, cliques, agencies, and organizations. Thus, most of the time, a network analyst would be concerned with how an actor is located in the network and how that very structure is created by the relationships among those actors (Hanneman, 2001; Provan, Veazie, Staten, & Teufel-Shone, 2005).

With the increase of network-related research and its applications, several analysis tools were developed to examine social network dynamics (STOCNET, VISONE,
STATNET, UCINET, etc.). UCINET is a social network analysis software program that enables users to analyze network routines (e.g., centrality measures, clique analysis, etc.) and the general statistics of multivariate analyses—such as multidimensional scaling, cluster analysis, and multiple regression (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002).

In public affairs education, SNA tools can be used to (a) measure student interaction, (b) identify patterns of interaction in student groups, (c) provide instructive guidance accordingly, and (d) evaluate the impact of instruction that aims to develop students’ interpersonal skills for working collaboratively in groups. As public affairs educators are increasingly adopting collaborative teaching methods, the use of SNA tools can provide them with supplementary techniques to evaluate the effectiveness and methods of their instruction.

Collaborative learning refers to an instruction method that assumes students have a central position in all teaching and learning activities that take place in interactive groups, where those students engage in problem-solving activities and teamwork to achieve a common academic goal with the help of an instructor-facilitator (Bruffee, 1984; Gokhale, 1995). Collaborative learning requires active class contribution by students that can include (a) joint projects, (b) working with peers outside the classroom, (c) participating in community-based, service-learning projects, (d) the ability to learn from peers, and (e) discussion of class readings with other students. This kind of active student participation in the learning process is considered “deeply democratic” (Finkel, 2000) because it develops students’ abilities to build consensus (Trimbur, 1989). In this sense, collaborative learning is a teaching method that is targeted at increasing student learning capacity (Gokhale, 1995) by encouraging collaboration where students work together, construct interdependent tasks and rewards (Bossert, 1988–1989), and use computer-supported modes of interaction.

Using social network analysis, the following questions are examined in this paper: How is collaborative learning defined in the literature? What are the key activities and techniques of effective collaborative teaching and learning—both inside and outside the classroom? What are the current trends in collaborative learning? What current teaching and learning methods and tools need to be changed in order to meet the challenges of 21st-century networked society? How can the technology be utilized to enhance collaborative teaching and learning? What is the nature of intragroup collaboration and intergroup cooperation within classroom networks that are sustained by collaborative learning techniques? The SNA techniques enable us to find answers to these types of questions by analyzing the data collected from surveys that asked students about their friendship-based and work-related ties in the classroom.

Theoretical Framework

Training and educating future public administrators of the 21st century is a challenging task. Preparing professionals in this new generation requires teaching
the deep-rooted knowledge and tradition of public administration as well as developing student skills for their future careers that enable them to build new relationships and manage creative teams and networks. (Senge, Smith, Kruschwitz, Laur, & Schley, 2008). Using SNA techniques on a network perspective can improve the effectiveness of a classroom learning environment by (a) identifying points of misalignment and accelerating collaboration in student groups, (b) determining whether certain functions of a group are achieving the interaction required for desired results, (c) identifying and tracking intervention strategies, and (d) identifying high performers in a team and replicating these results with low-performing student groups (Provan et al., 2005; Cross & Thomas, 2009).

Collaborative learning uses many different approaches that have common points of group work, student involvement, interaction, and interdependence. Figure 1 summarizes the merits of collaborative learning techniques for improving student learning and development. The collaborative learning process leads to the generation of social capital among students, which results in better learning. Increasing interaction among students creates a greater student network, which leads to a richer social network (Dimitracopoulou & Petrou, n.d.). Although people have boundaries in managing social networks due to limits on time and energy, technology helps them manage more connections with less effort and time (Cho, Lee, Stefanone, & Gay, 2005). Online learning tools, synchronous and asynchronous communication mediums, and course-supporting Web applications can increase student-faculty interaction and student-student interactions (Mingus, 1999). The important factor in collaboration among students is their eagerness to collaborate. Balance among group members and readiness to collaborate are important points of consideration (Dillenbourg, Baker, Blaye, & O’Malley, 1996).

SNA methods and tools can help researchers and educators test whether the collaborative learning techniques listed on the left side of Figure 1 have an impact on the dimensions of student learning and development listed on the right side of Figure 1—which are those that improve interpersonal and networking skills. For instance, centrality measures are important statistical figures for seeing more general pictures of the case at hand that otherwise could not be seen. Generally speaking, they are used to identify powerful and important actors in the network (Analytic Technologies, 2008). More specifically, centrality measures are important for understanding power, stratification, ranking, and inequality in social structures (Hanneman, 2001). They thus can help interpret deficiencies and structural holes in the network (Burt, 1992). Depending on the relationships between actors in the network, they are either in advantageous or disadvantageous positions. Respectively, these characteristics may reflect opportunities and constraints faced by the actors. While such positions create power or weakness, their scope may vary across different types of networks.
This study addresses three types of centrality measures—“degree,” “closeness,” and “betweenness.” Each of them analyzes the position and power of network actors from different perspectives (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Degree centrality refers to the total number of ties that each organization has with others. The organizations or individuals with more interactions have more degree power (Hanneman, 2001). From this perspective, the primary coordinating agencies that are responsible for leading operations should have higher degree centrality than the regular organizations that are responsible for supporting these operations. Therefore, in a perfect network, it is imperative that the most important and active organizations have higher degree centrality.

Closeness centrality is the communication distance between each network actor. This measure shows how close an actor stands to others in terms of having access to those actors. Thus, the measure is based primarily on the concept of geodesic distances and is measured by taking the reciprocal of “farness” (one divided by farness), which is the sum of all the actors’ geodesic distances (Hanneman, 2001). It is useful for analyzing the flow of communication, based on the premise that the shorter the actors’ paths are to others, the quicker their communication will be (Comfort & Haase, 2006).
Betweenness centrality identifies key organizations that facilitate relationships between other actors. They act as bridges, as intermediaries, or as liaisons (Kapucu, 2006). In their absence, network communications can show substantial damage due to a disruption of links between smaller groups or networks. Although the perspective of an organization having higher betweenness centrality is good, it is not preferable from the network perspective because network members do not like to be dependent on certain mediators. Betweenness centrality, on the other hand, refers to a positional power that results from being between the communication vehicles of different actors or groups of actors. An actor has betweenness power when providing communication linkage between two other actors or subgroups in such a way that the nonexistence of that actor could cause a serious communication breakdown for those two actors or subgroups that it is facilitating (Comfort & Haase, 2006; Wasserman & Faust, 1994).

UCINET software also is used for identifying cliques—or subgroups of actors—who have direct ties with one another in each network. The analyses of cliques help researchers evaluate intergroup collaboration and group overlap in networks (Belotti, 2009). The next section illustrates how we used SNA tools and methods to evaluate student interaction in an MPA class at the University of Central Florida (UCF).

Methodology

To illustrate how SNA can be used to observe and test increased student interaction over the term of a class—and thus analyze which course methods are better for that goal—this paper illustrates the analysis of a class that extensively used collaborative learning techniques (see Appendix for a sample survey instrument). This study included an analysis of collaborative learning techniques that were employed in one of the elective courses taught in the MPA program at UCF. University of Central Florida is one of the largest universities in the nation, with a student population of nearly 52,000. Its Department of Public Administration has the largest MPA program in the state of Florida: nearly 200 active students at the time of this writing. Twenty-nine students took this elective course in the spring 2008 term. Because one student did not fill out surveys either at the beginning or end of the term, network analysis was conducted on 28 students who participated in those surveys. The surveys, which were distributed in class, aimed to discover friendship and work relationships among students (and the change in those relationships throughout the term). They asked each student to list their friends in the classroom and the people they worked and studied with. The listed findings are a result of conducting network analysis on the survey data that measured changes in student interactions and social capital. Network analysis is a quantitative research technique that enables researchers to represent relational data in a format that explores the nature and characteristics of those relations (Monge & Contractor, 2003). People, work groups, events,
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organizations, and various other entities can be nodes or actors in network analysis. In this study, students were the nodes or actors in the classroom network; the nature of their ties and the structural properties of the network as a whole were the focus of analysis.

Application of Collaborative Learning in an MPA Class

Based on the experiences from previous years, the instructor of this MPA class shifted his teaching philosophy and evolved his role into that of a facilitator rather than an instructor. The relationship between professor and students in this class stood on three main pillars—collaboration, mutual respect, and engagement. Class environment was designed to achieve better student participation. Students formed groups to achieve class tasks, and they brought their knowledge and experiences with them. Each of these experiences was somehow unique. Because they all embarked on the journey together, they needed to respect and understand each other and build on those differences and similarities. Mutual respect also ensured that the professor-student relationship was a two-way street, where each side had something to learn from the other. The students gathered knowledge from the professor while the professor got to understand their needs and values and to adapt his teaching style accordingly.

In this collaboration, each partner needed to be actively engaged in reaching the goals. During class, the professor and the students needed to be engaged in lively conversations that could help students understand concepts, notions, and the necessity of long and complicated formulas. Students were interdependent because every group member had to use his or her experience to make connections between the actual world and the flow of knowledge from the professor, while also creating successful group tasks. Building an atmosphere of respect, collaboration, and engagement in a classroom not only teaches students but also prepares them for life.

To enhance student collaboration and add a collaborative approach to the classroom environment, the following tools—summarized in Table 1—were used: (a) response papers—a critical review of reading materials for the assigned week, prepared as a group and posted on the Webcourse discussion board at least a day before the class; (b) response to response papers—a critical evaluation of the response paper for the assigned week that provided constructive feedback to its preparing group; (c) term papers—organizational analysis reports prepared by each group about their research experience with a chosen public agency, as a result of interviews and field visits; (d) class discussions—as facilitated by the instructor, the assigned group that prepared the response paper for the week took the lead; (e) guest lecturers—three guests came to the class to deliver an interactive speech; (f) simulation—students participated in a major simulation guided by professionals; and (g) organization visits—students received a guided tour by a professional of an organization that was central to class goals.
Table 1.
*Collaborative Assignments for the Class*

| Assignment 1 | Response papers—a critical review of reading materials for the assigned week, prepared as a group and posted on the Webcourse discussion board at least a day before the class. |
| Assignment 2 | Response to response papers—a critical evaluation of the response paper for the assigned week that provided constructive feedback to its preparing group, and posted on the Webcourse discussion board at least a day before the class. |
| Assignment 3 | Term papers—organizational analysis reports prepared by each group about their research experience with a chosen public agency, as a result of interviews and field visits. |
| Class Discussions | Class discussions were facilitated by the instructor, while the group that prepared the response paper for the week took the lead. |
| Guest Lectures | Three guests were brought into the class to deliver an interactive speech. |
| Simulation | The students participated in a major simulation that was guided by professionals. |
| Organization Visit | The class included a guided tour by a professional at an organization that was central to the class goals. |

Moreover, the evaluation of term papers and students’ performance were based on thoroughness of discussion, professional appearance, correct grammar, spelling, and use of the third-person voice throughout, as well as the evaluation of team members by each other. Furthermore, the focus of the course delivery was interactive learning. This included lectures, case presentations, and group discussions. Most sessions began with a formal lecture to present the main ideas and concepts. After the break, there were group exercises or class discussions. It
was critical to manifest a respectful attitude toward the subject and to value the diversity of opinions expressed by the students. All students were encouraged to freely ask questions and express their opinions. Guest speakers from relevant organizations enriched the content of lectures.

Network Analysis Findings and Discussion

This section of the paper presents findings of the case study by showing how degree and closeness centrality measures—as well as clique analysis measures coupled with visualized maps—can be used to evaluate student classroom interaction. One simply can see the number of ties each student has at the beginning of the class and compare that number to the results at the end of the class. If there is no substantial increase in the number of ties (degree centrality), no change in the structure of ties that take a fewer number of references to get to somebody in the network (closeness centrality), or still no increase in the number of interactions among student subgroups that consist of two or three members with mutual ties (cliques), then one can judge that there has been no increase in student social networking throughout the term.

Now we explain the results of our analysis. For confidentiality purposes, the names of the students have been converted to numbers. Figure 2 displays the friendship network of the students in the class at the beginning of the term—the square nodes with numbers beside them represent students, and directed lines between two nodes depict the relationship (friendship in Figure 2) between those nodes, and the direction of the relationship. For example, 13→15 means that Student 13 considers Student 15 a friend. However, the reverse is not true; that is, Student 15 does not see Student 13 as a friend. That is why this friendship tie is unidirectional. It also is called a directed tie. As opposed to mutual, bidirectional ties, directed ties can be illustrated with a mere line (without arrows). Depending on the nature of the relationship being studied—in this case, friendship—the directionality of ties has different implications. In this case, both Student 15 and Student 13 receive credit for the relationship when calculating centrality measures. Essentially, Figure 2 means that some students have met one another and kept in touch before the class, because they were in the same MPA program and had taken other classes together.

Figure 3, on the other hand, maps the friendship network of the class at the end of the term. Visually, it is obvious the friendship network among class members developed considerably during the term due to the increased number of reported ties among students. In an individual instance, Student 7 on the top left of Figure 2 and Figure 3 had no degree power—meaning that he or she reportedly had no ties with others—at the beginning of the term (Figure 2) because he or she did not know anyone. However, at the end of the term, (Figure 3) Student 7 had become friends with eight students, which showed that he or she substantially expanded his or her social network.
In addition to the increased level of connectivity in the student friendship network of the class, one can observe cliques—or subgroups within a network that contain mutually inclusive members. The term **clique** is technical and is not meant to carry any positive or negative connotation. Clique analysis can provide useful information on intergroup interaction. It can be interesting to see how formal groups (determined by the instructor) overlap with informal groups (based on student social networking), or how some members of these subgroups play the role of broker or mediator in the network. For example, on the left side of Figure 2, Student 14, Student 17, and Student 27 form a friendship clique that is connected to the network via Student 27. These types of cliques cannot easily be observed in Figure 3, because each student is mapped nearly at the same spot in Figure 2 in order to more easily show the increased ties across Figures 2 and 3. However, Figure 4 is the same as Figure 3, except that actors in the network were placed on the map so that nodes with lengths equal to their ties were located next to each other. This was done by using the NetDraw component of the UCINET software program, and it basically means that clusters in the network were set apart so they could be read and understood. Figure 3 at first may look like a strongly centralized network—meaning that everyone has connections.
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Figure 3.
Class Friendship Network Map at the End of the Term

Figure 4.
Friendship Network Map at the End of the Term; Layout with Node Repulsion and Equal Edge Length Bias
with everyone else. However, as opposed to Figure 3, Figure 4 enables one to see the less centralized part of the network (top and left sides of the map), and to view overlapping cliques such as C1 = (17, 27, 14) and C2 = (17, 14, 25).

Table 2 presents normalized centrality measures for each student at the beginning and end of the term. Centrality measures indicate how central a student’s position is in the network (Durland & Fredericks, 2006). There are

Table 2. 
Normalized Centrality Measures for Class Friendship Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>22.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>21.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>21.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>17.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>17.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>18.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>64.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>54.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>58.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>63.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>54.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>43.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>55.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>63.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two types of centrality measures in Table 2. First, degree centrality estimates the actors’ centrality in the network based on their number of ties (Kapucu, 2006). Second, closeness centrality measures the centrality of network actors by determining how close each actor is to the other actors, based on the shortest possible path (Hanneman, 2001). For example, in Table 2, Student 5 has the highest normalized degree centrality of 41.667 at the beginning of the term, meaning that he or she has the most ties in the network. However, in the same table, Student 2 surpasses Student 5 in the closeness centrality measure—the number of shortest possible ties to reach other actors in the network—at the beginning of the network. By comparing both types of measures at the beginning and end of the term, one observes a substantial increase in network centrality; and in fact, Student 5 surpasses Student 2 at the end of the term, based on closeness centrality.

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for the friendship network at the beginning and end of the term. Arithmetic, means, variances, and ranges of both degree centrality and closeness centrality measures show a significant increase during the term, which indicates a considerable development in the friendship network of the overall class. The centralized network must not be confused with a centralized hierarchy. In the former, actors have an increased level of connectivity through relational ties with one another; in the latter, actors hierarchically are tied to the center via many different actors (bosses) as though they were forming a chain. When individual centrality measures are compared in Table 2, all but one of the students in the class expanded his or her friendship network, which also shows how the course contributed to expanded student interaction and friendship ties. These are key concepts for collaborative learning and to prepare

Table 3.
**Descriptive Statistics for Each Measure of the Class Friendship Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning of the Term</th>
<th>End of the Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Closeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>475.00</td>
<td>441.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>145.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>22.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students for their professional, real-life careers. (Student 18 reportedly has the same degree centrality score at both the beginning and end of the term, meaning that the number of friends has not changed.)

The second survey question asked students to list who they worked with in or out of the classroom, in order to document data on the work- and advice-related network. Figure 5 and Figure 6 display the work network of the class at the beginning and end of the term, respectively. As Figure 5 demonstrates, students reported having break-even work-advice relationships at the beginning of the term, possibly because they worked together in other classes or were colleagues from the same public agency. It also shows ties between group members, as assigned by the instructor on the first day of class (The survey was distributed at the end of the first class session.) The difference between Figure 4 and Figure 5 shows that the collaborative teaching tools implemented in the class had increased the connectivity and collaboration among students in terms of the class work-advice network. Work-advice networks include student interactions based on class work. The friendship network includes student interactions based on extracurricular relationships. For MPA students to be successful in their careers, they need to master skills that teach them to be effective team players as well as brokers and network builders. In addition to providing a visual representation of the relationships, Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for the class work network at the beginning and end of the term. Comparing the statistical variables demonstrates that network connectivity and centrality among students grew over time.

Figure 5.
Class Work Network Map at the Beginning of the Term
When individual examples are analyzed in Table 4, Figure 5, and Figure 6, it shows how students interacted with each other for work-related purposes. For instance, Student 17 (on the far left) had prior work-related relationships with two students (see Figure 5), but interacted with four more students on work- and study-related activities during the class and expanded the related work network to six people by the end of the term (see Figure 6).

Table 4.
Normalized Centrality Measures for Class Work Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>43.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>38.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>47.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>43.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>45.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>45.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>41.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>42.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>42.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.
Class Work Network Map at the End of the Term

Figure 7.
Class Work Network Map at the End of the Term, Displayed with Equal Lengths of Ties
Similar to the friendship network, one can observe cliques in the work-advice network of the class. Figure 7 is the same as Figure 6 but shows ties of equal length by using UCINET software. In it, one can observe (a) cliques or subgroups of students who collaborated with each other, (b) subgroups that are connected to the whole network by ties with one or more members, and (c) ties with other subgroups created by engaging in intergroup collaboration.

Table 5.
Descriptive Statistics for Each Measure of Class Work Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning of the Term</th>
<th>End of the Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Closeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>35.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>889.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 and Table 7 demonstrate the number of cliques identified in each network and the members of each clique, respectively. The far right column of Table 7 shows formal groups assigned by the instructor.

In addition to formally assigned groups, one can see in Table 6 and Table 7 an increase in the number of cliques, which could represent either formal or informal groups that emerged over the course of the academic term. Each group of numbers in each row—except for those in the far right column of Table 7—represents a clique of students denoted by numbers. Groups of numbers in the far right column of the table represent students formally assigned into groups by the instructor. At the end of the term, some cliques of the work-advice network match with formally assigned groups while some do not. This shows developed collaboration across formal groups and indicates that new, informal work-advice groups also formed. It should be noted that in the friendship network, both the numbers and the sizes of cliques grew. On the other hand, for the work-advice network, although the total number of cliques declined, the number of larger cliques increased.
Table 6.  
*Number of Cliques Found in Four Networks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friendship Beginning</th>
<th>Friendship End</th>
<th>Work Beginning</th>
<th>Work End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cliques of 3 students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliques of 4 students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliques of 5 students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliques of 6 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 summarizes the main findings of the study. Network analysis appears to be a useful tool for understanding changes in student interactions as a key to building long-lasting relationships, engaging in collaboration, and increasing collaborative learning. Without interaction there cannot be any collaborative learning, because collaboration requires interaction.

*Figure 8.*  
Collaborative Learning Makes a Difference in Student Interactions
Table 7.
Cliques in Four Networks and in Groups Assigned by the Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Friendship Beginning Cliques</th>
<th>Friendship End Cliques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2, 9, 10, 16</td>
<td>12, 11, 24, 23, 8, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5, 8, 11, 12, 23</td>
<td>15, 2, 28, 5, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5, 8, 11, 18, 24</td>
<td>15, 28, 22, 5, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 5, 11, 24</td>
<td>15, 2, 28, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 5, 27, 28</td>
<td>28, 9, 8, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2, 15</td>
<td>2, 28, 9, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1, 2, 24</td>
<td>20, 16, 28, 9, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2, 15, 28</td>
<td>16, 28, 9, 8, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2, 9, 28</td>
<td>14, 17, 25, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8, 9, 20</td>
<td>11, 24, 19, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14, 17, 27</td>
<td>11, 2, 24, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5, 19, 24</td>
<td>18, 24, 23, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5, 19, 28</td>
<td>2, 24, 9, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19, 20, 28</td>
<td>24, 9, 8, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15, 20, 28</td>
<td>3, 15, 22, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9, 20, 28</td>
<td>12, 3, 22, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>18, 23, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>23, 8, 1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 15, 2, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 18, 23, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 16, 9, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 24, 19, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 2, 24, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 11, 24, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 24, 9, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>14, 5, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 15, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 2, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 10, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>16, 28, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>22, 25, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 7, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>20, 15, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As past research has suggested, friendship and work-advice relationships that are established in classes with collaborative learning techniques have important implications for student learning. They also prepare students for their careers by increasing networking skills and social capital. Conducting network analysis also provides effective techniques for evaluating student performance toward achieving a common goal (in this case, collaboration and collaborative learning) as well as for evaluating teaching methods beyond test scores and formal class evaluations.

Conclusion
This article focused on the use of network analysis as a method to analyze teaching practices that increase students’ social networks and interactions. The use of network analysis provides a means of measuring student learning capacity through collaboration. This includes collaboration with students, outside organizations, and the instructor. Various measures of centrality such as degree, closeness, and betweenness can be used to identify patterns of interaction among students. Collaborative learning tools utilized in the class are group projects (various team writing assignments), group discussions, interactive guest lectures, professionally guided simulations, organization visits, and Webcourses—online teaching and learning tools. These collaborative learning techniques were identified by the instructor, and through observation and network analysis, their effectiveness was tested and visually shared with students.

Findings of the study indicated that students considerably increased their friendship—and work-related ties through intragroup and intergroup networking—as a result of collaborative learning techniques introduced by the professor, who acted as a facilitator in an MPA class. Using SNA, these interactions were analyzed in terms of quality, intensity, and direction. As a result, these techniques can be suggested for facilitating collaborative learning. In group projects, students were given the opportunity to work in teams, which meant they worked together and learned from each other. Group discussions facilitated a learning environment where students could interact with each other and exchange information with students outside their project teams.

The course website on Webcourses, on the other hand, provided many technological communication tools for collaborative learning. Course mail, chat rooms, and group discussion rooms were some of the functions that engaged student interaction. Students used website tools to share their class projects. They provided website addresses that might be of interest to other students, and they announced project meetings and social events. The effectiveness of the various communication tools also were analyzed using SNA methods and tools.
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Appendix

Sample Network Analysis Survey

The purpose of the survey is to collect data on collaborative learning in the classroom environment. The analysis will identify the informal (friendship) network and work-related (formal) network in the classroom as a living organization, in the beginning of the term and toward the end of the term. It also will identify the most helpful activities for student interactions. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Naim Kapucu at nkapucu@mail.ucf.edu or at (407) 823-6096.

Your name: __________________

Please name the students that you know in the class (you can list as many as you wish):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please name the students that you work/consult with for study/assignments and related issues in the class (you can list as many as you wish):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Which aspect of the course activities helped you interact with and learn from the class members? (You can check more than one option.)

__ Team (term) project
__ Class discussions
__ Position papers
__ Response papers
__ Del.icio.us @UCF¹
__ Other (please specify): __________

Please return completed surveys to Dr. Kapucu. Thanks for your participation!

Footnote

¹ Del.icio.us@UCF (pronounced as “delicious”) is a Web service that enables individuals to create, store, and share links. It is similar to IE Favorites or Firefox Bookmarks but is online and shareable.
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**Abstract**
This article describes and analyzes a new approach to teaching collaborative leadership to masters of public administration students at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University. The 3-year-old course teaches students how to design a collaborative network with the necessary players at the table; structure governance for a collaborative group; negotiate ethically to best leverage resources; facilitate meetings of a network; manage conflict among network members; effectively engage the public, including designing and sequencing civic engagement to make effective use of public knowledge; design useful systems for evaluating the outcomes of collaboration; and operate within the legal constraints on collaborative public agency action. The theoretical and pedagogical underpinnings of the course are explained. Ideas and lessons for the field are offered.

Today’s leaders are working in a new landscape that requires them to be collaborative. By collaborative we mean the process of facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by single organizations. Collaborative means to co-labor, to achieve common goals, often working across boundaries and in multisector and multi-actor relationships. Collaboration typically is based on the value of reciprocity and can include the public (O’Leary, Gazley, McGuire, & Bingham, 2009). This article describes and
Teaching Collaborative Leadership: Ideas and Lessons for the Field

analyzes a new approach to teaching collaborative leadership to masters of public administration students at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University.

In this article we use the terms collaborative leadership and collaborative management. While we are in agreement with Pascale’s statement (1990) that managers do things right and leaders do the right thing, we find the dichotomy a false one. Rather, we believe that leadership is one of many assets that successful public managers must possess. Yukl (2005) supports this argument by noting that “most scholars seem to agree that success as a manager in modern organizations necessarily involves leading” (pp. 6–7). In fact, much of what is taught in the Maxwell School’s Executive Leadership course is inspired by the literature on collaborative management.

George Frederickson observed early on (1999, p. 702) that public administration was moving “toward theories of cooperation, networking, governance, and institution building and maintenance” in response to the “declining relationship between jurisdiction and public management” in a “fragmented and disarticulated state.” Frederickson emphasized institutionalism, public sector network theory, and governance theory as relevant to the future of public administration research. He defined institutionalism as pertaining to “social constructs of rules, roles, norms, and the expectations that constrain individual and group choice and behavior” (p. 703); public sector network theory as pertaining to “structures of interdependence” that have “formal and informal linkages that include exchange or reciprocal relations, common interests, and bonds of shared beliefs and professional perspectives” (pp. 704–705); and governance theory as occurring at institutional, organizational or managerial, and technical or work levels, including formal and informal rules, hierarchies, and procedures, and influenced by administrative law, principal-agent theory, transaction cost analysis, leadership theory, and others (pp. 705–706).

Bryson and Crosby (2008) theorize that collaboration across sectors emerges after the failure of a single sector to address a public policy problem; they define sectors as markets and business, nonprofit organizations, community and the public, the media, and government. Lester Salamon (2005, p. 16) recently observed:

Unlike both traditional public administration and the new public management, the new governance shifts the emphasis from management skills and the control of large bureaucratic organizations to enablement skills, the skills required to engage partners arrayed horizontally in networks, to bring multiple stakeholders together for a common end in a situation of interdependence.

McGuire (2009) observes:

A “profession” emerges as an occupational grouping matures and there is an identifiable body of technical knowledge—perhaps what
we need to do in public management is reconfigure the professional identity to match the new third-party governance world.

How does public administration as a field begin to reconfigure managers’ professional identity to match this changing landscape? In a recent article, Feldman and colleagues (Feldman, Khademian, Ingram, & Schneider, 2006, p. 93) provide a compelling vision of this new professional identity: “The public manager as inclusive manager facilitates the practice of democracy by creating opportunities for people with different ways of knowing public problems to work together in a collective space to solve problems.” Crosby and Bryson (2005) call this “leadership in a shared power world.” Public managers and administrators need to combine many different disciplines; they need a synthesis of what we are learning not only in public affairs but also in political science, social psychology, organizational behavior, and communications (Bingham & O’Leary, 2006). They need to combine management skills with network theory, negotiation theory, and institutional theory to inform practice. They need to practice public policy dispute resolution, stakeholder processes, and civic engagement. They need to operate within public law’s frameworks for collaboration. They need to understand collaborative governance at the local, regional, state, national, and transnational levels.

Agranoff (2008) observes that in collaborative public management, knowledge is the key. However, knowledge is not a disembodied, platonic idea; Agranoff describes it as a combination of experience, value, context, and insight, because it is knowledge as applied to make sense of new experiences and information. In the tradition of Dewey, Agranoff discusses the differences between tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge.

Traditional teaching methods include readings and lecture to convey explicit knowledge. More recently, pedagogy has embraced small-group work or collaborative learning to deepen the way in which students engage with substantive concepts. In contrast, noncredit short courses and training programs address practice and skill development. However, this approach fails on two fronts. First, it fundamentally misperceives substance and practice as separate. Second, it fails to capitalize on the opportunity to convey to students how both are manifestations of a single competency in collaborative public management. The Maxwell School of Syracuse University worked to provide future leaders with an environment and series of experiences combining both tacit and substantive knowledge to give leaders that competency. As Agranoff observes, “Knowledge is broader, deeper, and richer than data or information”; knowledge is how humans combine information with experience and insight to do work: it is “both a process and an outcome” (Agranoff, 2008).

Public managers need to learn to do, and do to learn how to inhabit this new role. For public managers to engage in artful practice of these various areas of competence, we must adapt our teaching methods. This article describes one approach to cultivating the artful and effective practice of collaborative leadership.
The Collaborative Public Manager: Leading When You Are Not in Charge

Increasingly, scholars have called for change in the nature of public management education to better reflect what our students will encounter as they enter the public service. Lester Salamon (2005, pp. 7–8) recently noted, “We need to move from training public servants or policy analysts toward training . . . professional citizens.” Traditionally, public servants and policy analysts are taught to function in an expertise-driven decisional process. We train public administrators to function within a hierarchical bureaucracy, which is essentially a deductive process. Managers start with a theory of the policy problem, collect information and evidence regarding different approaches, evaluate reliability, and make a considered judgment about how to advance the public good within the scope of their delegated authority. This is a paternalistic model in which those governed are asked to accept arguments from authority based on claims of superior technical expertise. The model depends upon a linear, top-down authority structure and the notion of a chain of command.

Networks differ fundamentally from a single agency in the essence of their organization (Powell, 1990). Instead of a single member of a chain of command making an executive decision, multiple managers and stakeholders negotiate the decision. Moreover, they are not simply negotiating the final outcome; they often are negotiating every intermediate issue, including but not limited to the process through which decisions are made; relevant information, data, and science; the nature and form of intermediate and final outcomes; decision rules; the role of the public, public knowledge, and values; and steps for implementation. Everything may be on the table; there is no assumption that traditionally authoritative expertise such as that of trained policy analysts will determine the outcomes. Network participants each may come from an independent chain of command, or they may come from an organization that has a nonhierarchical structure. Some of the network participants may not have the power to commit their organization to a binding outcome, but instead only the power to recommend its approval, perhaps even ratification, through a vote of the membership or a nonprofit’s board of directors. A network’s decision process also differs from the traditional conception of expert administration. The outcome is not rationally dictated through a deductive process; it may be knowledge or wisdom developed inductively by incorporating the different frames of reference, backgrounds, values, and experiences of the participants.

One might ask how this differs from a committee, team, or working group within a traditional bureaucracy: the difference goes to the heart of the work. Within a traditional bureaucracy, the team, committee, or group always reports to someone up the food chain who has the power to impose a decision in the event of an impasse. The question of what happens if the members of the network reach an impasse is itself subject to negotiation and agreement. More-
over, many networks start from the position of consensus as a decision norm; in other words, there is no majority vote—there must instead be unanimity. One participant can veto an agreement on any of the issues under negotiation. Public administrators need fully to understand the importance of this form of leadership and the absolute necessity of mastering the skill sets of collaboration, negotiation, conflict management, and facilitation to function in a network.

Connelly, Zhang, and Faerman (2008) explain how collaboration presents many new paradoxes for the public manager. They find that as managers work both within their own organizations and within networks, they are challenged in very different ways. Collaborative managers must work both with autonomy (within their own organizations) and interdependence (as members of a network). Collaborative managers and their networks have both common and diverse goals. Collaborative managers must work both with a fewer number (because organizations are blended into a network) and a greater variety of groups that are increasingly diverse. Collaborative managers need to be both participative and authoritative. Collaborative managers need to see the forest and the trees. Collaborative managers need to balance advocacy and inquiry.

To be an effective manager in a networked world, these challenges demand different skill sets. While this is a new type of leadership, it has its roots in the work of management guru Mary Parker Follett (1942), who wrote about “power with” rather than “power over.” There is not only differentiation of roles; managers need the skills to tolerate the paradoxes and the corresponding ambiguity. This practice requires artistry and tacit knowledge in the context of limited authority; managers need to inspire rather than impose. Connelly et al. (2008) also point out the basic paradox of collaboration—that both parties can “win” (citing Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1991). Together, the participants in the network can search for solutions that fundamentally transcend the position of any single participant. Connelly et al. discuss four factors: initial dispositions to collaborate, issues and incentives, number and variety of groups, and leadership. These factors map very closely to the issues that Huxham and Vangen (2005) discuss in their synthesis of many years of study of collaborative practice.

McGuire (2009) conducted an empirical study of county-level emergency management agencies. Emergency management is an interesting case because the professional institutional boundaries are being formed at a time when the work is dependent upon abilities of staff to collaborate. McGuire examined how exposure to different flavors of professional development training contributes to collaborative management practice. While education overall is a significant predictor, the results also suggest that mid-career professional development courses matter—the specialized training in two cases is a significant predictor of collaborative activity (even when it is not stressing collaborative practices, in and of itself). For the high-performing counties, in fact, this professional development is a more important predictor. McGuire discussed the causal mechanisms for this
effect and how it can be true when collaboration is not a focus in the training. He suggested that knowledge transfer among participants teaches that collaboration is the way to get things done. Thus, it is increasingly clear that to engage in networked governance, students must both do to learn and learn to do collaborative public management.

**Artful And Effective Practice: Teaching Collaborative Capabilities**

Bingham, Sandfort, and O’Leary (2008) write that new network realities necessitate a different type of practice and new capacities. They use the word *capability* advisedly, in the sense of being able to do, not simply being passively competent. According to these scholars, the collaborative public manager needs capabilities in

- Designing a network with the necessary players at the table
- Structuring governance for the collaborative group
- Negotiating ethically to best leverage agency resources
- Facilitating meetings of the network
- Managing conflict among network members
- Effectively engaging the public, including designing and sequencing civic engagement to make effective use of public knowledge
- Designing useful systems for evaluating the outcomes of collaboration
- Operating within the legal constraints on collaborative public agency action

Bingham et al. (2008) point out that there is already a substantial body of research and curricula upon which the field of public administration can draw to develop these collaborative capabilities in public managers; it exists in the fields of negotiation, conflict resolution, conflict management, and participatory democracy.

McGuire’s study (2009) suggests that the field of public administration needs to redesign both degree programs and mid-career professional development to more closely map what people are grappling with in the field. In line with these arguments, in a 3-year experiment, the Maxwell School of Syracuse University attempted to meet the challenge of training these new leaders by teaching integrative and collaborative capabilities. We asked ourselves whether it was possible to create a course that would be a hands-on experience where over 100 students learned the skills of negotiation and collaborative problem solving. (Student information is shown in the Appendix). We wondered whether it was possible to torque the way we teach leadership to focus less on abstract theories and presentations by successful leaders, and more on the concrete collaborative skills that real-world leaders say are so important. We decided to find out. Figure 1 conveys the sequence of events in the course.
Students were asked to read excerpts from classic works on leadership. We wanted students to think about how the world has traditionally defined and operationalized good leadership and to make judgments for themselves as to whether these perspectives fit today’s collaborative world. Box 1 presents these readings, which range from Paul Hershey and Kenneth Blanchard to Warren Bennis and from John Gardner to Steven Sample.

In addition, students were asked to read more contemporary works on networks, collaborative public management, interest-based negotiation, and collaborative problem solving. Box 2 presents these readings. Initial classroom lectures and discussions focused on the changing landscape of governance, the importance of networks and collaborative problem solving, as well as the challenges of integrative and collaborative leadership.

### Nontraditional Classroom Requirements: Win All You Can Win

We wanted students to experience the opposite of creative problem solving: winner-takes-all competition. The first year we did this by playing a 1-hour game called “Win All You Can Win.” This is a four-person card game that rewards students for thinking in the short term about themselves to the exclusion of the group and long-term relationships. Those who cheat and act selfishly have a better chance of winning than those who think and act in a collaborative fashion. We used real money to foster real competition. Winners won big; losers lost...
The game was followed by a debriefing discussion on “What does winning mean?” including analyzing individual versus individual competition; group versus group competition; short-term versus long-term relationships; collaboration versus competition; creating value versus claiming value; and whether behaving in this fashion helped or hindered the ability to solve society’s most pressing public policy problems, as well as whether it helped or hindered students’ ability to be integrative and collaborative leaders.

**Interest-Based Problem Solving Training**

After debriefing the “Win All You Can Win” exercise, we introduced the

---

**Box 1.**

**Traditional and Classic Readings About Leadership Assigned**

- “Leaders and Followers Are the People in This Relationship,” by Joseph Rost (1991).
students to a collaborative problem-solving approach based on principled or interest-based negotiation as created by Fisher, Ury, and Patton and presented in their book, *Getting to Yes*. This part of the course was team taught by a Maxwell Professor of Practice with 30 years experience as a professional negotiator, mediator, and facilitator; and a tenured long-term university senior scholar. It spanned two 3-hour sessions.

Interest-based negotiation allows for using collaborative problem solving and creativity to uncover ways to meet many of the collective needs of the negotiation parties. It is a negotiation strategy that focuses on satisfying as many interests or needs as possible for all parties, as opposed to positions. It is a problem-solving process used to reach an integrative solution rather than distributing rewards in a win-lose manner. It is not a process of compromise. The basic tenet of interest-based bargaining is issue resolution through interest satisfaction.

We taught our students that to prepare for interest-based negotiation, one should first identify the subject and scope of the negotiation. Second, one should identify one’s best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA), asking what can your organization do or accomplish by acting alone? The BATNA question is fundamental because it determines whether there is a need to participate in the negotiation. Next, we taught our students to identify the necessary and appropriate network participants; identify the BATNAs of each of the other network participants; identify their own interests and identify or speculate on the interests of the other network participants; determine whether those who participate in network meetings have the authority to bargain, and if not, who in their organization does have authority; and finally, address ground rules or protocols for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2. Readings on Networks, Collaborative Public Management, Interest-Based Negotiation, and Collaborative Problems Solving Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Interest-Based Negotiation,” Christina Merchant (course handout, 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
negotiation (see O’Leary & Bingham, 2007.)

We taught the basic steps to doing interest-based collaborative problem solving as follows:

1. Clarify the issue, and frame it as a joint task to meet both parties’ needs.
2. Educate each other about your interests (disclose and listen); keep asking why?
3. Generate multiple options.
4. Evaluate the options (how well do they meet needs?).
5. Select or modify options based on which ones meet needs most.
6. Reach consensus solution; develop a plan to implement the agreement, including monitoring.

We also taught the students a number of critical but relatively easy-to-acquire communication skills that improve one’s ability to achieve mutually advantageous outcomes when working collaboratively. These include asking problem-solving questions to identify interests, reflective or active listening to reduce tension and manage the conflict, and responding to hard bargaining tactics through a variety of means.

We taught the students that for negotiation and collaborative problem solving in the context of a network, a good, long-term bargaining relationship is not the same as approval of the other side, shared values, avoiding disagreement, or perfect trust (Fisher & Brown, 1989). Instead, it is establishing an attitude that is unconditionally constructive by using rationality in response to emotion, understanding others when they misunderstand you, consulting others even if they appear not to listen, being reliable in not trying to deceive, being noncoercive and not yielding to coercion, and accepting others and their concerns as worthy of consideration.

Simulations

We then presented the students with opportunities to apply what they learned in hands-on collaborative simulations. First, the students participated in a two-person job negotiation simulation that concerned two characters from an upcoming larger simulation. This simulation lasted 1 hour. Second, the students participated in a four-person simulation lasting 3 hours that brought together three cities and a nongovernmental organization (NGO) interested in protecting groundwater. Finally, the students participated in a 10-person public policy simulation concerning water quality and quantity, which was streamlined each year. Negotiations occurred over a 16-hour period divided into 2 consecutive days.

Finding simulations that would allow students to take leadership roles and practice integrative and collaborative skills was a formidable challenge. The case we used, which we called “The Pablo-Burford Sustainable Water Quality Network,” started as a highly technical Sustainability Challenge Foundation simula-
tion, originally written by biophysical scientists. We adapted the simulation for MPA students, which took 6 months. The streamlined instructions were 16 legal-sized pages long, plus 4 pages of confidential instructions for each of 10 leader/negotiators. The simulation brought together 10 leaders from two countries, Burford and Pablo, as well as several international leaders: The head of the Burford Environmental Department, a federal agency; the director of the North Rhine Sustainable Agriculture Organization, an organization headquartered in Burford composed of organic farmers; the head of the Burford Farm Association; a governor; the head of the Pablo Agriculture Department, another federal agency; the director of CONSUME, a worldwide advocacy group working to end hunger; the head of the National Farmers Union of the country of Pablo; the director of the Trade Alliance of Pablo, an industry group interested in expanding trade; the head of the international organization The Earth Coalition; and the director of the international consortium of biotechnology companies called BIOtechlink.

The leaders had six decisions to make: First, they had to establish network governance and negotiation rules. Second, they had to choose water quality management schemes. Third, they were tasked with choosing options for water use reduction. Fourth, they grappled with options for chemical management. Fifth, they had to agree on how to enforce network agreements. Sixth, they had to agree on who paid for what. The leaders also had to figure out when to collaborate and with whom; facilitate meetings of the group; manage conflict in the network; engage the public; follow laws that both helped and hindered their efforts; and evaluate their integrative and collaborative strategies.

Time Out for Improv and Creative Brainstorming

In an effort to foster an environment of creativity needed to solve cross-boundary challenges, we hired Tim Mahar, a graduate of The Second City Improv, to work with the students halfway through their negotiations. The Second City is a famous comedy theater that originated in Chicago. Its alumni include John Belushi, Mike Myers, Gilda Radner, John Candy, Tina Fey, Steve Carell, and Stephen Colbert. Our Second City Improv expert taught students how to connect with others, solve unexpected problems in the moment, and create better ways of working. In addition, he taught our students how to create something out of nothing on the fly, especially when “the best-laid plans” go awry.

The following are some of his ideas to promote creative problem solving as collaborative leaders:

- Don’t judge.
- Stay open.
- Don’t say no.
- Don’t stop the action.
- Start anywhere.
Pay attention.
Face the facts.
Stay on course.
Wake up to the gifts (of others at the table).
Make mistakes, please.

On the same day, we introduced the students to “Thinkpak,” a creative brainstorming card deck created by Michael Michalko (available on Amazon.com). Thinkpak is a brainstorming tool that forces users out of their habitual ways of thinking. It is based on the idea that everything new is just an addition or modification of something that already exists. It requires users to take an idea and:

- substitute something.
- combine it with something else.
- adapt something to it.
- modify or magnify it.
- put it to some other use.
- eliminate something.
- reverse or rearrange it.

Our rationale was that in an integrative and collaborative world, these thought processes might catalyze creative thinking concerning new challenges.

Back to Collaborative Problem-Solving Negotiations
Throughout the negotiations, participants used their newly acquired improv and creative brainstorming skills. Each group had access to a Thinkpak, but it was left to the group whether and when to use it. They were encouraged to think creatively about the possible solutions to the pressing public policy problems they were grappling with.

One crucial part of the large simulation was the use of coaches. The first year, we used four PhD student coaches and two professional facilitator coaches who observed, and gave feedback, to 10 negotiating groups. The unevenness and lack of maturity across PhD student coaches, however, convinced us to drop that strategy the second and third year and ratchet up the coaching expertise. Instead, we hired five seasoned negotiators with an average of 29 years experience in public policy negotiation. Two PhD students were used as informal tutors when students did not understand their roles. Coaches had the discretion to “stop action” within a simulation in order to seize upon “teaching moments.” Typically, these time-outs were called when a group appeared to be stuck in positional bargaining and conflict.

After the 2-day negotiation, groups presented their creative solutions to
Getting beyond people’s positions to find the common ground.

The importance of negotiation and collaboration. In order to get anything accomplished, it’s absolutely essential to be open-minded, and willing to collaborate for the overall greater good of everyone involved.

Working with individuals who have opposing roles in interest-based negotiations requires patience, creative thinking, and collaborative efforts.

I learned that everyone can be a leader; it’s empowering to view leadership as a skill set and commitment rather than a born talent.

How focusing on interests, rather than positions, makes [collaborative] negotiations easier.

Leaders must have negotiating and people skills.

The importance of negotiation and collaboration. This is a skill I need to improve and the leadership course this year offered me tools to do this.

IBPS [Interest-Based Problem Solving] is an amazing process for professional, academic, and interpersonal settings.

Negotiation based on interests not position and the difference between talking leadership and doing leadership.

Negotiating on basis of interests and not positions results in agreements that shift relative power dynamics.

That active listening is a critical skill. Shut up and listen…you will learn a great deal.

That the best leaders focus on relationships. Active listening and asking why to learn interests builds trust and understanding which in turn encourages mutual respect.

Positions are not interests and often people are not even aware of what their interests are. It takes careful listening, time and trust to uncover interests.
The importance of negotiation when you can’t or don’t want to give orders.

Those negotiations play such a big role of a leader’s responsibilities. Hearing the professors and lecturers say this several times drove the point home.

Leaders look to the future for opportunities, develop the capacity of their organizations, foster collaborative efforts between organizations and people, and continue to learn and evolve as professionals. Leadership can take many forms, from facilitating a small meeting to developing a vision for a large multinational, but in all cases paying attention to people’s needs, wants, desires, fears, and aspirations is important. Good leaders take risks and learn from mistakes, are straightforward communicators, and know how to delegate.

Interest based problem solving. Whereas some of the leadership literature and lectures seemed abstract to me, I really liked the practical element to this negotiation process and intend to use it in many capacities.

A [collaborative] leader needs to be able to bring diverse groups of people together and work with them to solve a common problem.

Leadership is generally assumed to take one form, the boss, the leader, the decision maker . . . when there are really many forms of leadership appropriate to different situations, styles, and groups.

Box 3 reflects some of the most common statements about collaborative leadership made by students in their written work in response to the question: What is the number one thing you learned about leadership in this course? (See Appendix for student demographics.)

Box 4 contains a letter from a student in the class 3 months after the
course ended. During the course, this student, who came to the Maxwell School after 12 years on Wall Street, expressed distain for the improv and creative problem-solving exercises. He continually challenged the professor to explain why learning negotiation and interest-based problem solving was important. At one point in time, he lamented that the 3-credit course could not have been another budgeting and finance course. Just 3 months in the public sector catalyzed a 180-degree turn.

Letter from Student 3 Months After End of Course

September 15, 2008

Professor:

Greetings from our nation’s Capitol!

I wanted to let you know about my current job and what I do on a daily basis. During Executive Leadership (EL) I sensed frustration among my classmates and they were always asking “why are we doing this?” I think I mentioned this to you during the course as well. I am a big believer in “show me, don’t tell me” so hopefully my example will provide this “show.”

I am at the Conference of State Bank Supervisors in Mortgage Policy. . . . We have the daunting but important task of licensing mortgage loan originators as part of the recent Federal Housing legislation that you probably know because it allows FHA to now guarantee up to $300 billion in additional loans.

Working with 50+ state agencies/regulators to come to ONE nationwide, voluntary policy on how to license loan originators and all that goes with it is, well, ensuring I have no social life for the next year! To be frank, I use the skills taught in EL on a DAILY BASIS and my job would be impossible to perform without such skills. Every working group I run, every meeting I attend, every policy discussion I participate in involves skills you and the crew taught us during EL. 100% of my job is consensus building, negotiation, collaboration, etc. The best part is—IT WORKS!

When you have grumblers point them my way. Tell them I am doing something that has massive implications for regulation and the economy (hmmm . . . maybe this is important??) and I would fall flat on my face if I would not have had the EL experience over the summer. . . .
Lessons for the Field

This pedagogical experiment sought to teach MPA students collaborative capabilities needed by today’s public leaders. There are several lessons for the field that emanate from this experiment. We analyze the lessons for the field by returning to the lens provided by Bingham et al. (2008).

Designing the Network: Students Need to Learn When to Collaborate and With Whom

In the Maxwell School experiment, the students were “dropped” into a water quality network and were told to swim (pun intended). They struggled to figure out how to work in a collaborative fashion. The myriad possible directions for the network left dozens of options concerning how to get the job done, when, with whom, and how to motivate network actors to collaborate.

Managers first need to recognize whether they need to collaborate with partners (other agencies, nonprofit organizations, the private sector, other elements of the public or civil society) to accomplish a policy goal or objective. Next, they need to know when to collaborate (is the problem sufficiently identified and developed or ripe for collaboration?). Finally, collaboration starts with the right players. For collaboration to be effective, public managers may need the skills to analyze relevant stakeholders and convene a representative group.

The literature on convening stakeholder groups from the discipline of environmental and public policy conflict resolution (e.g., Moore, 2003; Susskind, McKearnan, & Thomas-Larmer, 1999) is instructive for the issue of network design. For example, it can help managers identify which players have the ability to veto a deal or prevent its implementation. Managers need to learn to inhabit the role of convener. They need to see their roles as related to broad framing of public problems to inspire participation.

There are substantive areas of knowledge that can help managers understand how one might motivate the necessary players to collaborate. We teach managers about organizational theory, diffusion of innovation, institutional theory, contingency theory, and performance measurement. We teach them how to use the lessons of organizational behavior to motivate people; to understand how groups develop, function, and make decisions; and to learn how people perceive things and absorb information differently. We teach them about personality and communication styles. Ingraham and Getha-Taylor (2008) discuss the current disconnect between institutional design in the redesigned federal human resources system and the espoused goals of the public sector workforce; for example, they point to more working across boundaries and problem solving. Managers are motivated to collaborate because people want rewarding work and to feel like they are making a difference working on significant problems. Design of the network should identify and take advantage of these potential incentives, and it should structure rewards for collaborative behavior not only at the individual level but also at the program level if individual rewards are not feasible.
Students Need to Learn How to Structure Governance for the Collaborative Network

In the Maxwell School experiment, one of the first tasks assigned to students in their simulation groups was deciding how to structure governance for the network. This entailed negotiating with nine other leaders of public, private, and nonprofit organizations. They had to reach an understanding of how they would govern themselves to accomplish their task. This included skills like identifying goals, framing the mission, and setting an agenda of work. It included identifying ground rules, agreeing upon conflict management processes, and selecting decision norms (e.g., majority vote or consensus). Members had to address how they would communicate their ongoing work to their respective organizations, agencies, constituencies, and the media. Governance sometimes also included decisions about transparency or communication with the public, civic engagement and the public voice, and accountability to each other and to the public. Research on multiparty negotiation suggests that reaching agreement on these preliminary issues can help build trust for the balance of the negotiation (Moore, 2003). Research on facilitated collaborative management of watersheds suggests that the work of reaching agreement on these issues can help build social capital among the stakeholders that carries over to other collaborative work over time (Leach & Sabatier, 2003).

Students Need to Learn How to Negotiate in a Network

In the Maxwell School collaborative simulations, no one person was in charge. Instead of giving orders, members of the network had to persuade and negotiate. Having professional negotiators teach the students these skills before they participated in the simulation was important.

Every leading scholar writing on collaborative public management emphasizes that negotiation skills are essential to effective participation. It is the fundamental skill set for collaborative problem solving. It helps managers recognize and use different types of knowledge and find ways of processing and reconciling differences. They need to learn negotiation analysis, which entails recognizing their best alternative to a negotiated agreement, their own interests, and reservation prices or the outer bound of the bargaining set. The relevant skills entail interest-based, principled, or integrative bargaining (Fisher et al., 1991; Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Schneider & Honeyman, 2006). These forms of bargaining help managers learn how to identify interests or basic needs such as security, economic well-being, belonging, recognition, and autonomy; determine which ones are shared, reconcilable, and conflicting; and craft agreements to maximize joint gains to the greatest possible extent. Negotiators must also learn the difference between interest-based and competitive bargaining, between creating value and claiming it in a negotiation (Lax & Sebenius, 1986), and how to recognize bad-faith or hard bargaining tactics.

This family of skills also includes active listening and communication. Active listening includes learning to paraphrase, ask open-ended questions (who, what,
where, why, how, why not?), and make statements in the first person (I or we statements) rather than second person (you statements are often heard as accusations). Mastery of negotiation skills gives managers the ability to suspend judgment and consider alternatives, which is an essential quality of creativity. Creativity helps managers to recognize cultural differences and symbols; this in turn enables them to cross boundaries and surmount barriers to agreement. Through extensive use of simulations involving multiparty negotiation, students and managers can become comfortable with the notion of negotiating as a stakeholder in a group. By learning these skills, they will be more effective at leveraging agency resources to accomplish shared goals as well as at knowing when the agency can function most effectively without collaboration.

Students Need to Learn How to Facilitate Meetings of the Group

Students in the Maxwell Executive Leadership class had to learn how to facilitate meetings of the group. This proved to be one of the more compelling teaching challenges because skill in facilitation was unequal across students. By the third year of teaching this course, we learned to appoint students with previous training in facilitation as the initial facilitators in order to jump-start productive negotiations.

In the real world, unless the group hires an outside facilitator, members will need to have someone run the meetings. There is an art and science to good facilitation skills—that is, skills that allow each participant in a meeting to contribute their knowledge constructively and feel that they have been heard (Schwarz, 1994, pp. 19–41). These skills include active listening (paraphrasing, mirroring, problem-solving questions), knowing when to suggest that the group break into small-group meetings or committees, and knowing when stakeholders need to caucus or meet privately with one or more other participants to address some issue. Facilitators can help group members engage in brainstorming to generate ideas for solving a shared problem. There are a variety of techniques for brainstorming, visioning, and storyboarding, which are all procedures for encouraging group members to “think outside the box.” The facilitator acts as a recorder, keeps stakeholders from criticizing any idea prematurely, helps the group members set priorities for the ideas they want to discuss, and helps them to combine these ideas in ways that yield a workable agreement. Group members develop social capital and learn how to resolve conflict. Role-plays and interactive simulations can permit students and managers to become comfortable in the facilitator role. Empirical research on facilitation in networks can deepen students’ understanding of this dynamic (Leach & Sabatier, 2003).

Students Need to Learn How to Manage Conflict in a Network

Conflict occurred throughout the simulations. This was deliberately built into the simulation and was inevitable given the diverse interests of the parties at the table. Students learned how to manage conflict before and during negotia-
tions. Often times, however, the intervention of a coach was needed to demonstrate possible positive ways to channel conflict.

Milward and Provan (2006) find that one of the most important tasks for network managers is to try to minimize the occurrence of conflict and try to resolve it successfully if and when it does occur. Networks, by their very nature, are composed of multiple members with different organization-level goals, methods of operation and service, and cultures. All of these characteristics make managing conflicts in networks extraordinarily challenging.

Many guiding principles from the conflict resolution literature can assist in managing conflicts in networks. These include reframing (redefining) conflicts as mutual problems to be solved together (Moore, 2003); educating each other to better understand the problem; developing a conflict management plan that addresses procedures, substance, and relationships; involving members of the network in designing the process and developing a solution; striving for balanced representation; insisting that network members participate directly, fully, and in good faith; maintaining transparency; attending to timeliness; and ensuring implementability of agreements.

Students Need to Learn How to Effectively Engage the Public

The Maxwell experiment was structured to include members of the public in negotiations. While this was a scaled-down version of what collaborative leaders must do in the real world, it compelled the students to think about how they might engage the public in a meaningful way.

When a collaborative network does the public’s work, appropriate civic engagement is important both to address potential conflicts and to foster participation in democracy. By allowing managers to work in partnership with the public, within the scope of their delegated authority and the constraints of representative democracy, new forms of civic engagement can provide a mechanism through which to make the decision process and content transparent, and they can enhance managers’ accountability by providing them with an independent source of information on public preferences and values.

A wide variety of tools and approaches are inherent in collaborative governance, “a term used to describe the integration of reasoned discussions by the citizens and other residents into the decision making of public representatives, especially when these approaches are embedded in the workings of local governance over time” (http://www.ca-ilg.org, an excellent resource for information on local government uses). Collaborative governance includes deliberative democracy, a form of participatory democracy in which citizens engage in civil, small-group discussions, exchanging viewpoints and sharing their informed judgment and values with public managers and elected officials to influence decision making. In this regard, the new forms of collaborative governance include deliberative polling, choicework dialogues, 21st-Century Town Meetings, study circles,
public solutions dialogues, citizen juries, national issues forums, and a variety of other models (Bingham, Nabatchi, & O’Leary, 2005).

Managers need to know how to design a sequence of processes for meaningful civic engagement by a network. For example, in determining how to allocate limited vaccine supplies during a possible future flu pandemic, the Centers for Disease Control and a number of network partners have designed a series of dialogues to engage the public in setting priorities and weighing important values (http://www.everyday-democracy.org). Collaborative public managers need to develop both the substantive, explicit knowledge of these new forms and the facility to work within them and use them for networks to become both transparent and accountable to the public.

Students Need to Learn How to Evaluate Collaborative Strategies

At the end of the Maxwell course, students were asked to think critically about what they did and to evaluate their collaborative strategies through the lens of accountability to the public. This component is necessary to address the criticism that collaborative networks are not sufficiently accountable to the public. Evaluation should be a piece of the network’s initial design and construction. Evaluation can help the network learn continuously. Public administrators should be introduced to principles from public program evaluation as they apply to the collaborative context.

A substantial literature exists on evaluating collaboration in environmental conflict resolution and policy consensus processes, and it bears directly on col-

Box 5.

Examples of Evaluation Indicators (O’Leary & Bingham, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upstream</th>
<th>incorporating public values, improving decision quality, resolving conflict, building trust, educating the public, socioeconomic representativeness, information change, effectiveness, efficiency and equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midstream</td>
<td>positive net benefits, measurable objectives, cost-effective implementation, financial feasibility, fair distribution of costs among parties, flexibility, incentive compatibility, improved problem-solving capacity, enhanced social capital, clear documentation protocols, and reduction in conflict and hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream</td>
<td>participant procedural justice, comparative satisfaction of different categories of disputants, reducing or narrowing issues, referrals, and voluntary use rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
laborative public management and collaborative governance (Bingham, Fairman, Fiorino, & O’Leary, 2003; Bingham & O’Leary, 2006). Environmental conflict resolution entails the creation of a collaborative network of governmental stakeholders from federal, state, and local government; tribal sovereign governments; nongovernmental organizations; citizen groups; and the private sector. The upstream/midstream/downstream frame for the policy process has proved useful in that context (O’Leary & Bingham, 2003). Upstream includes the formation of policy, midstream its implementation, and downstream its enforcement. Box 5 shows the exemplary indicators for assessing success of upstream, midstream, and downstream.

Many of these criteria, developed to assess collaboration in one context, have a direct bearing on evaluating the success of collaboration in the new governance. Public managers need a framework for thinking about how to measure results in collaboration.

Students Need to Think About the Importance of Operating Within Legal Constraints When Acting in a Collaborative Fashion

Students in the Maxwell experiment were told that all actions of the network must be conducted lawfully and ethically. Public administrators have an obligation to know and comply with the Constitution and public law. Robert Agranoff (2007) finds that legal constraints have an impact on the work of collaborative public management networks; networks with express legislative authorization or charters are more likely to take action rather than simply to share information. Feiock (2008) illustrates how legal authority to collaborate facilitates local government collective action. Whether perceived legal constraints are real or merely feared, managers must address them for collaboration to reach its full potential in public management and governance. Existing legal infrastructure in state and federal administrative law provides that a public agency may use certain processes in governance across the policy continuum (legislative, quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and judicial; see Bingham et al., 2005). These statutes do not expressly refer to collaborative public management networks (Bingham, 2008). They have been used, however, to authorize collaboration in the fields of environmental and public policy conflict resolution. Understanding the scope of existing legal infrastructure as it provides authority and incentives, or presents constraints, obstacles, and barriers, is an important form of explicit knowledge that can shape practice.

Conclusion: Teaching Collaborative Leadership

Conditions within the field require those of us involved in training the next and current generations of public managers to deeply consider what we teach, why we teach, and how we bring these new topics into the classroom. This is a tall charge. Most of us involved in teaching were, ourselves, trained during an era that emphasized the control and mastery of facts rather than application.
We were socialized into academic disciplines that focused on the development and refinement of abstract knowledge rather than that gleaned through practice experience. In short, many of us feel more comfortable teaching topics that draw upon explicit knowledge—concrete information, facts, predictable relationships—rather than situations requiring the development and refinement of tacit knowledge. Some professional education creates a dichotomy between these two types of learning; law schools, for example, have doctrinal classes where students master explicit knowledge and clinics where they develop tacit knowledge through practice. Yet, the potential in public affairs is to bridge these two traditions, recognizing that the new public management practice requires professionals who are skilled as analytic and social actors as two aspects of a single competence. As McGuire (2009) points out, a professional emerges through the training of people in particular knowledge and skills. In public management, we must align our pedagogy with the realities that public management occurs in networks of many different actors.

In this article, we have presented an experiment in teaching a new body of skills that is necessary if people are to be equipped to function effectively as collaborative leaders. Rather than simply supplement with continuing education training, we have tried to adapt the public administration curriculum needs to the new realities of administrative practice in a world of collaborative networked governance. As a field, we need to reconfigure managers’ professional identity to one that includes being collaborative leaders. We need to cultivate capacities including convening a network with the right members, structuring governance processes, engaging in collaborative practice using the skills of negotiation, facilitation, and conflict management, designing processes for public engagement, evaluating progress toward outcomes, and ensuring that the network operates in a transparent and accountable fashion within public law. We can cultivate these abilities only through active and experiential learning. These capacities are the enactment of both explicit and tacit knowledge in context. In other words, public managers must learn to do collaborative practice, and only through doing can they learn to be effective in this new landscape.
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Appendix
Student Demographics

Table 1 shows demographics of graduate students who enrolled in the Executive Leadership course at Syracuse University in June 2008. Ages ranged from 22 to 53 years. Of these students, 46% were male and 54% were female.

Table 1.
Student demographics (N = 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of work experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. *Continued*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract
With the increasingly changing demographics of the U.S. population, increased opportunities for an effective public sector arise. The opportunities can be found in new and innovative approaches to the government-citizen relationships, which take into account the cultural diversity of their population. Cultural competency initiatives within the public sector allow for increased effectiveness of the public sector and the public it serves. The following article explores where these opportunities for cultural competency initiatives can be placed within the public affairs curriculum. The article provides a framework for a cultural competency curriculum in public affairs based on four conceptual approaches: knowledge-based, attitude-based, skills-based, and community-based. Cultural competency discourse in academia sets the necessary foundation for future public administrators working in increasingly diverse populations.

Contemporary public administration research is increasingly emphasizing the need for the public sector to explore cultural competency initiatives underscored by the continually changing demographics of the United States. White and Rice suggest that the changing demographics of the country will require public sector organizations “to develop more inclusive work cultures that have a better understanding of the many ways people are different from one another and/or different from the organizations” (White & Rice, 2005, p. 3). Bailey (2005) further suggests that demographic changes underscore the demand for more culturally competent public servants. Driven by changing demographics or an aim to have a socially equitable organization, cultural competency has surfaced as an integral part of service delivery and organizational change. Therefore, it is equally important to ensure that the public affairs and administration programs and their curricula reflect cultural competency discourse. Many public service courses hold numerous opportunities for such an inclusion, but various challenges also present themselves.
Broadly defined, cultural competency reflects specific actions or policies within an organization that enable it to more effectively serve its culturally diverse populations. The increased diversity of a population leads to an increase in the number of differences. Cultural differences can play a critical role in public service delivery as well as continued or increased citizen trust and participation in government. Cultural differences among local communities have led some local governments to adapt with efforts for increasing their cultural competency (Benavides & Hernandez, 2007). However, the health sector was first to adapt to cultural differences and changing demographics. The 1980s witnessed the emergence of a collective effort by health practitioners and scholars to promote cultural competency in health and social services (Satterwhite & Teng, 2007).

Cultural competency has numerous definitions and interpretations, each of them applicable to the various organizations of service delivery. However, each definition is underscored by a common focus on organizational change to better serve its customers. For example, Fernandopulle (2007) refers to cultural competency as the “ability of organizations and individuals to work effectively in cross-cultural or multicultural interactions” (p. 16). Moreover, competency can represent a spectrum of developmental stages (Fernandopulle, 2007). Lonner (2007) outlines cultural competency as a continuum “with no absolute fixed endpoints; that is, there is neither an exact bottom for total cultural incompetence nor an exact top measure” (p. 6). To provide a consistent understanding and resource for cultural competency in the health sector, a federally funded institution was founded: National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC). The NCCC defines cultural competency as “having the knowledge, skills, and values to work effectively with diverse populations and to adapt institutional policies and professional practices to meet the unique needs of client populations.” (Satterwhite & Teng, 2007, p. 2)

The health sector saw cultural competency as a means to provide quality health care through the elimination of existing disparities of health service among race and ethnic groups. Cultural competency has remained a critical component of quality health care delivery. These same strides are not as evident in the public administration as a whole. Rice (2007) outlines four important reasons for embracing cultural competency in public administration: first, cultural competency recognizes the cultural context in which public encounters occur; second, cultural competency presents an opportunity to address the often inaccurate public service and programs provided to minority populations; third, cultural competency increases the relevance of a public agency’s administration, services, and programs to groups that can best utilize them; and fourth, service delivery officials are better prepared to do their jobs (p. 44).

The significant increase in research and discussion around cultural competency in the public administration raises some questions: What role do academic programs have in promoting and fostering a cultural competency dialogue?
Where are the opportunities and challenges for the inclusion of cultural competency into public administration curriculum? Cultural competency provides new and innovative opportunities for the government–citizen relationship. However, through a review of public administration concepts and literature, it should be noted that cultural competency will face ideological and practical challenges before its eventual inclusion in public affairs. Moreover, a review of contemporary cases and literature indicates that there are opportunities for such a discourse to be grounded in existing public administration core concepts.

**Cultural Competency Education**

The notion of incorporating cultural competency into the curriculum of higher education is not new. Higher education programs for the health profession have explored and practiced teaching cultural competency for the past three decades. More importantly, cultural competency training has been found to improve the knowledge as well as the attitudes and skills of health professionals (Beach et al., 2005). Moreover, Beach et al. (2005), in a review of studies dating back to 1980, found that cultural competency education also affects patient satisfaction. Some of these studies outlined objectives and frameworks for incorporating cultural competency into health care curricula.

Ronnau (1994), in a study of cultural competency in social work education, outlines three objectives for educators in moving students toward cultural competence: (a) raise the students’ awareness about the importance of being culturally competent; (b) create an atmosphere in which students and teachers can ask questions and share their knowledge about cultures; and (c) increase the amount of information the students have about cultures, including their own (p. 31). Ronnau (1994) also outlines the values of a “culturally competent professional” that students should become familiar with (p. 33). First, cultural competency requires a commitment—acknowledging a lack of knowledge about other cultures and a commitment to learn about them. Second, a culturally competent professional accepts that differences exist between people of different cultures. Third, a professional must be self-aware and recognize the influence of his or her culture. Next, the culturally competent professional will be aware of the different meanings that behaviors may have among different cultures. Fifth, the professional recognizes that knowledge acquisition is an ongoing process. Finally, Ronnau (1994) points out that “culturally competent professionals will be able to make use of the cultural knowledge they have gained and adapt their practice behaviors to meet the needs of the people they are serving” (p. 34).

Just as ideas for cultural competency education within the social work curriculum have been developed, scholars have also discussed and provided frameworks for cultural competency within medical and nursing education (Anderson, Calvillo, & Fongwa, 2007; Kripalani et al., 2006; Rapp, 2006). Kripalani et al. (2006) outline the emerging conceptual approaches for teaching cultural compe-
tency in medical education. First, knowledge-based programs highlight information such as definitions about culture and related concepts. Second, attitude-based curricula underscore the impact of sociocultural factors on patient's values through self-reflection. The third major conceptual approach toward cultural competency teaching is skill building. These skill-based educational programs focus on learning communication skills and applying them to negotiate the patients' participation in decisions (Kripalani et al., 2006).

Adding to the three conceptual approaches just described, Anderson et al. (2007) introduce a community-based approach in their exploration of cultural competency in nursing education. They emphasize the importance of community involvement in all aspects of cultural competency from education of, to the eventual practice by, health practitioners. They propose a four-way partnership with community members, health professionals, students, and faculty to work together in defining cultural competency relevant to their community. The authors conclude that when the community is involved, cultural competency education, practice, and research “become complementary and linked components” that enhance and reinforce each other and ultimately lead to improvements in service (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 57).

The application of cultural competency within curricula is not limited to health professions. Although the research of a cultural competency curriculum is limited in public affairs, a review of the associated discussions, such as diversity and social equity, highlights current opportunities and direction. Johnson and Rivera (2007) point out that “graduate public affairs students need greater exposure to diversity themes and issues” (p. 15). In its guidelines for public affairs schools seeking accreditation, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) advances the notion of diversity across curricula. As NASPAA notes, public affairs graduates are “required to function in increasingly diverse and heterogeneous organizational settings,” therefore, “course and curriculum materials as well as other programmatic activities should expose students to issues relating to race and gender and develop in them the capacity to work effectively with individuals representing diverse backgrounds” (NASPAA, 2009, p. 1).

Although most public affairs programs include some form of diversity within the curriculum, this is not a standard across all programs; in some cases, this component is limited to a minimal part of a course rather than an entire course or courses (Hewins-Maroney & Williams, 2007). Similarly, in some public administration courses, such as human resource management, concepts such as social equity are covered but opportunities to formally integrate an understanding of them into HR courses are underdeveloped (Gooden, 2007). Moreover, some public affairs programs can mask the lack of diversity within the curriculum with the argument that there is little diversity among students and faculty (Wyatt-Nichol & Antwi-Boasiako, 2008).
Efforts toward having a more socially equitable public administration begin with the education of future administrators (Brintnall, 2008; Wyatt-Nichol & Antwi-Boasiako, 2008). Ultimately, a program failing to address cultural competency and diversity issues within its curriculum limits the ability of its graduates to “deliver responsive public service” (Hewins-Maroney & Williams, 2007, p. 36).

Rapp (2006) suggests cultural competency education as a key mechanism for the delivery of culturally competent services. To this end, Rapp provides a framework for a cultural competency curriculum that outlines general components and content examples. This framework is adapted for public affairs curricula and expands to include the four conceptual approaches outlined earlier: knowledge-based, attitude-based, skills-based, and community-based. The framework (Table 1) is used as the basis and outline for the remainder of this paper, following a discussion of the current state of public affairs education and diversity.

Knowledge-Based Curriculum

Cultural competency can become an integral part of public affairs curricula through various content areas; however, none is more critical than having a normative understanding of the importance of a culturally competent public sector. Therefore, it is critical for public affairs programs to provide a knowledge-based component of cultural competency into their curriculum. Content examples for this component area include definitions and terms, local and national demographics, discussions of societal disparities and social equity, and an understanding of the legal and policy implications of cultural competency. Although recent research has focused on a culturally competent public sector, a normative understanding of definitions and terms for course discussions presents a theoretical challenge.

There is an inherit belief within public administration that public servants should be neutral in service delivery, thus limiting discretionary and political decisions by public servants. However, cultural competency runs directly counter to this ideal and expects recognition that a diverse public has diverse needs. Rice (2007) argues that “a focus on cultural differences and cultural variations does not fit the neutrality/equality principles—treat all clients the same with neutral feelings” (p. 44). Rice (2007) also states that “the focus on cultural competency in public administration/public service delivery is evolving very slowly and, therefore, the concept has yet to be clearly accepted and understood by the community of public administration/public service delivery scholars and administrators” (p. 44). For cultural competency efforts in public administration to succeed, the field of public affairs must first acknowledge that cultural differences are critical in public service delivery. However, this acknowledgment is dependent on a normative understanding of cultural competency.

Moreover, the concept of knowledge-based content of cultural competency can be found amid curriculum discussions of social equity. Cultural competency builds on the ideological legacy of social equity as well concepts that emerged from the
Minnowbrook Conference in 1968 and New Public Administration. New Public Administration (NPA) aimed to add social equity to administration’s objectives questioning whether the service delivered by public agencies enhanced social equity (Frederickson, 2007). In speaking of NPA, Frederickson (2007) points out that administrators are not neutral and “should be committed to both good management and social equity as values, things to be achieved, or rationales” (p. 297).

In addition to definitions and terms, knowledge-based curriculum can be positioned with an understanding of the policy and legal aspects of cultural competency. As Bailey (2005) points out, there has been continued congressional legislation requiring or promoting cultural competency among federal employees or recipients of federal funds. The origins of federal mandates for a culturally competent administration can be traced to the Hill-Burton Act (1946) and the Social Security Act (1965), which emphasize providing health services to individuals who have limited English proficiency (Bailey, 2005). Civil rights laws have also fostered the development of language access services in health institutions.
and organizations with staff diversity (Mayeno, 2007, p. 12). These early mandates require agencies and other federally funded service providers to reach out to individuals with limited English proficiency. As a result, these organizations are “forced to confront and address the cultural barriers that exist in communication and in establishing effective service delivery” (Bailey, 2005, pp. 179–180).

The knowledge-based component of a cultural competency curriculum has many facets that can be explored. This section highlights only a few areas where cultural competency can be further understood and taught; namely, through definitions and policies. However, other examples include discussions of demographics, social disparities, and to a greater extent, the role of cultural competency in the context of social equity.

Attitude-Based Curriculum

A second curriculum component underscores the attitudes of people—most notably, of public servants. Content examples include but are not limited to self-reflection and societal biases. When considering the discretionary power of public servants, an individual’s views become a critical part of the equation. As noted earlier, an inherent ideology is that public administration should be neutral, but that actual practice is far from it. This concept underscores the potential need for a more representative bureaucracy.

Meier and Nigro (1976) define the theory of representative bureaucracy as administrators with attitudes “similar to the attitudes held by the general public, the decisions administrators make will in general be responsive to the desires of the public” (p. 458). Krislov (1974) viewed representative bureaucracy as a notion that “broad social groups should have spokesmen and officeholders in administrative as well as in political positions” (p. 7). Lipset (1950) argued that the social values of bureaucrats influence their governmental decisions—a reflection that Mosher (1968) identifies as active representation. The theoretical basis of active representation asserts that favorable decisions should be expected by administrators representing a sector of society with similar views and demographics. On the other hand, passive representation asserts that a bureaucracy is representative simply when the demographic characteristics of the community are similarly reflected in the administration. Equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and managing diversity are key elements for achieving passive representation in public sector service and delivery; but to achieve active representation, government employees need to become culturally competent (Bailey, 2005).

Street-level bureaucrats are critical components in the development of culturally competent policies and programs within organizations. Brintnall (2008), writing from an international perspective, argues that the work of Central and Eastern European civil servants is critical given their direct involvement with citizens and communities in addressing issues of ethnic and religious diversity, social and political equity, and political pluralism and conflict. Moreover, Brintnall
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(2008) suggests that civil servants “must know policy issues appropriate to the issues they deal with and be effective at implementing policy, and they must have an understanding of the particular circumstances of the citizens with whom they deal” (p. 40). Through research interviews, Brenner (2009) finds that Latina administrators’ “integrated multiplicative identities” allows for their policy intentions to be realized within government and in turn influencing policy that impacts their ethnic communities” (p. 846). A representative workforce can help in communicating rules, as Brenner (2009) exemplifies by stating, “Latina administrators are able to shed light on ambiguous rules and norms that may have previously marginalized Latino/a clientele and residents” (p. 846). Ultimately, one argument calls for creating a more diverse workforce, which can then help in achieving organizational cultural competency (Betancourt, Green, & Carrillo, 2002).

In addition to a curriculum that incorporates the concept of a representative bureaucracy, attitude-based content looks at students’ individual views and beliefs. As Lonner (2007) argues, “a provider’s cultural competency is based on her ability to overcome misperceptions, misconceptions, and miscommunications at a one-to-one level with patients” (p. 8). Students coming into MPA/MPP programs may be doing so with preconceived views and beliefs that can influence their perceptions of and future interactions with diverse populations. Borrego (2008) has found that Hispanic MPA students have internalized perceptions such as helplessness and resiliency issues. These internalized perceptions may dictate their future actions as public servants. As Rice (2007) highlights, “being competent in cross-cultural situations means learning new patterns of behavior and effectively applying them in appropriate settings” (p. 42). One approach may be for graduate programs in public affairs to adopt foundational principles for decision making that is based on human rights theory and puts social equity at the forefront (Alvez & Timmey, 2008). Alvez and Timmey (2008) highlight the failed response to Hurricane Katrina victims as an example of where public administrators would have benefited from adopting a human rights framework for decision making. Culturally competent approaches begin to set the educational foundation for providing more equitable and effective responsive services and programs.

An area of additional consideration in developing an attitude-based curriculum for cultural competency is reflecting upon the perception communities have of their public administrators. For example, studies of Latino perceptions of government have found differences among the various Latino groups. De la Garza et al. (1992) found some differences among Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban populations. Cubans were found to have the highest degree of trust in government. Just over 50% of U.S. Mexicans and Puerto Ricans felt that government is run “by the few in their interest” (p. 81). Similarly, Barger (1976) found differences in Mexican American, African American, and Anglo students’ images of government.
In addition, students can participate in existing programs and centers that
raise awareness of biases and diverse cultures. For example, the New York Toler-
ance Center “offers a series of programs exploring the character and consequenc-
es of racial, ethnic, religious and sexual bias,” and some programs are designed
specifically for public servants such as law enforcement and educators (Fried,
2008, p. 1). The White Plains Police Department intends to have all 215 officers
attend the Center’s “Building Community Trust in a Diverse Post-9/11 Envi-
ronment” (Fried, 2008, p. 1). Rather than wait until students become public
servants, such programs can be incorporated in public affairs curriculum to begin
developing understandings of cultural competency sooner instead of later.

Skills-Based Curriculum

In discussing health care service delivery, Betancourt (2004) notes that
cultural competency will not eliminate disparities but serves as a set of skills for
providers to deliver high-quality care to patients. By accepting this premise, Be-
tancourt argues, cultural competency can be viewed as mainstream movement—
a premise just as applicable in the public sector as in the health sector. A skills-
based curriculum builds on existing public affairs skills such as communication,
leadership, and program planning and evaluation, yet it incorporates both the
knowledge- and attitude-based curriculum to translate into cultural competent
skills. As public administrators, students will be responsible for executing the
skills learned throughout the curriculum. Two content examples, communication
and assessment, are explored further here.

Bailey (2005) outlines five elements organizations need to develop to become
culturally competent. One of these elements is self-assessment: measuring and
assessing cultural competency within an organization is critical to overall efforts
of implementation. Assessing cultural competency within a public organization
includes several aspects such as the racial and ethnic diversity of staff, whether their
mission statement acknowledges the importance of cultural diversity, the require-
ment of staff training in cultural competency, and overall organizational environ-
ment (Rice, 2008). In the application of a skills-based performance assessment,
Rice (2008) outlines tools and measures that can be utilized by organizations, prac-
titioners, and students and ultimately incorporated into a public affairs curriculum.

An additional skill often covered in academia is communication. Cultural
competency emphasizes recognition of diverse languages, and short of taking a
foreign language course, students have the opportunity to explore new and in-
novative ways that technology can help improve the ability to communicate in
diverse populations. New technologies in the public sector allow for enhanced
efficiency in government’s effort to provide public goods and services (White &
Rice, 2005). For example, municipal call centers and websites have the ability to
disseminate and process information in the primary languages of their constitu-
ents. With this ability comes an increased dependence on new technologies for
service delivery. One approach toward addressing the increased dependence on technology is to ensure that government’s technology-based services are multi-lingual. Kellar (2005) points out that “languages are the front door to another culture, and many local governments are recognizing this fact” by providing initiatives and programs within multilingual communities (p. 8). A critical step in advancing cultural competency in the public sector is ensuring programs and services are accessible in the primary client’s language. This can be achieved by translating brochures and program materials as well as websites.

**Community-Based Curriculum**

Collectively, knowledge, attitude, and skills-based components of a cultural competency curriculum can go a long way toward ensuring a culturally competent public sector. However, all three component areas and examples discussed can be significantly enhanced by incorporating the community. Benavides and Hernandez (2007) exemplify the benefit of working with communities through their review of best practice cases that highlight how by collaborating and seeking participation from Hispanic localities, public sector organizations are able to design optimal programs.

Wu and Martinez (2006) identify six principles for implementing cultural competency. After an initial recommendation underscoring the role of community representation and feedback, they go on to suggest that organizations seeking to advance cultural competency within their organization should seek out leaders of community groups so they can become active participants in developing and implementing guidelines. Successful best practices in local government tend to be those that reach out and tailor programs with input from the community they are aiming to serve (Benavidez & Hernandez, 2007).

The practice of public sector organizations working with communities has critical benefits that should first be explored in academia. This ideology is reflected by the NASPAA diversity guidelines, discussed earlier, for schools seeking accreditation in public affairs education. In two of the five examples that NASPAA provides in efforts toward a diverse curriculum, the importance of working with the local community is emphasized. First, NASPAA (2009) suggests that public affairs programs use “prominent women and minority officials as guest speakers in courses, workshops or special programs.” This relationship between academia and local community leaders of diverse backgrounds is a critical introduction to diverse populations; but more important, it is an introduction to the practice of working with the community.

A second NASPAA recommendation is for public affairs programs to design internship experiences to place students under the supervision of women and minority agency mentors. This recommendation also works at various levels. Working with and in diverse groups via an internship highlights the importance of internship placement, but it also provides the critical mentorship that can help meet the challenges and opportunities discussed in the attitude-based
curriculum. Similarly, Johnson and Rivera (2007) recommend that internship placements aim toward putting students in contact with communities of color. Ultimately, any efforts to bring students, faculty, and the community together help ensure the success of a community-based curriculum.

Conclusion

With the increasingly changing demographics of the United States, new opportunities and challenges will arise for public service delivery. These opportunities and challenges can be met through innovative approaches and organizational changes that reflect effective service delivery for diverse populations. As outlined in this discussion, public sector organizations and employees can be at the forefront of such efforts through a culturally competent curriculum of public affairs programs. Building on existing practices and culturally competent curricula, this paper provides a framework for a culturally competent curriculum. This framework outlines four conceptual approaches—knowledge-based, attitude-based, skills-based, and community-based—and offers content examples for each approach. Although this paper does not present an exhaustive list of content examples, it is evident that ample opportunities exist for public affairs programs to make their curriculum more culturally competent, if they are not already doing so. Based on the existing studies and this framework for a culturally competent curriculum, it is important to note that the four content areas have their greatest potential when evaluated and practiced collectively. In closing, it is highly recommended that public affairs schools explore and assess their current curriculum to find where they can further integrate cultural competency.
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The Pedagogy of “Governance”
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Abstract
Traditional public administration scholarship focused on government, reflecting the study of public actors delivering services. But recently the focus on government and governmental actors has been replaced by a new term “governance” to reflect the increasing reliance on for-profit, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations to deliver these services. The reasons for the government by proxy are varied, yet little attention has been given to its constitutional implications. This article examines the implications of this new governance when it comes to service delivery of traditional public goods by public, for-profit, non-profit, and faith-based organizations. It describes the challenges this blurring of sectoral lines poses both for the study of public administration and in the teaching and training of students.

Public administration scholars and schools of public affairs increasingly use the term governance to describe the processes they study and teach. Governance—rather than the older word government—is thought more accurately describe the reality of contemporary state structures, where—among other things—an ever-increasing percentage of the work of the state is outsourced to for-profit, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations.

The reasons for this growth in “government by proxy” are varied, but among its roots are distrust of government and an often reflexive preference for markets and/or civil society. What those holding that reflexive preference fail to recognize is that contracting out is not “privatization,” properly understood—that is, the choice of private surrogates to deliver services on behalf of government agencies obscures but does not alter the fact that government is choosing, directing, and paying for those services. For their part, reflexive opponents of contracting often fail to recognize that often—certainly not always, but often—the choice of a private intermediary will provide needed flexibility or expertise. Whatever the merits of these opposing ideological positions, this article is intended to suggest that—at a time that policy makers and public managers increasingly accept
third-party government as a fait accompli—those concerned with the delivery of public affairs educational programs think long and hard about the implications of these practices—not just for public administration, but for a pedagogy that is grounded in specific constitutional norms.

Scholars and practitioners have focused significant attention on issues of fiscal and political accountability raised by outsourcing, but with few exceptions have paid little attention to the growing disconnect between the new governance paradigm and the basic constitutional norms that have structured American government and public management for two hundred years. While the literature generated by privatization and the “reinvention” movement is copious, it has dealt almost exclusively with the management challenges and fiscal accountability issues raised by contracting. More recently, serious scholarly attention has turned to the effects of outsourcing on nonprofit partners of government, and concerns about the transformation of organizations within the voluntary sector resulting from their increasing dependence on government dollars.

Public administration scholars have paid little attention to the constitutional implications of government by proxy, however, and that is a troubling omission because the issues here are foundational. Public administration in the United States is grounded in a specific constitutional regime, a regime that begins by placing certain limitations on actions that may be taken by the state. Efforts to keep government responsible and accountable—politically, fiscally, and constitutionally—thus depend on the ability to identify government and to recognize when the state has acted. Governance may be robbing citizens and public managers alike of the ability to make that crucial threshold identification.

The Constitutional Bases of Public Administration

Woodrow Wilson wrote that “it is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one” (Rohr, 1986, p. 1). Wilson meant to call attention to the importance of constitutional values to questions of administrative legitimacy and the dangers of forgetting that critical link under the pressures of day-to-day management challenges.

John Rohr, David Rosenbloom, and other public administration scholars have emphasized the normative role played by the constitution. As Rohr wrote in an introduction to Constitutional Competence for Public Managers (Rosenbloom, Carroll, & Carroll. 2000):

We are witnessing the gradual reintegration of constitutionalism and public administration. I say reintegration because of the obvious connection between public administration and constitutionalism in The Federalist Papers. So integral was administration to the intent of the framers that the authors of The Federalist Papers made more
frequent use of the word administration and its cognates they did of the words Congress, President or Supreme Court. (p. xiii)

The book itself makes explicit the connection between “public values” and the “daily decisions and operations of public managers” (p. xvi).

Political theorists and public administrators alike emphasize the importance of legitimacy, defined as operational rules rooted in constitutional norms, to public administration. As Michael Spicer has noted, “in the absence of consensus surrounding the role of government, bureaucracy becomes increasingly seen simply as a tool by which some groups gain benefits and privileges at the expense of others” (Spicer, 1995, p. 4). A legitimate exercise of authority, no matter how coercive, is different from the exercise of raw power unrestrained by adherence to codes of normative values, and it is seen differently by members of the polity. That difference is especially critical to those on the front lines of state and local government, who must make and implement policies that are anything but abstract to the citizens they affect.

The importance of tying our teaching of public administrative practices to constitutional values rests in the central question of both political philosophy and public administration: What is the role of the state, and how should that role be managed? What are the convictions that should animate public service, and how should that service be defined? The United States Constitution rests upon very specific understandings of human nature, the role of the state, and natural and human rights. Those particular understandings and the philosophical commitments that flowed from them led the founders to sharply limit the power of the state. To put it another way, the original American concept of liberty was in the negative: Liberty was seen as an individual’s right to be free from state control or interference, subject only to the equal rights of others.

To limit government, however, one must first define it. And such definition is becoming increasingly problematic. D. D. Raphael summarized the contemporary idea of the state by defining it as “an association having universal compulsory jurisdiction within territorial boundaries” (as quoted in Kennedy, 2003, p. 205). The two elements of that definition—territoriality and a monopoly on the right to use certain types of force or power—are arguably integral to popular understanding of the concept of statehood—of government. Both are undergoing redefinition, and our students ignore that redefinition at their peril.

The changing nature of governing institutions cannot be attributed solely to the growth of contracting out, of course: In industrialized nations, and perhaps elsewhere, the growth of the global economy and the worldwide penetration of the Internet are increasingly challenging traditional notions of territorial jurisdiction. In America, the steady expansion of government since the New Deal has already required us to rethink the relationship between government power and fundamental rights. As previously noted, in the American system, rights were
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traditionally defined as limitations on the coercive power of the state; today, lawyers and political philosophers speak of both negative and positive liberties and debate the propriety and nature of affirmative “entitlements.” The advent of widespread contracting, where a growing number of services are provided by and paid for by government but delivered by contractors, has raised a host of new questions: Are partnerships with businesses and nonprofit organizations creating a new definition of government? Is “privatization” (understood as government contracting) extending, rather than shrinking, the state? Does the substitution of an independent contractor for an employee equate to a reduction in the scope of government, as proponents apparently believe? Or does the substitution operate instead to shift the locus and visibility, but not the scope, of government activity (Kettl, 1993; Smith & Lipsky, 1993), and thereby blur the boundaries between public and private, making it ever more difficult to decide where “public” stops and “private” begins? If we are altering traditional definitions of public and private by virtue of these new governance relationships—turning for-profit and nonprofit organizations into unrecognized arms of the state—what is the effect of that alteration on a constitutional system that depends on the distinction between public and private as a fundamental safeguard of private rights? If the constitutional system is being altered, what are the implications for political theory and public management? And finally, in the midst of what might be characterized as a paradigm shift, what are the responsibilities of public administration educators?

STATE ACTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

However we understand government, a central tenet of public administration theory in democratic regimes is that the state must be accountable to its citizens. Contracting out complicates accountability in a number of ways (Gilmour & Jensen, 1998). Smith and Lipsky were among the first to explore some of the issues for the nonprofit sector inherent in the transfer of state power to private providers (Smith & Lipsky, 1993); more recently, legal scholars have addressed the issues of constitutional accountability raised by the emergence of what some now call third-party government (Minow, 1999, Kennedy, 2001; Metzger, 2003).

One traditional way to enforce government accountability is through the courts. But just as a lack of transparency in contracting relationships can impede political accountability, the failure of state action jurisprudence to keep pace with the political reality of government contracting—the inability of current legal theory to identify government action for purposes of assessing government responsibility—has significantly undermined constitutional accountability. We are in danger of losing an important constitutional check on the exercise of government power because we rely on our understanding of the state action doctrine to know when we may ask the courts to restrain government agencies. If we do not have comprehensible rules defining those actions we may legally attribute to the
state, the efficacy of constitutional litigation is undermined. If we are unable to convey to citizens the boundaries of government’s legal responsibilities, our ability to fashion appropriate political remedies will also be compromised. And if we are unable to describe with any specificity the actions that might lead to governmental and/or personal liability, we cannot adequately prepare public administration students for the duties they will assume.

To understand the dimensions of this problem, and its (underappreciated) importance to public administration educators, it is necessary to engage in a brief review of the genesis and history of the state action doctrine. “State Action” was first defined by the Supreme Court in 1883, in the *Civil Rights Cases* (1883). Passage of the Fourteenth Amendment had prohibited states from denying, to persons otherwise entitled to them, the “privileges and immunities” of citizenship. The Court was addressing the scope of that prohibition.

The Fourteenth Amendment expresses prohibitions (and consequently implies corresponding positive immunities), limiting State action only, including in such action, however, action by all State agencies, executive, legislative, and judicial, of whatever degree….Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject-matter of the amendment. (*Civil Rights Cases*, 1883 p. 3)

As the Court recently restated the doctrine,

Embedded within our Fourteenth Amendment jurisprudence is a dichotomy between state action, which is subject to strict scrutiny under the Amendment’s Due Process Clause, and private conduct, against which the Amendment affords no shield, no matter how unfair that conduct may be. (*National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Tarkanian*, 1988, p. 191)

The Court has thus established a distinction between invasions of rights that are constitutionally forbidden (“public” invasions) and those that are not (“private” invasions), and that distinction rests upon the identity of the actor. As one legal scholar has noted, “a central premise of U.S. constitutional law is that the Constitution imposes limits on the actions that governments can take.” The corollary premise is that “the rules governing private actors should be politically, rather than constitutionally, determined” (Metzger, 2003, p. 1373).

The Bill of Rights was initially designed to limit the reach of the federal government; the Fourteenth Amendment later extended those limitations to bar similar action by the states. Over the years, by the process known as “selective incorporation,” most of the provisions of the original eight amendments
have been held to apply to state and local government units as well as the federal government (Twining v. New Jersey, 1908; Palko v. Connecticut, 1937; Adamson v. California, 1947; Berger, 1977; Ely, 1980). But the citizen’s protection is against the public actor only. Discriminatory acts, or denials of due process, or restrictions on speech by private parties, are all constitutional; indeed, they are entirely legal unless prohibited by virtue of legislation like the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Americans with Disabilities Act.

This distinction between public and private acts loses clarity in a number of contexts (indeed, it has been referred to as a conceptual truth; Stone, Seidman, Sunstein, & Tushnet, 1986, p. 1467). Accordingly, the Court has been obliged to develop rules allowing certain private acts to be attributed to government. As Robert Gilmour and Laura Jensen (1998) have noted:

When the relationship between government and citizen becomes more complex than that between a mere commodity or service provider and its customers, more than marketplace efficiency is required to hold the government and its proxies and surrogates accountable for their exercise of authority on behalf of the state. (p. 247)

Acknowledging the need for such rules and actually fashioning them have proved to be very different matters. As one commentator has wryly noted, the Court’s “sifting” and “weighing” in state action cases “differs from Justice Stewart’s famous ‘I know it when I see it’ standard for judging obscenity mainly in the comparative precision of the latter” (Brest, 1980, pp. 1296–1330). On one hand, the mere fact that a regulatory agency exercises oversight of a licensee and has thus implicitly approved the licensee conduct at issue has been held insufficient to attribute an action to the state (Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison, 1974). On the other hand, where government intentionally funds an unconstitutional program conducted by private actors, the Courts have generally found state action (Norwood v. Harrison, 1973).

As many have noted, the current state action jurisprudence is incoherent; as the Supreme Court has struggled with cases presenting different factual situations, the major casualty has been the very predictability that law is intended to provide. Worse, in an increasing number of situations, government contracting can provide a handy mechanism for evasion of the limits imposed by the Bill of Rights. As the dissent in one case noted: “The State can shield its legislation affecting property interests from due process scrutiny by delegating authority to private partners. (Flagg Bros. v. Brooks, 1978, p. 153)

Blum v. Yaretsy (1983) is an excellent example of the inadequacies of current state action doctrine. The case involved an alleged due process violation arising out of involuntary discharges and transfers of Medicaid patients in a nursing
home. Rehnquist, writing for the Court, declined to find state action on the grounds that “a state normally can be held responsible for a private decision only when it has exercised coercive power or has provided such significant encouragement, either overt or covert, that the choice must in law be deemed to be that of the State” (Blum v. Yaretsky, 1983, p. 1012).

Acknowledging that over 90% (and perhaps as many as 99%) of the patients in the facility were Medicaid patients, and that the nursing home was subject to pervasive governmental regulation, the Rehnquist majority nevertheless held that programs undertaken by the State result in substantial funding of the activities of a private entity is no more persuasive than the fact of regulation of such an entity in demonstrating that the State is responsible for decisions made by the entity in the course of its business. (Blum v. Yaretsky, 1983, p. 1004)

In dissent, Justice Brennan underscored the superficiality of this analysis. Not only has the state established the treatment levels and utilization review in order to further its own fiscal goals, but … the State [has] set forth precisely the standards upon which the level-of-care decisions are to be made, and has delegated administration of the program to the nursing home operators, rather than assume the burden of administering the program itself. (Blum v. Yaretsky, 1983, p. 1013)

Rendell-Baker v. Kohn (1982) raised similar concerns. That case involved a private school for “problem children” referred to it by state officials. Nearly all of the school’s funding came from the state, the facility was heavily supervised and regulated, and almost all its students were sent by the state. Nevertheless, the Court declined to find state action, holding that “the school’s fiscal relationship with the State is not different from that of many contractors performing services for the government.” Critics of current state action jurisprudence would agree—and would note that this is precisely where the problem lies.

The inequities extend beyond service recipients, to differential treatment of employees. In Richardson v. McKnight (1997), the Court declined to find that private prison guards were entitled to qualified immunity, despite the fact that such immunity would clearly have been available to them had they been employed directly by the state. Lower courts, on the other hand, have not hesitated to find state action in private prison and institutional detention cases (Blumel v. Mylander, 1996), often noting that the power to deprive an individual of liberty is a quintessentially governmental power (Plain v. Flicker, 1986). This line of reasoning is persuasive, but difficult to reconcile with Richardson (1997), or with
cases like *Wade v. Byles* (1966), where a private company providing security to a public housing project was held not to be a public actor despite the fact that the guards had authority to carry guns, arrest people, and use deadly force.

Complicating matters even further is the tendency of reviewing courts to apply different standards of analysis depending on the nature of the constitutional right involved, generally without articulating the basis for those differences. Commentators have noted that, in cases involving racial discrimination or religious liberties, the Court has been much more willing to find—or assume—state action. (Finding a violation of the Establishment Clause requires the presence of state action, whether that requirement is articulated or not, since a private party cannot violate the United States Constitution.)

If state action jurisprudence is so complicated that lawyers often disagree on the presence or absence of governmental liability for particular actions, how can we teach students who will go on to be state and local managers to avoid outsourcing practices likely to embroil them in litigation? How can citizens, or corporations doing business with government agencies, know when the state has acted unconstitutionally? How _should_ the concept of state action be understood? Or, more broadly, when should we hold the state responsible for actions taken by a contractor? What would a coherent jurisprudence, capable of providing direction to public managers and accountability to citizens, look like?

And perhaps most pertinent to educators, how do we teach our future public administrators to safeguard constitutional accountability without sacrificing the administrative flexibility necessary to manage today’s third-party government? These are issues requiring a pedagogy that reflects their importance.

**Pedagogical Implications**

Contracting has significant implications for teaching public administration and public management courses, and those implications go well beyond contract management and cost accounting concerns. As an earlier article in this journal (Kennedy, 2003) put it:

Before there was public management, there was political theory: what should government do? What actions by the state are to be considered legitimate? What is justice? What is public virtue? … those of us who teach public management too frequently neglect these seminal questions for the necessary but inevitably more mundane skills of the profession—budgeting, planning, human resources management, policy analysis. But these practical subjects did not emerge from a void; they are inextricably bound up with our constitutional system, and that system in turn is the outgrowth of great philosophical debates.
about the proper ordering of human communities. It can be extremely rewarding for students to visit those debates. (One would love to say “revisit” but that would be inaccurate; virtually none of them have any familiarity with this intellectual history.)

The first questions of political theory are what should government do, what should government refrain from doing, and why? It is a truism that the existence of a problem is not a warrant for government action. There are many problems that government is uniquely able to address, and many other areas where government efforts to ameliorate problems simply create worse ones. Our classes need to include substantive, critical discussions about what those categories are, how they have developed, and the principled bases of the decisions involved.

Policy analysis may be the curricular area most in need of substantive additional materials discussing the policy consequences of contracting. Classes in cost-benefit analysis should (and increasingly do) recognize the “hidden” management costs involved. But contracting implicates a number of other thorny policy issues that are too infrequently addressed. One relatively obvious area is the phenomenon of contracting as patronage. How does this form of patronage differ from the more traditional (and legally limited) practice of trading jobs for political support? What are its implications for public trust and good decision making? Another is the difference between the contemporary practice of privatization as contracting-out service delivery and the more traditional practices of procurement—a distinction that few classes address.

We also need to provide our public management students with concrete tools they can use to make good choices among bidders hoping to provide government services on contract—tools that will allow them to develop fair and effective processes for choosing nonpublic partners. We need to teach them how to negotiate contract provisions that will be sufficient to protect against a variety of fiscal, constitutional, and public harms but that will not be so onerous as to deter potential bidders or significantly increase compliance costs. And they should understand the human and fiscal tools needed to adequately monitor and measure contractor performance on each of those dimensions.

Much more critically, we need to explore the principled bases upon which public decisions to contract out should be made in the first place—the bases for deciding whether certain public functions should be contracted out at all, as a matter of public policy. A case in point: In December 2003, The Guardian reported that private corporations had become the second-biggest contributor to coalition forces in Iraq after the Pentagon, and noted that the proportion of private contractors had grown markedly since the first Gulf War in 1991, when the ratio was 100 to 1. By 2003, the proportion was 10 to 1, and nearly a third of the budget earmarked that year for the wider Iraqi campaign, or $30 billion dollars, went to private companies in what The Guardian called “a booming
business” of replacing soldiers with highly paid civilians not subject to standard military procedures. The “booming private sector” has soaked up much of the expertise that became available as armies downsized after the Cold War, and its emergence has allowed America to wage war by proxy, without the congressional and media oversight to which conventional warfare is subject.

In Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry (2003), Peter Singer identified three categories of private military contractors: provider firms offering direct, tactical assistance—anything from training programs to staff services to front-line combat; consulting firms drawing primarily upon retired senior officers selling their strategic/administrative expertise back to the military; and support firms providing logistic and maintenance services. Singer highlighted numerous legal, policy, and management questions raised by this vastly expanded use of private military companies. Will the ties of these organizations to their countries of origin weaken as markets become more globalized, and opportunities for profit conflict with obligations of patriotism? Will states lose control of military policy to companies whose first responsibility is to clients and shareholders? How will foreign policy decision making change when a declaration of war entails “hiring” soldiers rather than deploying young citizens? Will companies pursuing profits lobby successfully for military “solutions” to global conflicts? How will we control the behavior of “private” combatants?

The Challenge

Government officials and public administration scholars alike have embraced third-party government without adequately addressing two important policy issues:

- Can we achieve efficiencies in service provision without sacrificing democratic norms of equity, accountability, and due process that are fundamental to our political order and constitutional culture?
- Are some tasks so critical to our collective identity, to our sense of what it means to be a member of a political community, that they must be provided by citizens pursuing their civic duty rather than by businesses pursuing profit? If so, what are those tasks, and how do we identify them? What makes them different?

If the tragedy of Abu Ghraib proved anything, it is that the substitution of governance for government has not lessened our need to control how state power is exercised. But too few of our policy texts highlight these issues, or ask these hard questions; and few of our classes spend time explaining their importance, exploring their ramifications, or preparing students to cope with them.

It is high time we do so.

Even when the policy consequences of contracting are not as potentially
grave as in the military context, those consequences should be explored in classes on public management. Once a specific government agency has been charged with a responsibility, the question becomes one of delivery. Is this a job best handled by employees, or by contractors? If it is the latter, what mechanisms will we need to ensure accountability for both program results and constitutional compliance? We must go through this analytical exercise before we can determine whether contracting out is an appropriate delivery method, and if so, how we can best structure the contracting relationship to protect the public interest.

It is a truism of public affairs education that when government acts, government should be accountable. The instrument government chooses should not alter that result. Whether government delivers drug counseling or job placement or any other service through a state agency, a for-profit or nonprofit provider, or a faith-based organization, the program should be properly understood as state action—the empowerment of a third party to act for and on behalf of the state. We do a disservice to students when we fail to explore the constitutional, management, and policy implications of that fundamental fact.
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Trees and Water: Mainstreaming Environment in the Graduate Policy Analysis Curriculum
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Abstract
In this article, we describe and evaluate a teaching project embedded within a core policy analysis course that allows students to engage with a major public policy issue—in our case, environmental policy—without a corresponding cost in terms of reducing curricular space for developing general policy analysis skills. We think that a win-win arrangement is attainable: a fairly intense immersion into a key thematic area of public policy and a correspondingly more vivid, realistic, and integrated treatment of general policy analysis. The project has the potential to allow teachers and students to explore in depth and develop the skills and appreciation required for practice in any major policy area, even in tightly packed graduate policy programs.

1. Searching for a Win-Win Design: More Policy Analysis Theory and More Sector-Specific Content

In tightly packed graduate policy programs, the curriculum leaves little space for teachers and students to explore and develop an appreciation and the skills required for the practice of any major policy area that is outside their rather narrowly defined primary areas of concern. Students are expected to rapidly develop knowledge of and basic skills in general themes about policy processes and trends, and later to specialize in one or at most two focal areas of policy interest through electives. This limits the opportunity to impart policy-relevant knowledge about a range of major public policy concerns, such as environmental policy or health policy, to a larger nonspecializing audience. We feel this is unfortunate. Moreover, because of time constraints, even the basic knowledge and skills in public policy processes and analysis are often less developed than would be ideal. There is substantial evidence from the literature on public affairs education that action learning in the form of in-depth, student-led exploration of well-defined themes contributes greatly to general learning objectives (Breen, Matusitz, &
Wan, 2009; Hartley, 2009; Kramer, 2007) but that such activities are infrequent because of packed curricula and time pressures. Our own institute used to provide an end-of-program, 6-week, full-time “synthesizing exercise” for Masters students, to expose them more intensively to the interface of theory and reality; but this was displaced eventually due to the need (for purposes of academic accreditation) to use that space to ensure appropriate depth in all students’ thesis work.

In this article, we describe and evaluate the design of a project embedded within a core policy analysis course that allows students to engage in a major area of public policy—in our case, environmental policy—without a corresponding cost in terms of reducing curricular space for general policy analysis skills. While the rest of the article focuses specifically on how we integrated environmental policy into the general policy analysis course, we should emphasize here that the architecture of this teaching experiment can be adapted to serve any major area of public policy based on the instructors’ and students’ interests, and that the article can be read equally fruitfully by viewing the use of environmental policy as an illustrative tool rather than as a primary policy concern. The first half of the article describes in detail the considerations behind the course design, including the large-scale environmental policy analysis project, in comparison to our previous approach. The second half then presents our experiences with the redesigned course, in terms of course management and dynamics, and levels of student achievement and fulfillment of learning objectives.

Our own decision to focus on environmental policy was based on several factors. The advent of climate change as an increasingly likely potential calamity has propelled environmental policy into the mainstream of core global policy concerns. There is now a more broadly shared interest in environmental policy as, in the absence of ready technical solutions, climate change requires us to reflect on basic questions of production and consumption. In recognizing the more systemic roots of climate change issues, which require natural and social scientists, engineers, and philosophers (among others) to work together, a transdisciplinary space for inquiry and action has emerged. The outcomes of these debates, as well as the processes they will use and the forums where they will be conducted, concern us fundamentally as policy scientists, in our positive as well as our normative analyses and engagements. We are required to understand emerging trends, and we are also required to train future actors in these arenas. Managing these policy questions requires integrative skills and the ability to make decisions while being cognizant of competing values, claims, and priorities, all in a context characterized by incomplete and conflicting knowledge and information. Stimulating and developing knowledge about environmental issues in a range of students broader than those that fall under the generic label “environmental studies” has thus become an important challenge confronting graduate public policy and management programs. We offer one technique to address this need.
We think that a win-win arrangement is attainable: on the one hand, a fairly intense immersion in key environmental policy themes, made possible by the very nature of the issue that renders it a more accessible and familiar policy area to students than most others; and on the other, a correspondingly more vivid, realistic, and integrated treatment of general policy analysis themes—about debates over facts and values, rights and responsibilities, focus and feasibility.

In our course we focused on two increasingly stressed resources—forests and water—with very different characteristics that are critical to sustainable development and planetary resilience. Questions about “trees” and “water” are no longer domains of specialization, but have become mainstream global problems with potentially far-reaching consequences.

2. An Environmental Policy Analysis Project as an Ongoing Strand Within a Course on Policy Analysis

Course Objectives and Structure

Our course, Policy Analysis and Design, is the second-semester core course in a Public Policy and Management (PPM) specialization within the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) Master of Arts in Development Studies curriculum. ISS in The Hague (http://www.iss.nl) is a graduate school of development studies oriented to an international clientele drawn from around the world. Most of ISS’ students enter with 2 to 15 years of work experience. Founded in 1952, ISS is now part of Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Policy Analysis and Design is a standard-length course, which in our system represents about 35 hours of classroom teaching and tutorial time and a target of about 200 hours of student input in all, spread over 12 weeks, for an average student to obtain an average mark. This figure of 200 hours includes the time for reading and project and exam preparation. The objective of this course is to make students “more thoughtful, effective, and equitable participants in policy analysis” through imparting knowledge in (a) the understanding of policy theories, concepts, tools and techniques; (b) skills in their use; and (c) awareness of value aspects in policy analysis. It builds upon a first-semester course, Policy Processes in Context, in which students are introduced to the history of the field of public policy analysis, its main concepts, and the diverse perspectives through which the field is approached and constructed. Students who have not taken the latter course may register for Policy Analysis and Design subject to the instructor’s permission. These students take a two-session remedial tutorial on some classic introductory readings on public policy.

In terms of content, the course is divided into three blocks. The first block, Standard Analytic Approaches, deals with policy analysis from economics and systems analysis perspectives. The topics are representative of different impor-
tant strands in policy analysis and public management: the “logical framework approach” (known also under the labels of objectives-oriented management and results-based management), which follows systems analysis approaches, usually within a top-down management perspective; cost-benefit analysis, which represents and slightly adjusts market-based economic thinking; cost-effectiveness analysis, which is at the intersection of the two previously mentioned strands; and multi-criteria analysis, which here represents a move toward a more debate-oriented, participatory approach and brings in a wider range of value criteria (Gasper, 2006). We cover the principles underlying these methods, their rationales and contributions, and their limitations and potential biases.

The second block, Policy and Policymaking as Political Argumentation, addresses the use of language and arguments in policymaking, including the typical elements of policy arguments and systems of arguments, and how to construct, test, and present them more effectively (Apthorpe & Gasper, 1996; Dunn, 2008; Fischer & Forester, 1993). It helps students to probe the meaning of key terms used, such as efficiency and effectiveness (Gasper 2004, ch. 3), and how to critically investigate, evaluate, and construct a policy argument. It gives particular attention to drawing out and reflecting on the assumptions about values—including values about outcomes and values about processes, and how value conflicts are handled—as well as the assumptions about policy instruments.

The third block, Exploratory Approaches in Policy Design and Assessment, looks at more advanced skills of general relevance in policy analysis, notably: (a) how to analyze and assess a policy position not only as a system of arguments but also as involving the use of particular mental frameworks, images, and packages of assumptions, which typically reflect the worldview of particular “interpretive communities”; (b) how to contribute to building alternative frameworks, arguments, options, and scenarios; and (c) how to understand and participate in inter-, not only intra-, community deliberations. So the block includes attention to both exploratory cognitive techniques and the social processes of discussion and decision making that can contribute to group (re-)formation and rethinking (White, 1990).

Our Traditional Teaching Methods

Earlier versions of this course always included group-based case study and workshop exercises in which students were provided with one or a few relatively short readings on each of a series of policy issues—ranging from privatization to national parks management to casino gambling—that they were required to analyze and present to the class. The objective was for students to explore policy processes in terms of the range of stakeholders involved and their political views, the technical and financial constraints on potential solutions, and the limits of comprehensive rational planning and policymaking. These exercises would increase in intensity through the course, and each exercise would cover a com-
pletely different policy issue.

As activity-based learning exercises, these case studies and workshops supported several of our course’s learning objectives that were aimed at building core intellectual skills, such as (a) to find, integrate, and analyze facts while exercising good judgment; (b) to work collaboratively; (c) to reason, debate, and defend positions; and (d) to respond to problems arising from incomplete information and uncertainty.

However, none of these four objectives was fully realized due to the limited scope of each of the exercises. The achievement of the first objective, related to skills development in finding, integrating, and analyzing facts, was limited due to the exercise being restricted to the analysis of only a few given texts. Time constraints did not permit us to assign students tasks that would require them to do independent research and incorporate their findings into their analyses.

With regard to the second skill, although the students were divided into groups and required to prepare the presentation as a team, the limited scope of each exercise and the fact that only a group grade was awarded (or that some exercises were purely for learning purposes, not also for assessment) meant that some students could free-ride without much resistance from the other students, whose main aim was to get through the exercise as quickly and as well as possible. This limited effective collaboration and teamwork to the more conscientious students. The benefits of “forcing” effective participation from potential free riders in a group were perceived by those students as much less than the costs of confronting them.

The third skill was realized also only to a limited extent because although there was a space—typically of about 10 minutes—after the student presentations to discuss and critique their material, we used this space more for providing feedback rather than for students to actively debate and defend their positions and conclusions. Moreover, the fact that students felt no ownership over the texts on which the exercise was based meant that they often did not engage fully with the content.

The fourth skill was also little developed: given the limited number of texts involved as the basis for the presentation, students did not engage much with issues of incomplete information and uncertainty. Instead, they effectively drew a boundary around the given material, and relegated incomplete information and uncertainty to ceteris paribus status.

Our Redesigned Methods for Teaching and Learning—The Environmental Policy Analysis Project

Having in mind these limitations, we redesigned the course in 2009 by introducing a policy analysis project (PAP) to run throughout the term. Two broad topics were selected, and each student was assigned to a group to work on one of the topics. Our intention was to replace the discrete and limited case study and
workshop activities with a comprehensive activity that would run throughout the semester. This activity would present the students with a broadly defined policy issue and require them to generate the information and arguments required to support their diagnoses and proposals.

We expected 25 to 30 students to enroll in the course and decided that, given the need for intensive tutoring and feedback, four groups would be the maximum that we could reasonably accommodate into the course schedule. Eventually, 32 students enrolled and we made four groups of eight, with two groups per topic. Initially, we feared that this could give unwieldy groups, but in the end this was not a problem.

When we began brainstorming about potential policy issues that could serve as the topics for these exercises, we were concerned about whether students would be able to make reasonably detailed policy analyses for a topic they had not previously been exposed to in anything more than a superficial manner. Surely it would require a substantial investment of time to develop an understanding of the literature that underpins any important and complex policy issue? Given what we expected our students to deliver (which we describe later), we concluded that the issues selected would have to be in some sense popular; that is, issues students would have been naturally and repeatedly exposed to over a considerable period. This would reduce the need for us to spend time familiarizing the students with the basic aspects and importance of the topic. We were also concerned whether some students would resent having to invest a considerable amount of their time focusing on a policy problem that was outside their main and immediate academic and professional interests.

We decided that environmental issues satisfy the criteria of sufficient popularity and prior general exposure. First, environmental issues have long figured prominently and in detail in general news coverage, which means that the students enter the course with a basic familiarity with the intellectual terrain. Second, nearly all students seem to have a natural affinity for the issues, inasmuch as the theme is broad enough to include a wide variety of intellectual and analytical approaches, ranging through the natural sciences to the social sciences and the humanities. Finally, these themes are in the general community interest domain, and their decision dynamics are not restricted to narrowly defined, epistemic communities. This means that a variety of policy approaches are relevant in their study.

We chose two themes within the broad field of environmental and resource issues. Two student groups were assigned to each theme, which facilitated a degree of competition and critical feedback between paired teams.

The first theme, which we will call “Trees,” asked students to develop advice for policymakers on the trade-offs between forest protection and economic growth. The students were given the following scenario: They are in a mid-sized developing country with a substantial forest endowment. The students were told
that this could be any country of their choice, but that they needed to focus on generic policy issues rather than on country-specific facts and figures. In the end, one of the groups chose Peru and the other chose Nepal, which we found to be apt. They were then told that thus far the governments of their countries have pursued an environmental policy that has prioritized economic growth over forest protection. The national environment policy is now being debated in the legislature and the wider polity, and the concerned policymakers want independent analyses of the fundamental trade-offs involved and the short- and long-term consequences of prioritizing forest protection over economic growth, and vice versa. One group of students was told to argue for better protection, and the other was instructed to argue for accelerated economic growth. We also told the students that they should think about these national and local concerns about deforestation as embedded within the cross-border debates around climate change.

The second theme, which we call “Water,” asked students to advise the government in a large city in a developing country on how to meet its population's need for water and sanitation services and also reduce environmental pollution through the construction of wastewater treatment facilities. The students were provided with the following scenario: The chief executive of the city needs a large amount of financing to increase the capacity of the city’s water agency to extend water and sanitation services to the growing population of the city. However, the government is fiscally constrained, and multilateral aid agencies say they are unwilling to provide funding unless the chief executive agrees to a privatization program. As with the previous groups, the Water groups were able to choose any city; but they both settled on thinking in generic terms of a city in a developing country as the basis for their project rather than identifying a particular city.

Our Redesigned Methods for Teaching and Learning—The Sequence of Activities

Over the course of the semester, the students were required to prepare a policy analysis report. The target length of the report was 50 to 80 single-spaced pages (i.e., 7 to 10 pages of output per student) and it consisted of three parts, corresponding to the three blocks of the course. These three parts were built up through three assignments, each due at the end of the corresponding block. Each assignment required, for each group, a 30-minute classroom presentation and an accompanying draft written report. After a week to incorporate feedback received during their presentation, each group submitted a final written report to obtain more detailed feedback from the instructors (rather than at that stage to obtain a grade).

The first assignment covered the methods introduced in Block I and required students to prepare an analysis of the problem situation using the logical framework approach: The assignment thus included a stakeholder analysis, problem-tree analysis, alternatives analysis, and tentative solution-tree(s) analysis as well as a set of criteria for evaluating the policy alternatives by using a multi-criteria decision approach. Our teaching objectives were to enable students to undertake
comprehensive analyses of policy problems—using tools such as problem trees—to determine, classify, and analyze the various interest groups through stakeholder analysis and to create a policy evaluation framework using multi-criteria analysis. The unstated objective was for students to realize how complex policy problems and solutions become as we probe them in greater depth.

To accelerate the process of problem analysis, one of the instructors and the teaching assistant prepared a bibliography of about 60 relevant articles for each of the two themes. Endnote files including the articles’ abstracts were provided to the students, who were instructed to divide the articles among the group and first to scan them for content and relevance. This stage was, as we had expected, the most stressful for the groups as they had to quickly absorb the material and develop their initial problem trees. There was an initial shock when the volume of references was first presented to the groups, since each member felt she or he had to read each article, but this dissipated after it was explained that dividing the readings among themselves would result in an individual load of seven or eight articles each.

The second assignment was due at the end of Block II, and it required students to prepare two types of policy argument structures for each of at least two policy positions. One structure is an adjusted version of the well-known Toulmin format for describing argument structure (Toulmin 1958), which is applied to policy arguments in, for example, William Dunn’s standard textbook (2008) and by many other authors. The format has several attractions: It encourages digging out underlying assumptions and identification of possible counterarguments and qualifications. Toulmin’s own diagrammatic format is, however, prone to misuse by non-experts, and a tabular format prepared by R. V. George proves more workable and reliable (Gasper & George, 1998). Table 1 shows that format applied repeatedly, to describe a whole set of arguments that have interconnections. This layout, whether with one or multiple rows, is called a synthesis table (Gasper, 2000, 2002).

The Toulmin-George format applies to any argument or system of arguments. It gives no policy specifics to guide people’s thoughts; its role instead is to guide people to think in a context-specific way about the case concerned.

The other format derives from Ralph Hambrick’s identification of the types of proposition that he found in a large set of U.S. policy documents (Hambrick, 1974). Gasper (1996) arranged these 10 or so types into a series of three stages that show the imputable structure of a typical policy argument. Its first stage contains the cause-effect story contained in a policy proposal. The second stage contains “normative propositions” that proffer the normative justification for such a policy initiative, in terms of the quality of both the processes and the outputs. It attempts to convert the if-then proposition to a means-ends proposition in which both the means and the ends have been validated as sufficiently justified. The third stage involves testing the means-ends proposition in a variety of ways. A detailed illustration of the format—prepared by one of the Trees groups—is provided in the Appendix. Used as a design tool, not merely as a tool
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to describe an existing position, the stage of tests will typically identify gaps and weaknesses that require at least modification of the set of instrumental propositions, try to include measures that cope with the actual constraints, substantially reduce the undesirable external impacts, and maximize the desirable and reinforcing external impacts, and overall try to increase the coherence of the proposal. These two complementary formats provide both trees and water in argumentation, figuratively speaking. The Hambrick format provides a policy-relevant structure that helps focus students’ thoughts, and the Toulmin-George format

then nourishes this structure by directing attention to counterarguments and giving more space for the specifics of the situation and the disputes in question. And conversely, the Toulmin-George format is often used by students to, in effect, establish the core “causal proposition” that they will then take up as a narrative through the successive stages of the Hambrick format, to ground the proposition both positively and normatively, elaborate it by identifying accessible feasible policy instruments that can activate that proposed causal chain, and test it in diverse ways.

The third and final assignment was due on the last day of class. It required students to integrate the first two exercises—problem analysis and analysis of competing policy arguments—to develop their own policy recommendations and then present these in class. The Tree groups presented first, for 30 minutes each. Then the two Tree groups sat across from each other as each group posed several questions, challenging the other group on its analysis and policy recommendations. After the groups finished challenging each other, they fielded questions from the rest of the class and from the instructors. The Water groups presented next and followed the same format. At the end of the exercise, the Tree groups voted for the most convincing Water group presentation, and vice versa.

A final report was due at the end of the semester, after the final examinations. This report consisted of an updated version (after receiving feedback during the workshop discussions and in addition later from the instructors) of the first two reports, which had to be consolidated together with the reasoned final policy proposals and an overall summary.

Grading and Evaluation

In earlier years, the group exercises would account for 15% of the students’ final grade. Given the scale and intensity of the project work in the new course design, the PAP accounted for 50% of the students’ final grade, including 35% for an individually attributable contribution and 15% for the overall group performance. (Students also write a closed-book examination on the theories and approaches covered in the course, for the other 50% of the grade.) To help control for free-riding, we required students to divide the written submissions between them and clearly identify which students took responsibility for which sections.

3. Student Performance

In this section, we explore how the students performed in each of the three assignments, the problems they faced, and how we dealt with them. We also present our observations of group dynamics. Besides our own impressions and what was reported to us by the students, verbally (in plenary, in groups, and by individuals both during and after the course) and in the end-of-course questionnaire, we draw also on the observations of the course teaching assistant, who was available on a 50% basis and was regularly called on by groups and individu-
als for guidance and feedback. We will later link these observations on group dynamics and on performance to the learning objectives defined for the course as well as to the objective of developing knowledge about environmental issues. We rely mostly on informal discussions and reflection and confess that most of these sources are not formal evaluation techniques, which are, as Goodman (2008) notes, difficult to perform in cases such as ours.

**Process and Dynamics**

We found that much of our feedback and comments to students during the stages of workshop preparation and evaluation were similar to what we traditionally provide to them on essays: issues regarding clarity of problem definition, writing style, and analysis. However, we expected that this year we might encounter significant new tensions and group dynamics related to the course project.

Tensions did surface at various stages of the exercise. On the whole, the students found the first assignment to be the most stressful. This resulted primarily from them being as yet unfamiliar with the contours of the policy issue, unclear about what the instructors were looking for, and uncertain about how to divide tasks and work in a group. We also left it to the student groups to progressively specify additional context parameters for their cases, beyond those given at the outset, such as whether to clearly specify a country or city or use a generic place. They were welcome to consult with us, but we wanted them to feel co-owners of the exercise and to think about what types of information they needed. The co-responsibility for defining the exercise also brought some tensions, but these faded.

Besides tensions, there was impressive involvement. Sometimes students got carried away in the role playing and claimed to have done certain kinds of analysis when clearly they had not. For example, in discussing multi-criteria analysis, one of the Water groups claimed that they “organized a focus group discussion where key local government officials (decision-makers) were asked to give their opinions about the importance of each of the above criteria.” In our opinion, this was a result of students getting carried away in the role playing rather than an attempt to lie for gain. Making exaggerated claims without any supporting evidence was another problem that surfaced repeatedly. We attribute this partly to the competitive angle and partly to poor argumentative skills or maturity, but it was also a sign of enthusiasm.

During the initial stages, a few students tended to dominate and set the direction of the groups’ argumentation structures, not always in a sensible direction. This was corrected through tutorial sessions in which the instructors encouraged each student to contribute to the discussions.

There was some element of free-riding, but all indications point to it being considerably reduced in comparison to the group work exercises in previous years. Although we did note an imbalance in the output of individual students, it appeared that some students dominated the process because of their enthusiasm.
and initiative rather than because of deliberate free-riding by others. Every student contributed substantially, in at least some stages of the public discussions in tutorials and workshops as well as in their “signed,” individual written contributions. However, whether the aggregate balance for the course as a whole shifted away from free-riding and toward universal contribution is still unclear.

Overall, we drew the following lessons. For the students, we advised them to treat the intragroup tensions as part of experiential learning and as food for thought about policy processes. We also suggested that they might, for example, use parallel thinking to better structure group deliberation processes: collecting points of a particular type all at the same time from all group members (e.g., what are the advantages of doing X), then separately collecting points of the next type (e.g., what are the disadvantages of doing X), and so on, rather than the typical intragroup contestation in which one member’s comment in favor of X immediately elicits another member’s criticism of that view, leading to personalized position taking.

For ourselves, lessons include that we should probably have specified countries (or a small set of countries for student groups to choose from) to which the groups should have related. Time was wasted because groups lacked parameters, and different members pulled in different directions. Similarly in need of some further structuring is the allocation of work between individuals within groups, to ensure not too dramatically unequal loads and to ease the subsequent identification and grading of individual contributions. Under-specification of the assignment can exacerbate the collective action problem and generate an attribution problem too.

Performance in the Assignments

In doing the first assignment, all the groups confronted similar difficulties. We did not expect this part of the assignment to be simple. It required students to become conversant with the techniques of drawing problem trees and associated forms of systemic representations as well as to understand the policy issues intimately. The logical structure of problem trees was understood by most students, but the drawing of the problem trees themselves raised several challenges.

• First, students often confused cause and effect, and this meant that they provided an incorrect hierarchical presentation of the problems.
• Second, students found it difficult to deal with sets of problems that were interconnected and that reinforced each other. In other words, they had difficulty in representing problems that were circular. One of the groups reported that they used mind map software (e.g., FreeMind or any of the other widely available freeware)—which graphically presents relationships among ideas and among pieces of information—to overcome the limitations of the vertical logic structure imposed by problem trees. This helped them trace and represent
problems that have more of a feedback character than a simpler, unidirectional cause-effect character.

- Third, the sheer volume of discrete problems appeared to overwhelm the groups in terms of finding a way to represent them in a problem-tree format. Students resolved this dilemma by dividing the problems into different “families” and tackling each family of problems separately.

The stakeholder analysis presented fewer challenges. Most mistakes were committed when students tended to agglomerate discrete and distinct interests under overly broad headings such as “government” or “private sector,” thus failing to recognize the diversity of impacts and interests found within them.

The exercise to develop the multi-criteria analysis did not present significant problems. The assignment stated that students were required to develop a set of criteria, with a set of weights attached, by which their own and other policy proposals could be evaluated. The purpose in developing these criteria was to assist in dealing with trade-offs among competing and simultaneously desirable outcomes, which are inherent in complex policy proposals. The weights were supposed to reflect a ranking of priorities that would be acceptable to a broad group of concerned stakeholders. The students were cautioned that the setting up of relative weights, as one of the more subjective elements of multi-criteria analysis, was prone to abuse and manipulation; and so they needed to have good, plausible arguments to support their assignments of weights. With encouragement from the instructors, students displayed some creativity in coming up with these weights. Two groups choose to survey what they called an expert population (culled from the student and faculty population at our institute) and used the weights on the results of these surveys; a third group found a journal article and used the weights assigned therein. Groups were, in addition, warned that criteria should not be applied mechanically. There might well be minimum necessary levels of achievement on some criteria, which every acceptable option must fulfill regardless of how well it performs in terms of the other criteria. This could be particularly pertinent in relation to access to drinking water and assurance of ecosystem stability.

In the second assignment, we noted that the Water groups, who had worked on a task where various public sector reform packages are widely available and disseminated in the literature, showed less creative thought than we desired, and this persisted through to the final policy proposals. Students presented prepackaged solutions. To counterbalance this and to stretch their minds, we required that the Water groups explore in detail the case both for and against more than one option. For example, one group prepared such argument analyses for each of three different responses to the urban water and sanitation case: privatization, a public-private partnership (involving a concession for a fixed period), and a
management contract in which public ownership and strategic control would be combined with private sector management and operational control.

The three sections of the final reports submitted by the students were often linked in a somewhat disjointed manner, perhaps due to time limitations. This is not surprising given the stage of the overall study program in which these reports were due. Most of our students cannot yet have detailed sectoral knowledge (here, on environment) or theme knowledge (e.g., on different models of public sector reform and privatization) if they have not already taken courses on them.

However, we found that the final reports incorporated a fairly sophisticated understanding of policy issues, including how different components of the issues are interlinked and, often, how desired policy objectives are mutually incompatible, therefore requiring trade-offs, compromises, and design of tailor-made packages that contain multiple complementary measures. For example, in the Water groups, one group supplemented its advocacy of a management contract system by identifying supplementary projects whereby access for poorer people would be promoted. The other Water group picked up and advocated the less standard public-public partnership model, in a variant with echoes of David Ellerman’s model (2004, 2005) of learning from local successes and south-south cross-fertilization, which we discuss during the course. Further, the latter group assessed their two policy options—public-public partnership versus a combination of build-operate-transfer for new infrastructure and operation-and-maintenance-contract for existing infrastructure—in terms of not only a multi-criteria set of desiderata but also a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats (SWOT) analysis to think outside conventional expectations. This proved decisive for their deliberations, leading to adoption of an option that scored lower on the multi-criteria analysis but faced fewer risks and opposition.

4. Reflecting on the PAP in Terms of Skills Development and Achievement of Learning Objectives

In reflecting on two pedagogical models in a recent article, O’Hare (2008) advocated strongly what he called Theory C (for coaching) Pedagogy as providing a better match to what students will later have to do in the workplace. He points out further advantages of Theory C teaching, such as obtaining more participation and less passivity from students, building more capacity for independent and creative thinking, and improving interpersonal skills.

In addition to these, we find several other advantages to the PAP in terms of achieving policy-specific learning objectives, both for general policy analysis skills and in environmental issues analysis. We obtained these additional benefits by making a more or less equal marriage of Theory C Pedagogy, represented by the PAP, with Theory T (or traditional lecture format) Pedagogy, which formed the basis of the lectures. We summarize these advantages next.
Skills to Find, Integrate, and Analyze Facts: The Value of Student-Generated Material

The PAP helped students to develop a deeper understanding of the techniques of policy analysis as well as of the substantive policy issues they tackled. The exercises required extensive student effort in synthesizing material and generating arguments and presentations. This was, as mentioned earlier, a time-consuming process. There is little doubt that if the students had spent more time in reading and reviewing material rather than preparing presentations and reports, they could have accessed a larger volume of relevant literature. However, the focus on obtaining more long-term learning and skills versus acquiring more short-term knowledge appears to be worth it. The value of student-generated material in the learning process is well known. A paper by Goberts & Clement (1999) tested this hypothesis, comparing the learning effects of student-generated information and arguments vis-à-vis summarizing of texts. In their study, students were given a text to read and then were divided into two groups: One group was asked to draw diagrams explaining the concepts in the reading while another group was required to write a summary of these concepts. The researchers found that although the students who drew the diagrams were able to convey less information than those who summarized the reading, they outperformed the other students in tests that measure descriptive and causal understanding of the reading. In our case, we found that having to build policy arguments by themselves forced students to develop a deeper understanding of processes, interlinkages, and underlying logic than they would have if we had placed greater emphasis on absorbing factual material and relatively passively ingesting other people’s viewpoints.

Skills to Reason, Debate, and Deliberate

We found that the PAP was useful in honing deliberative skills. Having students “compete” on the PAP by setting up two groups to argue each issue facilitated skills development in reasoning, debating, and defending positions. Controversy encourages students to review known facts, identify additional information required to solve a problem and make a case, and continue the search to find and critically examine new information. Moreover, we find that one great advantage of the debate format in developing these skills is that critique from student peers is more likely to elicit enthusiastic rebuttals and active argumentation and learning, in comparison to gloomily accepted instructor criticism. The utility of debate and controversy as a learning tool is supported by other researchers (Ballantyne & Bain, 1995; Schweizer & Kelly, 2005), who found that confronting students with alternative viewpoints and evidence challenges and enhances their conceptions of issues and that, as a result of such teaching methods, students are able to formulate their own positions more clearly, better understand the viewpoints of others, and become aware of the inadequacies and inconsistencies in any given conception.
In addition, requiring the use of structured formats—such as showing argumentation structure and presenting and debating competing positions—promoted active student learning, produced a more realistic view about the issues (especially about the limitations of any particular argument), and introduced political and social dimensions and their interactions with other argumentation. We would add here that the role of the “Unless” column in the Toulmin-George table and of the “Tests” stage in the Hambrick format proved important in obliging students to pay systematic attention to finding and assessing objections and qualifications for every proposed item of data and every proposed warrant. It helped build students’ habits of care, precision, and judgment and improved their ability to construct new and alternative policy proposals that grow out of some of the objections. While the Toulmin-George and Hambrick formats are extremely useful also in teaching outside of a large course project—they serve most of these roles even via small exercises—deepened reflection on warrants, and in particular on sources of authority and purposes, becomes more widespread among students through the more intense and difficult experience of a large project.

**Skills to Recognize Values and Make Value Judgments**

Through the PAPs, we were able to better address the issue of value judgments. This issue has several aspects. One is that value judgments are implicit in many policy contexts even though policy analyses often present themselves as value-neutral. In the PAP exercises, we encouraged students to address the issue explicitly by using the Hambrick format. In the format’s extended version (Gasper, 1996), the second stage in dissecting the logic of a policy proposal articulates its significant value assumptions. Further, since value judgments are judgments, not mere opinions or intuitions, both policy argumentation formats—the Toulmin-George synthesis table, too—helped students to deepen their sense of how the selection of processes and criteria to make a policy judgment contain embedded value judgments. Next, while Corney (1998) found that in the teaching of environmental issues the teachers must make value judgments, we felt it would be counterproductive to intrude strongly into the process of value formation and did not ourselves take an explicit stance here. We instead presented a series of relevant, but possibly conflicting, major values and value perspectives—human rights, economic growth, notions of equity, principles of sustainability, and so on—without establishing a set of predefined values; and we constructed the exercise as a policy debate that encouraged, and often even required, students to explore and propound diametrically opposed viewpoints. The PAP format thus required the instructors to remain value-neutral but at the same time be available and engaged in order to provide concrete suggestions regarding the value content and logic of each set of arguments and to push students to consider more carefully the character and range of the values they had used, explicitly or implicitly. For example, we asked students to reflect on the value assumptions built into
economic cost-benefit analyses (e.g., Etzioni, 1995; Hoksbergen, 1986; Shue, 2006), on the alternative values represented in human rights–based approaches (Gready & Ensor, 2005), and on the values contained within different processes of discussion according to their degrees and forms of public participation.

Skills for Policy Analysis and Debate Under Complexity, Uncertainty, and Ambiguity

The PAP format was useful in developing skills related to policy analysis and policymaking under conditions of complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity, which are characteristic of a range of major policy debates including environmental policy issues such as climate change. The approach we adopted requires students to delay the gratification of instant solutions to pressing policy problems and exchange it for the pleasures (and frustrations) of a more profound exposure to the technical complexities of an issue, the various stakeholders involved in them, and the debated and diverse possible roles of science and politics and the interactions among them (Verweij & Thompson, 2006). By actively courting complexity and controversy, we confronted students with classic ethical dilemmas, such as: Should protecting the forests be prioritized over improving livelihoods? Who sets the values? Who are the legitimate actors? In the Trees case, by issuing the challenge of presenting a local issue (deforestation) embedded in a cross-border environmental issue (climate change), we were able to include discussions about issues of global justice and address some of the tensions that permeate these issues, such as the observation that the worst environmental degradations exist in the poorest communities. In doing so, we feel we succeeded in tying environmental issues to other agendas and taught students how better to engage in the contemporary debates.

5. Conclusions

We have described use of a large-scale policy analysis project in a central rather than peripheral role in a graduate-level core course on policy analysis. There are several pitfalls in running such a project, and in retrospect we see important ways to streamline the activity while fulfilling the same learning objectives. In our enthusiasm to capture as far as possible the reality of a policy investigation, we left students with many open choices that they gradually formulated and negotiated, but only after a large investment of time in group discussions. Many students reported diversion away from other courses and from preparing for this course’s examination. Some streamlining of the project is needed to keep it consistent with the time slot available, since it is part of one course run at the same time as students take one or usually two others rather than a self-contained short course. Indeed, one of the main reasons proffered to explain why coaching-type teaching is not more widespread is that it requires a considerable time commitment on the part of the instructors, and we can confirm this claim (O’Hare, 2008).

We would need also to establish a better balance between group work and individual work, to ensure some report sections have only one author (some
students chose to coauthor sections and receive a joint grade) and to assign sections or approve an allocation of sections that ensures a required minimum and maximum load per person. The most popular type of assignment that we traditionally used—writing a structured policy options paper on a topic selected by the student but requiring approval by the instructor—no doubt eliminated free-riding, but free-riding in the PAP was at least reduced when compared to the shorter case-study workshops we previously conducted.

We also need to improve assessment methods. Lipsey (2008) points out that coaching-type pedagogy has an apparent uncertainty of outcome because testing for student achievement cannot be specified in the same way that tests and problem sets assess student achievement in traditional teaching formats. We can confirm some of the concerns expressed by Lipsey. One could remark that this is more reflective of real-world situations where individuals’ “assessments” are strongly conditioned by the performance of their group, but this argument will not suffice in the academic sphere. Our new design, which assesses students for their individual contribution to a group report, very likely makes individual failures rarer. Further, the quality of the strongest work done in pure individual essay format was higher than that done in group format. On the other hand, the quality of work by the poorer participants was clearly pulled up, and they and the middle students are intensively exposed to the work of their most able colleagues. Conversely, the most talented students gain from the more intensive exposure to the inputs and often considerable experience and insight of their less academically talented fellows.

At the same time, we saw significant learning gains. By its nature, policy studies is an integrative field that requires students and practitioners to develop a breadth of mind and understanding, awareness, and appreciation of other people’s ideas and ways of thinking in other fields. Policy studies require persons trained in one discipline to have the ability to synthesize and apply the insights of related fields and to think expansively, drawing on more than just narrow disciplinary knowledge to address problems. They put a premium on skills of research, critical thinking, information processing, sense making, and judgment. The PAP, complemented by traditional classroom lectures, facilitated a deeper immersion in the practice of techniques of policy analysis, which in turn helped develop the desired policy analysis skills. We found students progressed in terms of maturity, sensibility, and creativity, as well as being more systematic in their thinking and more independent in their reasoning, in the end turning less to the instructors to “tell” them what the right answer is. Table 2 summarizes our findings related to using the PAP, following De Bono’s (1995) Plus-Minus-Interesting format (PMI; see, e.g., Portmann & Easterbrook, 1992). In addition to its pluses and minuses, we include a number of more ambiguous features under the “Interesting” column.
Table 2.
*PMI Table of Restructured Policy Analysis Course Incorporating PAP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Plus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Minus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interesting</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotes analytic reasoning and debate skills.</td>
<td>1. Requires increased time commitments for instructors and students.</td>
<td>1. Simulates real-world work conditions in terms of time pressures, working in teams, and satisficing: reveals both the joys and sorrows of policy analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotes independent thinking.</td>
<td>2. Increased time commitments and teamwork requirements sometimes create stressful situations for students.</td>
<td>2. Generates “creative confusion.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promotes collaborative work skills.</td>
<td>3. Creates more difficulties in individual performance assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotes research skills.</td>
<td>4. Allows some free-riding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allows fairly in-depth exposure to substantive (e.g., environmental) issues within a core graduate policy curriculum course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivates self-directed learning as an attitude and as a skill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explicitly addresses value issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Balances theory with coaching; promotes linkages between the two strands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

In concluding, we believe that by having sustained group work on specific policy topics, we got for most students a better payoff in terms of broad learning about generic themes in policy analysis than we have traditionally obtained by concentrating on the generic themes and having a series of far less integrated workshops and then a separate, purely individual assignment. We got a larger group of students to think more deeply about environmental policy and its implications for development than we could have by offering a specialized but elective environmental policy course. We exposed students to a substantial depth in environmental issues, but we did not attempt to impart encyclopedic knowledge about the field—which is, like many others, simply too large, too sprawling, and too complex for nonprofessionals to quickly grasp. Instead, we focused on developing skills in the broader analytic and argumentative techniques in policy analysis that will enable students to develop the competencies to contribute more thoughtfully, effectively, and equitably in policy processes. We tried to minimize the forgone benefits of not imparting encyclopedic knowledge by stressing that students develop search skills that, in an Internet age, will allow them to rapidly access and evaluate relevant information. In doing so, we taught process more than content. For a core course in a Public Policy and Management specialization, this approach served us fairly well in developing the core skills described in Section 2 of this article. We found too that with this balance there was no resentment among students over our choice to expose them to environmental policy issues throughout the 12 weeks of the course.
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Appendix
Illustration of the Hambrick Format

STAGE 1: Cause-Effect

CAUSAL PROPOSITIONS
If government ensures sustainable management of forest resources, the rate of deforestation will decrease.

GROUNDING PROPOSITIONS
Government failures allow preventable deforestation to happen.
Deforestation poses a threat to functioning of ecosystems and well-being of future generations due to its negative effect on physical and social environment.
Sustainable management of forest resources will balance indefinite needs for forest outputs with the preservation of the critical level of forest vitality and stability.

INSTRUMENTAL PROPOSITIONS
C1 Systematic management will ensure better monitoring and control over forest covers and losses.
C2.1 Coherent national legal framework for forest protection will require economic activities in forests to be environmentally and socially responsible.
C2.2 Increased environmental control will ensure supervision and prevention of illegal deforestation practices.
C3.1 Strengthened capacity of institutions will allow for improved sectoral governance.
C3.2 Decrease in antagonistic policy and institutional interplay in different sectors will lead to improved implementation practices.
C4.1 Institutionalization of participatory planning and public deliberation practices, along with awareness-raising will foster compromise and creative solutions to conflicts over resources.
C4.2 Renegotiation of concessions to the private sector will help mitigate negative effects of economic activities and generate a fair share of public revenue.

STAGE 2: Means-Ends

NORMATIVE PROPOSITIONS
Current and future generations have a right to access to essential resources.
Current and future generations have a right to live in a safe environment and enjoy their cultural adobe.
Government has a responsibility to ensure well-being and satisfaction of human rights of its people.
Sustainability and participatory planning should be a priority in government’s forestry policies.

Action → Valued Impacts
If sustainable forest management practices are introduced, along with the proposed policy measures, current and future generations will be able to lead healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.
### STAGE 3: Tests

#### CONSTRAINTS PROPOSITIONS
- Sustainable management of forest resources and strengthened environmental control would have budgetary and human constraints.
- Economic recession may limit government expenditure for sustainable environment.
- Government might lack political will to prioritize sustainable forestry practices.

#### COMPARATIVE PROPOSITIONS
- Market-based regulation is not in line with the principles of sustainable development and would lead to rapid forest depletion and environmental degradation.
- Market-based regulation is profit-driven and would not guarantee well-being and satisfaction of human rights of all citizens.
- A system of incentives will have to be created for stakeholders to comply with the proposed policy measures.
- Cross-sectoral approach to changes in land use policy, coherent with the proposed policy measures, will have to be adopted.

#### TIME-PLACE PROPOSITIONS
- Recent [WWF report](https://www.wwf.org.uk) shows that unsustainable exploitation of the Amazon’s forest resources is a major cause of deforestation ([WWF Netherlands 2009](https://www.wwf.org.uk)).
- [GEO Amazonia report](https://www.goeamazonia.org) demonstrates the avoidance of worst outcomes from forest loss and ecosystem destruction in Amazon area countries can be ensured only in case of urgent government action ([UNEP 2009](https://www.unep.org)).

#### EXTERNAL IMPACT PROPOSITIONS
- Requirements of sustainability may impose limits on the scale of short-term economic growth.
- Strict forestry regulations may discourage investment of foreign capital.
- The proposed measures will cause diversion of resources from other sectors.
- Compliance with international environmental accords may help the government raise funds for sectoral development.
- Government may receive payment for eco-services provided by the rainforest.
- Social conflicts in communities, between stakeholders and with government may reduce in the long term.
- Public and corporate culture based on social responsibility and legal compliance will be promoted in the country.
- Systematic and transparent policymaking in the sector may attract foreign direct investment.
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- Requirements of sustainability may impose limits on the scale of short-term economic growth.
- Strict forestry regulations may discourage investment of foreign capital.
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#### CONSTRAINTS PROPOSITIONS
- Sustainable management of forest resources and strengthened environmental control would have budgetary and human constraints.
- Economic recession may limit government expenditure for sustainable environment.
- Government might lack political will to prioritize sustainable forestry practices.

#### TIME-PLACE PROPOSITIONS
- Recent [WWF report](https://www.wwf.org.uk) shows that unsustainable exploitation of the Amazon’s forest resources is a major cause of deforestation ([WWF Netherlands 2009](https://www.wwf.org.uk)).
- [GEO Amazonia report](https://www.goeamazonia.org) demonstrates the avoidance of worst outcomes from forest loss and ecosystem destruction in Amazon area countries can be ensured only in case of urgent government action ([UNEP 2009](https://www.unep.org)).

#### EXTERNAL IMPACT PROPOSITIONS
- Requirements of sustainability may impose limits on the scale of short-term economic growth.
- Strict forestry regulations may discourage investment of foreign capital.
- The proposed measures will cause diversion of resources from other sectors.
- Compliance with international environmental accords may help the government raise funds for sectoral development.
- Government may receive payment for eco-services provided by the rainforest.
- Social conflicts in communities, between stakeholders and with government may reduce in the long term.
- Public and corporate culture based on social responsibility and legal compliance will be promoted in the country.
- Systematic and transparent policymaking in the sector may attract foreign direct investment.

### Policy Action Proposal

Sustainable management of forest resources should be introduced by the government.
- Coherent legal framework for forest protection should be created.
- Environmental control should also be increased.
- Capacity of governmental institutions involved with the forestry sector should be strengthened.
- Intra-governmental coordination and policy adaptation should be ensured.
- Participatory planning should be institutionalized, and environmental awareness promoted.
- Concession contracts should be renegotiated.

If such policies are implemented, the rate of deforestation will decrease.

---

*Note. From Group 3 final submission for Course 4209 PAP, ISS MA program, 2008–2009.*
What Business Schools Can Learn From Public Management—and Vice Versa

Reginald Shareef
Radford University

Abstract
Continuing 21st-century Wall Street ethical scandals have triggered calls, by leading business school professors and others, for major reforms in the MBA curriculum. The goal of this reform movement is to challenge the dominance of the nonnormative organizational economics paradigm in MBA education by introducing a management model that features both efficiency and ethics as co-equal determinants of organizational outcomes. The article argues that diffusing public management’s market efficiency/public failure model across the MBA curriculum would accomplish the reformer’s institutional and societal objectives. Moreover, the implementation and diffusion of this construct into the MBA curriculum would both (a) help public management escape the intellectual absolutism of what Kelman (2007) calls the “public administration ghetto” and (b) enhance the discipline’s reputation as an ethical decision-making model in the marketplace of management ideas.

Sumantra Ghoshal’s (2005) seminal Academy of Learning & Education article “Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices” argues that a causal relationship exists between two value-free, economic-based theories taught in MBA programs and subsequent Wall Street ethical scandals. This market-driven educational framework combines agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) and transaction cost economics (Williamson, 1985) and is commonly referred to by public and business management scholars as organizational economics (Donaldson, 2005; Terry, 1999). Research shows that many of the business enterprises involved in 21st-century corporate malfeasance were headed by leaders holding the MBA degree (Holland, 2009).

Ghoshal’s (2005) call for MBA reform is twofold: (a) to make ethical management as important a strategic objective as profit maximization in the training of future managers; and (b) to diffuse the teachings that efficiency and ethics are coequal values across the MBA curriculum in order to undermine behavioral assumptions of organizational economics that human beings are motivated solely by self-interest. Ghoshal views organizational economics as a paradigm-based
form of *intellectual absolutism* that can be challenged only by *intellectual pluralism*; that is, normative management theories from within the social science field. Consequently, several prominent business school professors believe a reintroduction of normative management theory into the MBA curriculum should come from public administration with its focus on the public interest (Mitroff & Swanson, 2004; Walsh, Weber, & Margolis, 2003).

**The Market Efficiency/Public Failure Model**

Bozeman’s (2002, 2007) market efficiency/public failure model offers a viable public management construct that meets Ghoshal’s (2005) reform criteria. He accepts the economic assumption that market efficiency, in which prices act as a coordinating mechanism, is an effective framework to facilitate public agency delivery of goods and services (Bozeman, 2002). Yet, his analysis recognizes that often “prices ‘lie’—that is, when the prices of goods and services give false signals about their real value, confounding the communication between consumer and producer” (Bozeman, 2002, p. 146). These market distortions can have positive economic outcomes for the business firm (i.e., profit maximization) and public agency (i.e., budget surpluses) but negative socioeconomic outcomes for the broader society when institutions do not produce essential public values like (a) the right to subsistence or (b) non-dehumanizing management processes (Bozeman, 2002).

Bozeman (2002, 2007) calls the institutional inability to deliver core public values—because of market dynamics including imperfect monopolies, benefit hoarding, and scarcity of providers—public failure. Moreover, he argues, “A fundamental assumption of the public-failure model is that market failure actually tells us about whether government should intervene” (Bozeman, 2002, p. 150). Consequently, the model identifies the management paradox that efficient markets are often the catalyst for public failure and subsequent government intervention in market activities.¹

Moore (1995) conceptualizes public values as a correlate to private values that are measured by stakeholder return. The public value concept moves beyond the ill-defined idea of the public interest and represents a normative theory of public management (Bozeman, 2002). In sum, when efficient markets fail to produce public value (i.e., moral economics producing social good), government intervention is necessary to prevent public failure (Bozeman, 2002).

Bozeman’s (2007) model encourages managers to engage in efficient market activities but provides an ethical “tipping point” to prevent market efficiency from leading to public failure. He contends that market-based theories like organizational economics dominate institutional decision-making processes at the expense of the common good. Additionally, Bozeman (2007) argues that the market efficiency/public failure model is often a more effective distributional framework of public values than market-based pricing structures.
Thanassoulis’s (2009) account of Merrill Lynch’s executive bonus pay just before it was purchased by Bank of America (using taxpayer dollars) provides a good example of market efficiency leading to public failure. He explains how corporate management allows traders in investment banks to take greater risks in order to maximize profit and, thus, their annual bonuses. Thanassoulis does not oppose trader incentive contracts but believes legislation that restricts bonuses paid to senior employees of firms that received federal bailout dollars is appropriate and creates a disincentive to future excessive risk taking. Because of Merrill’s executive actions and aroused public opinion over bailed-out banks and taxpayer-funded bonuses, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi was able pass legislation that placed bonus pay caps on these financial institutions.

Lindblom (1977) found that when business organizations fail to respond to social crises (i.e., public failure), politicians are quick to introduce regulatory mechanisms. He calls these government polices business defeats since corporate leaders intensely dislike government interventions in market activities (Sowell, 2004). Conversely, public policy entrepreneurs look for economic and social opportunities to intervene in private markets (Kingdon, 1995).

It is precisely at the peak of market efficiency—when unmet social needs, aroused public opinion, and activist public policy entrepreneurship coalesce—that public failure occurs. MBA students can be taught the socioeconomic conditions under which businesses can and cannot profitably operate. Obviously, the public failure arena is one area wherein market efficiency will be constrained by regulatory intervention.

There is an additional reason why Bozeman’s model would likely be successful in triggering MBA curriculum reform. Critical management theory (CMT), which utilizes multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving, is becoming an increasingly important institutional component of MBA redesign (Wallace, 2010). Zald’s (2002) CMT research concludes that four criteria are necessary for successfully introducing a normative management model into graduate business education: (a) The replacement theory must emerge as a result of social crises and demands for ethical management; (b) the construct has to endorse capitalism and focus on the business firms’ operating political context; (c) the normative component of MBA reorientation must be based in political concepts like citizenship, rights, empowerment, and democratic accountability (e.g., participative management); and (d) academic disciplinary and subdisciplinary change is triggered through borrowings across subdisciplines and orientations. The market efficiency/public failure model meets all of Zald’s (2002) CMT criteria for facilitating change in a social science discipline.

Finally, Shareef (2008) reports success in teaching MBA students ethical management using the market efficiency/public failure model. He notes these students were surprised to find (a) how relatively easily managers can determine the tipping point when market efficiency triggers public failure and (b) that
profitability and managerial ethics can coexist. Students also learned how ethical management leads to needed positive image constructions and reconstructions for public consumption by media elites, even during periods of economic downturn.

**The Public Administration Ghetto**

Based on the preceding discussion, it seems that Bozeman’s (2002, 2007) public management framework would be an excellent reform model for the MBA curriculum. Ghoshal (2005) recognizes there will be resistance to reform from many business school faculty but believes the deans of business schools are the key institutional actors in facilitating this transformation. He suggests that the deans take the leadership role in recruiting and promoting professors who endorse intellectual pluralism models like market efficiency/public failure.

Yet, a fundamental question is, would the field of public management be receptive to such a multidisciplinary sharing? The answer is not clear. Kelman (2007) writes convincingly about the *separatist* turn the field has taken over the past 25 years by fixating on the “public” part of public organization while neglecting the “organization” part that connects the field to the larger world of organization studies. Thus Kelman’s (2007) ghetto analogy focuses on the socially constructed reality that public management’s contemporary identity is primarily shaped by its *uniqueness* features rather than its generic characteristics that would allow the study of agencies and firms together.

Perry and Kraemer’s (1991, p. 8) writings helped solidify the uniqueness identity of the public management discipline. In contrast to administrative science’s generic management approach, these authors ask, “And, would profit-conscious ‘business school types’ appreciate the value of the public interest as an important aspect of administrative science?” They conclude that the answer is less than comforting and close by stating, “the other perspective is of public administration as a special activity, involving public interest values, public goods, and social affairs.” Wamsley’s (1990) discussion of the *Blacksburg Manifesto* and Pollitt’s (1990) work sounded similar uniqueness themes.

However, in the same article, Perry and Kraemer (1991) also explicitly state there is much to share between public and private management. Much of their concern with the administrative science paradigm was the call by some public administration theorists for organizational economics (renamed public entrepreneurship) to be taught in MPA programs and accepted in the profession as the construct for improving agency efficiency performance. Predictably, this advocacy generated strong resistance from other public administration scholars due to the nonnormative orientation of organizational economics, distorted views of human nature, and threats to democratic accountability (Terry, 1998, 1999).

Moynihan’s (2008) advocacy for a marriage between the market and normative models demonstrates how multidisciplinary sharing between public and...
private management can occur. This union is designed so the normative model limits the excesses of the market model in management processes. That is, the normative component of a public management model will not allow utilitarian incentives to “crowd out” intrinsic (Frey & Osterloh, 2005) or altruistic public service motivations (Perry, 2007; Perry, Brudney, Coursey, & Littlepage, 2008).

Consequently, public management is not as separatist as Kelman (2007) and others interpret the uniqueness framework. However, implementing the market efficiency/public failure model in the MBA curriculum means the emergence of a reconstituted public management paradigm prominently featuring a linguistic reinterpretation of the uniqueness concept (e.g., Pfeffer, 1981). This new paradigm constitutes what Weick (2003) calls a cosmology episode, where a phenomenon is so novel that everything seems strange and unfamiliar.

Thus, “meaning” for the reconstituted paradigm can be established only if non-neutral, socially constructed terms like uniqueness are reinterpreted by the academic discipline’s exemplars after cosmology episodes (Pfeffer, 1981; Weick, 2003).

Learning Outcomes for Business and Public Management

If business school leaders accept that public management’s market efficiency/public failure model meets Ghoshal’s (2005) criteria as an intellectual pluralism construct for teaching ethics across the MBA curriculum, they will (a) escape their own ghetto of organizational economics–inspired intellectual absolutism and (b) avoid the risk of the MBA becoming irrelevant in solving society’s managerial and ethical dilemmas (Navarro, 2008; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). Furthermore, if introduced, these leaders would learn how the social sciences can provide actual help in the rational reconstruction of society’s valued institutions (Ghoshal, 2005).

Likewise, if this normative model is implemented in MBA education, public management scholars will learn several invaluable lessons. First, Perry and Kramer’s (1991) uniqueness argument does not constitute intellectual absolutism. Rather, their argument possesses a powerful sharing component that allows the transmission of normative management and political values to business management theory. Second, the discipline’s scholars will better understand that the MBA borrowing of Bozeman’s public values concept enhances public management as an ethical decision-making model in the management idea marketplace (Davenport, Prusak, & Wilson, 2003). Finally, in escaping the public administration ghetto, public management scholars will be able to make sense of how the intellectual pluralism of the market efficiency/public failure paradox enhances rather than diminishes public management as a unique normative enterprise.
What Business Schools Can Learn
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FOOTNOTE

Throughout this discussion, it is important to keep in mind that the terms *efficiency* and *market efficiency* are used to indicate private efficiency for the firm (e.g., profitability) and are not used in the social welfare economics sense.
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Reflections on Evolution in the Use of Information Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning: From the University of the West Indies, to the United States, and Back Again

Charlene M. L. Roach

The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine

This reflection provides my perspective as someone who has experienced the University of the West Indies (UWI), St. Augustine Campus, in Trinidad and Tobago (TT) as an undergraduate and postgraduate student. I then traveled to the United States for masters and doctoral work and have since returned to serve UWI as a faculty member. It highlights the changes I observed in UWI’s approach to using information technology (IT) to enhance teaching and learning. It also reflects on how my perspectives evolved as I was exposed to using IT in the United States as a graduate student and teaching associate, and on how I am able to embrace the changes I see at UWI as a faculty member.

This reflection is relevant to diverse audiences. It can be of interest to international students who, like myself, have studied in the United States for many years and will return home to work as faculty members at their local universities. It can be of interest to prospective students or faculty members from countries outside the United States who may in the future visit the United States as exchange students or visiting scholars. It can be of interest to Americans who will visit other countries as teachers or visiting faculty. Finally, it can be of interest to those who may be on the cusp between embracing or resisting the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning.

My experience of teaching and learning as an undergraduate student in the Faculty of Arts was characterized by didactic techniques. This was typified by the use of lecture notes, “chalk and talk,” and very little interaction. This was the model of both delivery (teaching) and learning. Classrooms were lecture theaters, where faculty members delivered a lecture for about 2 hours. The extent of post-blackboard technology was the use of acetate overhead slides. This system was supported by tutorials for which smaller groups of students met with a tutor, yet even in the smaller tutorials there was a reliance on chalk, talk, paper, and ink to exchange ideas and transfer knowledge. Students took copious notes of the lec-
tures that were delivered live, and if you happened to miss a class you got the notes from others who attended the lectures. We developed the habit as students of photocopying notes if we succeeded in getting someone to share them. Assignments were accepted in longhand, with the sole exception of the final-year project, which had to be typed and bound. Grades and comments on assignments were paper based. Other resources outside the classroom reinforced this kind of approach and relied largely on paper and hard copies. For instance, the library services consisted of an old-fashioned catalog system that was manually organized and managed. Thus, to carry out research, you had to be there physically in the library.

From my learner’s perspective, this was a passive way of learning. I listened, made notes, and had little interaction with my professors. In classes, the capacity of my learning relied on my ability as an individual to listen and take notes and, outside of classes, to do additional reading through the library services. Despite all this, I excelled because this mode of delivery, I later discovered, suited my learning styles, which are auditory and read-write (Gardner, 1999). On reflection, whereas it suited me, it was probably limiting to other students who had different learning styles such as visual and kinesthetic (Gardner, 1999).

After graduating with my BA in History, I worked for three years in the public sector and then returned to UWI on a part-time basis to pursue a postgraduate diploma in public administration at the Faculty of Social Sciences. I found that little had changed in the learning and teaching environment: Talk and chalk was still the primary medium for learning and teaching. However, the library was changing its approach by using and experimenting with IT to improve and expand its services and facilities (e.g., by adding online catalogs, online databases, and electronic journals). This was making an incremental difference in the ways students could conduct research and access materials for their courses.

In 1999, I left Trinidad and Tobago to pursue my graduate education in the United States. I spent eight years at Arizona State University (ASU) where, in contrast with my earlier experiences at UWI, the use of IT was central to my learning and teaching. Initially, this was challenging for me since I had to overcome my relative lack of IT experience. Once I gained competence with the new IT skills, however, they became routine. I grew to expect them in my classes—whether as teacher or student—and in the ASU libraries.

I returned to UWI armed with a repertoire of IT skills and experiences I learned at ASU. In my first year as a faculty member, I was prepared to implement many IT techniques in my delivery of courses to enhance teaching and learning outcomes compared to my own experiences as a UWI student. To my great surprise, the landscape of UWI had dramatically changed with respect to IT and its role in teaching and learning. In those intervening years, UWI had developed a strategy that promoted and encouraged the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning. This was part of an overall greater emphasis on teaching and the scholarship of teaching.
One of the first things I noticed was the existence of an Instructional Development Unit (IDU). This unit is charged with the responsibility to oversee and lead the course of this change. It functions as a center for teaching and learning excellence for UWI St. Augustine. In October of 2007, IDU revised its goals to reflect the current Strategic Plan of UWI (UWI, 2010). These goals include the following:

- Promoting best practices in teaching at UWI
- Fostering the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Elevating the status of teaching at the St. Augustine Campus
- Certifying teaching through formalized programs
- Guiding the curriculum review process and approving curriculum documentation
- Becoming the authority for research on higher education in the Caribbean

On its website, IDU illustrates that it seeks to “perform a combination of academic, administrative, consultative and technological functions . . . workshops, [programs], and services are aimed at equipping teaching staff with the pedagogical skills and techniques needed for promoting student learning and achievement at the St. Augustine Campus” (UWI, 2010).

In so doing, IDU has been successful in providing workshops and activities to support “the purposeful use of information and communication technologies in learning and teaching” (UWI, 2010). Every semester, IDU organizes a calendar of events and workshops that highlight various aspects of using IT in the classroom and provide faculty members and tutors with a range of areas in which to hone their skills. Some examples of these workshop themes are plagiarism detection using Turnitin software, recording and sharing lectures using Camtasia software, and using myeLearning to support teaching and learning. In other workshops, participants learn how to create and use podcasts, blogs, wikis, video clips, and other information and communication technologies to enhance faculty members’ teaching effectiveness and the learning outcomes of students.

All of these IDU activities have allowed faculty members to be exposed to continuous expert training in using these technologies and new forms of media, and at the same time to have support while they are implementing and experimenting with them. For their part, students are being exposed to all kinds of IT in the classroom through PowerPoint lectures, use of video clips, and other IT support systems to equip them for a digital world and with technical skills in their coursework assignments and activities. MyeLearning is a free course management system similar to what I was exposed to at ASU in using Blackboard. Using this free course management system helps UWI, in a developing economy, to use IT and improve the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and,
at the same time, to manage its expenditures. In using myeLearning, students can download their lecture outlines before coming to classes, do online quizzes, submit coursework assignments, download supplementary course materials, be provided with links to URLs and library services (e.g., electronic journals and databases), register for tutorial sessions (e.g., some departments created e-tutorials for management students), and communicate with their classmates and professors more effectively.

IDU is also promoting SoTL using e-conferences such as its 2009 eLearning Conference as a framework that UWI St. Augustine can use to create a community of sharing among faculty members and the wider world. Additionally, while these e-conferences help those of our island nation to interact with others off-island, they also present opportunities for IT that are particularly suited to our culture. For example, the plenary speaker at the 2009 e-conference presented a research work in progress: Her team created an e-learning software platform titled Burrokeet, which allows for the creation of content packages (Bernard & Ramnanan, 2009). This software generated websites for secondary schools and allowed students with very little knowledge of IT to create and manage websites for their schools. This research team is transforming SoTL through this project, and they have partnered with the Ministry of Education to use it as a pilot project among secondary school students. This work is demonstrating that students are able to understand IT as an abstract subject using software that incorporates fun and lots of interaction into their learning (Bernard & Ramnanan, 2009).

IDU is helping faculty members to have a greater appreciation of their teaching effectiveness. Every two years, they present teaching awards (The UWI/ Guardian Life Premium Teaching Excellence Award) through a highly competitive process to faculty members showing excellence in SoTL. This provides an opportunity to showcase faculty members who have raised the bar in the quality of teaching and learning via their practice and the ways they are able to engage their students effectively. These successful faculty members all use IT in some ways and are able to engage their students in dynamic ways. This year, the award will focus on how IT is being used to enhance SoTL at UWI St. Augustine Campus. I am eager to see the kinds of portfolios presented and the rich and unique ways that faculty members from multidisciplinary backgrounds are using IT to achieve interactive learning environments.

On reflection, I can say that IT has taken center stage in its role of enhancing teaching and learning at UWI, St. Augustine Campus. Students are challenged to learn to use and engage with the described forms of IT. Their technical skills are developing. For some like myself when at ASU, initially it will require a steep learning curve; but for others, it will be routine. IT is making a difference in the ways students can learn and faculty members teach. Properly designed, IT-assisted teaching and learning accommodates a universal approach that allows different learning styles to be highlighted, and this enhances learning inside and outside the classroom.
As I reflected, I saw that not only did the UWI, St. Augustine Campus evolve during those stages of my academic development, but I also changed as I personally experienced the use of technology in teaching and learning in the United States at ASU, both as a graduate student and then as a teaching associate. Using technology became an important aspect of my teaching approach since I saw the added value it brings to my students—especially those who have more active learning styles—as they learn, and to me as I teach more effectively.

To conclude, I will leave you with some reflections, questions, and possible recommendations to consider. If you are at the cusp of change, perhaps you may have mixed feelings about the value of technology in teaching and learning. If you have experienced IT in a different culture, maybe you have grown to see the value in using technology versus the no-technology, talk-and-chalk method. Embrace IT-enhanced teaching and learning, and seek ways to continue to expand your skills in using it and in helping your students to be comfortable in using it. If, after being exposed to IT, you have returned to your country and found your colleagues are still using the old method of noninteractive lectures, I challenge you to consider incremental ways that you can introduce using IT in your teaching and encourage your students to develop these technical skills. Start small and build on what is already there to expand its use and application. If you are considering studying or serving as a visiting scholar to a U.S. university and you have no exposure to using technology, seek ways to learn and prepare yourself for that new experience. Become computer literate. Take basic courses in technology that can assist you to make an easier transition to a mediated classroom. Finally, if you are from the United States and might be interested in teaching in another country, prepare yourself that you may be faced with a university culture that is still making the transition from talk and chalk to using IT to enhance teaching and learning. In this case, adopt a middle ground where you can seek out ways to incrementally bridge the gap between a mediated approach and the more traditional approach. Use what resources exist; be prepared that not all will; and find ways to direct students to be interested in learning to use IT so they can adapt to this growing trend. My cross-cultural experiences in teaching and learning with and without IT assistance convince me that IT is simply better. It transforms learning inside and outside the classroom. It gives greater access to all learner types. Using IT in teaching and learning has opened a virtual world for me to use smart technologies for students’ engagement and learning.
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The topic of diversity in public administration tends to be approached as a necessary response to change. Much of the literature focuses on the need for the creation of diverse organizations in order to respond to changes in the demographic characteristics of the U.S. population in general (Pitts & Wise, 2010) and to changes in the makeup of the workforce through the inclusion of women and minorities as well as the effects of aging baby boomers (Selden & Selden, 2001), changes in attitudes toward affirmative action (Selden, 2006), and changes in the cultural and ethnic identification of people using public services. Organizations have dealt with the impact of these changes through implementation of a variety of diversity programs and policies (Pitts, 2009). Change is a good reason to pay attention to diversity issues, but it does not tell the entire story. The second edition of Mitchell Rice’s edited work, *Diversity and Public Administration: Theory, Issues, and Perspectives*, expands the diversity discussion to include issues of culture, social equity, administrative neutrality, and organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Rather than simply making a case for diversity based on population changes, Rice and his contributors explore the meaning of diversity management and cultural competence in the public sector, critique the status quo, and offer ideas and rationales for diversity on the basis of equity in order to improve organizational decision making, performance, and efficiency.

**Summary of Contents**

The first chapter, “The Multiple Dimensions of Diversity and Culture,” by Harvey White and Mitchell Rice, serves as an introduction and rationale for the rest of the book. This chapter identifies demographic changes as a significant challenge to public sector organizations, not only in managing an increasingly diverse workforce but also in providing public services to a diverse population. White and Rice point out that diversity in the workforce includes traditional
ideas of diversity such as race, age, and gender but must also consider other issues such as socioeconomic status and cultural differences. In Chapter 2, “Diversity Ideology in the United States,” David Embrick and Rice take a historical look at diversity and how it has been implemented in public and private organizations over the past 40 years. This chapter provides a useful, concise history of employment policies such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, affirmative action, equal opportunity employment, multiculturalism, and diversity. Embrick and Rice contend that while the term diversity has seen increased attention in organizations, a broadening of the definition of the term that includes “just about everything but the kitchen sink” (p. 25) has allowed organizations to ignore traditional gender and racial inequalities in the workplace.

Chapter 3, “Managing Diversity in Communities, Workplaces, and Society” by Brenda Marina, moves beyond diversity theory to strategic diversity management, a methodology organizations can adopt in order to “enhance decision-making about diversity” (p. 45). Marina defines several types of diversity and argues that organizations that actively manage diversity issues can create better organizational effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, Marina asserts that simply hiring a diverse workforce is not enough; diversity tends to create conflicts and tension, and in order for organizations to capitalize on the benefits of a diverse workforce, those conflicts must be actively managed in a culturally sensitive manner. Rajade Berry-James continues the diversity management theme in Chapter 4, “Managing Diversity: Moving Beyond Organizational Conflict,” by concentrating on race and gender. Berry-James recounts the history and articulates policy differences between affirmative action and equal opportunity employment. She then places these two policies in contrast with court cases concerning diversity issues in the higher education admissions process. Berry-James asserts that affirmative action, equal opportunity employment policies, and diversity policies have recently come under fire because of differing commitments to the value of social equity. Using the idea that different values tend to create conflict in diverse situations, she suggests a management approach that encourages “employee disclosure of perceptions regarding diversity” (p. 75) and creates procedures for problem solving by a diverse group of employees. Chapter 5, “Institutional Racism, Diversity and Public Administration” by Mario Rivera and James Ward, continues this focus on race and defines different types of institutional racism in the public sector and in public affairs graduate programs. Institutional racism is defined as “practices that directly or indirectly restrict the professional access and mobility of individuals or groups on the basis of race” (p. 82). Rivera and Ward point out that institutional racism often goes undetected because the practices are simply an expression of the status quo. Using public affairs graduate education programs as an example, Rivera and Ward provide specific institutional practices that may be considered legitimate but actually reduce the recruitment and upward mobility of minority faculty members. For example,
hiring practices that give preference to graduates from the top-ranked public administration programs lead to a less diverse faculty, whereas widening the net to include less elite institutions will improve the chances of recruiting qualified minority faculty members. Institutional devaluation of research in areas such as diversity or gender studies is another example of practices that can hinder minority faculty members’ careers. These examples support the authors’ conclusion that simply managing individual attitudes and actions toward diversity is not enough; it must be addressed at an institutional level to identify and modify practices that unwittingly exclude or marginalize minority applicants and faculty members.

Chapter 6, “Workforce Diversity in Business and Governmental Organizations” by Rice, serves as a conclusion of the workforce diversity theme addressed in the first five chapters. This chapter describes several diversity initiatives at the federal level, such as the U.S. Office of Personnel Management’s guide, Building and Maintaining a Diverse, High Quality Workforce: A Guide for Federal Agencies. Rice provides bulleted lists of best practices and questions aimed at discovering organizational attitudes toward diversity that can be applied in public organizations. This chapter is helpful for readers wondering how to assess the diversity of their organization and how to pursue organizational diversity goals.

In Chapter 7, “Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern Era,” Rice expands the discussion of diversity from race and gender to social class and social equity and advocates using public administration education as a tool for increasing social equity through changes in the status quo. He argues that public administration education programs tend to emphasize a traditional Weberian model of bureaucracy that is not amenable to “innovation and change” (p. 125), rather than emphasizing social equity, innovation, responsibility, and performance. Rice identifies three issues for teaching diversity that include recognizing the importance of social class as a variable in people’s lives, including social equity as a legitimate topic of study, and creating a diverse student population. In Chapter 8, “The Challenge of Balancing Organizational Expectations Revisited,” Mylon Winn and Leslie Taylor-Grover distinguish between managing diversity and valuing diversity. Valuing diversity entails seeing differences as a source of value and, in turn, changing the organizational culture through interactions with those differences. This can be seen as a bottom-up strategy compared to the top-down strategy of managing diversity. Managing diversity emphasizes changing the organizational culture first, through policies and procedures. As Rice does in Chapter 7, Winn and Taylor-Grover emphasize the challenge of social equity in the delivery of services by administrators and call on the ASPA Code of Ethics to be updated to include adherence to values of diversity and social equity.

Chapter 9, “Networking, Career Management, and Diversity in the Public Sector” by Wilbur Rich, changes the perspective from the organization to the individual. This chapter makes a case for the minority administrator to create a national presence for him or herself by attending and presenting at national confer-
ences. Rich argues that the creation of social capital through networking at national conferences is important, especially for minority administrators, in order to improve mobility, create and maintain a professional reputation, and build a career.

The next three chapters focus on cultural competency. In Chapter 10, “Cultural Competency and the Practice of Public Administration,” Margo Bailey investigates the idea of representative bureaucracy and argues that representative bureaucracy consists of a continuum ranging from equal opportunity employment to affirmative action to managing diversity and finally to cultural competency. Bailey outlines a framework where the implementation of the first three parts of the continuum can lead to cultural competency in the organization. In Chapter 11, “Cultural Competency, Public Administration, and Public Service Delivery in an Era of Diversity,” Rice takes traditional administrative neutrality to task by arguing that cultural competency is considered illegitimate because it is, by definition, not neutral. This serves as a barrier to the creation of cultural competency and thus effective delivery of services. Rice provides several definitions of cultural competency, a framework of the culturally competent organization, and an example of an assessment of cultural competency in public agencies. In Chapter 12, “Diversity Management and Cultural Competency,” Audrey Mathews uses results of Rice’s cultural competency assessment to identify the cultural competency in public organizations in Inland Empire, California. Mathews concludes that cultural competency is not valued in the public organizations surveyed. In Chapter 13, “Cultural Diversity and Productivity,” Mathews makes a case for workforce planning that includes diversity concerns in order to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency. This planning should be strategic, comprehensive, and implemented “from the top down and from the bottom up” (p. 293). Finally, in Chapter 14, “Embracing Workplace Diversity in Public Organizations,” Rice and White reiterate the importance of workplace diversity and the need for comprehensive change to achieve it through “changes in communication, leadership, power arrangements, structure, values and related behaviors” (p. 303).

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

This book offers a fairly comprehensive overview of diversity issues in the public sector through the use of different perspectives and theoretical lenses. It provides good historical information about the evolution of diversity policy in the United States and provides thoughtful discussion about why some of those diversity policies, such as affirmative action, have been coming under fire in recent years. Throughout the chapters, a variety of theoretical constructs are summarized, giving a high-level overview of research in the field over the past several decades. Many definitions of diversity are provided, leading to differing explanations, rationales, and outcomes of diversity in public organizations. Because each chapter is written from or for a different perspective, it is sometimes difficult to
discern the audience for the book. However, each chapter ends with a set of discussion questions, which suggests that it is meant for a classroom setting. These questions as well as the variety of topics and theories provide the framework for creating meaningful discussions about diversity with public administration students that go beyond a simple admonition that diversity should be valued and cultivated in organizations.

The book also points out important challenges to diversity that are easily overlooked by members of public organizations who are used to traditional bureaucracy and administrative values of neutrality and efficiency. *Diversity and Public Administration* makes a case for promoting social equity and cultural competence as important factors in diversity and service delivery. According to Rice, social equity and cultural competency do not require administrative neutrality; in fact, they require the exact opposite. Instead of treating all people the same way, differences in culture and the promotion of equity must be important considerations. In turn, service delivery will become more effective because individual needs will be taken into account. This may be a controversial topic among public administrators, but it should certainly foster discussion. A case also is made for the idea that even though affirmative action and equal opportunity employment have increased the number of minorities and women in the public sector workforce, simply having a more diverse workforce is not the end of discrimination and does not erase barriers to employment and upward mobility.

While the book uses ideas of social equity and cultural competency as a way to improve the effectiveness of public services, it gives short shrift to aspects of diversity that are not race based. Mention is made of gender, age, sexual orientation, and social class in the first chapter, but with very few exceptions, race is the main category of diversity discussed. The near exclusion of other categories of diversity and their subsequent exploration is frustrating and puzzling. Some important ideas needed more nuanced discussion. For example, considering administrative values of neutrality and cultural competence as described earlier, perhaps the issue is not a conflict between two mutually exclusive values, but that public administration programs and services are not neutral and instead promote values of the mainstream culture. In Chapter 11 Rice alludes to this paradox, but it warrants more explanation. Some other questions would have been useful to address. For example, in the chapters discussing cultural competency, it would be helpful to explore how people can become culturally competent while avoiding stereotyping or racial profiling. Or, when considering the assertion that diversity improves organizational decision making, addressing the question of how to balance the differences in ideas and opinions with the conflicts those differences create would be helpful.

Finally, while it is difficult to create consistency in an edited volume, this book could have used a little more cohesiveness. The chapter about networking seems a bit out of place; it focuses on the individual while most of the book
discusses organizational and institutional issues. The chapters on cultural competency seem especially haphazard. Rather than building on each other as in the beginning of the book, these chapters tend to reiterate information. For example, Chapter 12 includes a word-for-word recounting of two numbered lists outlining elements of culturally competent organizations and a continuum of the cultural competency development process that appear earlier in Chapters 10 and 11 respectively. In general, a good deal of information is repeated, especially in the recounting of the history of affirmative action and in certain definitions and rationales of diversity.

It is important to note that this is not a handbook for implementing diversity practices. Because it offers very few how-tos, readers looking for detailed, pragmatic advice will be disappointed. However, readers interested in diversity theory will be rewarded with a good overview as well as ample references for those motivated to embark on further theoretical research. It can be assumed that for many readers, this book will not be the end of the journey into diversity theory but instead will serve as the map for more detailed exploration.
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Conference Theme:  
“Our Historical Challenge:  
Administering a Government for the People, By the People”

The purpose of the conference is to promote excellence in teaching through shared experience and research. The conference serves as a source of expertise for professors, administrators, students and practitioners concerned with (1) the preparation of the next generation of professionals in public service and (2) developing professional competency and leadership in individuals currently associated with the administration of public and non-profit organizations.

Each year the conference places emphasis on a different aspect of teaching. The focus and theme for 2011 is our historical constitutional challenge of administering a government for the people and by the people. Williamsburg was chosen as the site for this year’s conference to provide the historic setting and atmosphere where many of our founding fathers debated the issues and concepts of American democratic governance. The call for proposals for the 34th Annual Teaching Public Administration Conference is now open. This conference welcomes ideas and proposals from all disciplines and individuals passionate about the meaning of our historical challenge to serve the public in today’s demanding environment and preparing individuals for careers in public service. Presenters are invited to share their ideas, knowledge, and experiences through lecture, discussion, role play, game, audio, video, or any other pedagogy. We offer several possible venues for participation.

Session Formats: 
- Individual papers: 20-30 minute presentations that will be grouped with other presenters for discussion (referred submission).
- Panel discussion, demonstration project, or debate: 90 minute presentation by a panel of 3-5 colleagues on a topic of general interest (non-referred submission).
- Workshop: 90 minute interactive presentation (non-refereed submission).
- Round table: 45 minute, informal, small group discussions. Ideal forum for presenting works in progress (non-refereed submission).

Submissions:
Early submission is encouraged. Efforts will be made to provide notice of acceptance within 30 days of submission.
- Individual papers will follow a double-blind peer-reviewed process. For acceptance, an abstract containing no more than 500 words must be submitted for review by **Feb 28, 2011**. Abstracts will be published in the Conference Proceedings.
- All other proposals (panels, workshops, round tables, etc.) will require a description (75 word minimum). Submissions are due **March 31, 2011**.
- Authors can submit their paper to be considered for a symposium in the *Journal of Public Affairs Education* (JPAE). Complete papers are due **July, 2011**.

Conference Information:
The 2011 Teaching Public Administration Conference is being hosted by Troy University, Political Science Department, Masters of Public Administration Program, Troy, Alabama 36082 (www.troy.edu). Complete information about the conference including travel, registration, lodging, Williamsburg area attractions, the tentative schedule, electronic submission requirements, source documents and conference contacts can be found at the Teaching Public Administration Conference Web site at http://www.teachingpa.org/

Questions regarding the program may be directed to Dr. Pamela A. Gibson, Program Chair, tpac@troy.edu.
Troy University – Atlantic Region, 5425 Robin Hood Road, Suite B1, Norfolk, VA 23514.
Information for Contributors

The Journal of Public Affairs Education (JPAE) is the flagship journal of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). JPAE is dedicated to advancing teaching and learning in public affairs broadly defined, which includes the fields of policy analysis, public administration, public policy, nonprofit administration, and their subfields. Advancing teaching and learning includes not only the improvement of specific courses and teaching methods, but also the improvement of public affairs program design and management. The goal of JPAE is to publish articles that are useful to those participating in the public affairs education enterprise, not only in the U.S., but throughout the world. In service to this goal, articles should be clear, accessible to those in the public affairs fields and subfields, and generalizable. The new editorial team is particularly interested in articles that (1) use rigorous methods to analyze the relative effectiveness of different teaching methods, and (2) have international and/or comparative components, or consider the effect of country setting. Articles submitted for publication in JPAE should not already be published or in submission elsewhere. Articles that have been presented at conferences are welcome.

Submissions should conform to American Psychological Association (APA) style and generally meet the submission recommendations described in Appendix A of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.) For more information about APA please visit their website at http://www.apastyle.org/.

Generally manuscripts should conform to the JPAE stylesheet (www.naspaa.org/JPAE/stylesheet.pdf) and specifically should:

• Be typed in a standard 12-point serif font (such as Times New Roman), double- or 1-1/2- spaced, with margins of no less than one inch on all sides,
• Include one document with all author names including a title and an abstract of around 500 words,
• Use APA-style in-text citations and references.

Electronic submissions should be made in PDF or .doc files and need to be anonymous for blind review. Accepted articles will not be published until authors submit a manuscript that meets APA style, particularly in regard to citations and references. Articles accepted for publication must be submitted as .doc files. Submit electronic copies to jpae@hamline.edu.

Please include “JPAE” in the subject line of all emails. Authors should expect to receive acknowledgment of receipt. If acknowledgement is not received within two weeks, please do not hesitate to contact us at jpaee@hamline.edu. Articles will be given initial review by the editorial team. Articles must meet basic criteria including writing quality, reasonable conformity with these guidelines, and interest to JPAE’s readers before they are submitted for external, double-blind review. If accepted for publication, manuscripts cannot be published until all authors have provided copyright transfer authority, full contact information, and short biographies (of about five lines).

Because of its mission, educators may reproduce any JPAE material for classroom use and authors may reproduce their original articles without written permission. Written permission is required to reproduce any part of JPAE in all other instances.
The Journal of Public Affairs Education (JP AE) is the flagship journal of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). Founded in 1970, NASPAA serves as a national and international resource for the promotion of excellence in education for the public service. Its institutional membership includes more than 250 university programs in the United States in public administration, policy, and management. It accomplishes its purposes through direct services to its member institutions and by

• Developing and administering appropriate standards for educational programs in public affairs through its Executive Council and its Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation;

• Representing to governments and other institutions the objectives and needs of education for public affairs and administration;

• Encouraging curriculum development and innovation and providing a forum for publication and discussion of education scholarship, practices, and issues;

• Undertaking surveys that provide members and the public with information on key educational issues;

• Meeting with employers to promote internship and employment opportunities for students and graduates;

• Undertaking joint educational projects with practitioner professional organizations; and

• Collaborating with institutes and schools of public administration in other countries through conferences, consortia, and joint projects.

NASPAA provides opportunities for international engagement for NASPAA members, placing a global emphasis on educational quality and quality assurance through a series of networked international initiatives, in particular the Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPAcee), the Inter-American Network of Public Administration Education (INPAE), and the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA). It is also involved locally; for instance, directing the Small Communities Outreach Project for Environmental Issues, which networks public affairs schools and local governments around environmental regulation policy issues, with support from the Environmental Protection Agency.

NASPAA's twofold mission is to ensure excellence in education and training for public service and to promote the ideal of public service. Consistent with NASPAA's mission, JP AE is dedicated to advancing teaching and learning in public affairs, defined to include the fields of policy analysis, public administration, public management, and public policy. Published quarterly by NASPAA, the journal features commentaries, announcements, symposia, book reviews, and peer-reviewed scholarly articles on pedagogical, curricular, and accreditation issues pertaining to public affairs education.

JP AE was founded in 1995 by a consortium from the University of Kansas and the University of Akron and was originally published as the Journal of Public Administration Education. H. George Frederickson was the journal’s founding editor. In addition to serving as NASPAA’s journal of record, JP AE is affiliated with the Section on Public Administration Education of the American Society for Public Administration.