Behavioral Public Administration

Chapter · January 2019

DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1443

1 author:

Lars Tummers
Utrecht University

Behavioral Public Administration

Accepted for The Oxford Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Oxford University Press, edited by B. Guy Peters and Ian Thynne

Tummers, L.G. (2019). Behavioral Public Administration. In *Oxford Encyclopedia of Public Administration,* edited by B. Guy Peters and Ian Thynne. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1443

Summary

Behavioral public administration is an interdisciplinary research field that studies public administration topics by connecting insights from public administration with psychology and the behavioral sciences more broadly. Behavioral public administration scholars study important public problems such as discrimination, corruption, and burnout. Behavioral public administration has various potential uses. First, behavioral public administration tests and extends theories and concepts from psychology in political-administrative settings. Second, it tests and extends the microfoundations of public administration theories and concepts. Third, behavioral public administration scholars develop new theories and concepts. Fourth, behavioral public administration can help in tackling practical public problems. There are various future research suggestions for behavioral public administration. The field could move beyond one shot single studies and aim to build cumulative knowledge. This can be done among else via large scale collaborations and via replications. In addition, it is also beneficial if behavioral public administration scholars broaden their methodological toolkit to answer different kinds of research questions.

Keywords: Public Administration, Public Management, Psychology, Bounded rationality, Interdisciplinary, Behavioral Public Administration

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a grant from the Netherlands organization for scientific research (016.VIDI.185.017) and by a grant from the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant, funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2017S1A3A2067636).

Background on Behavioral Public Administration

Behavioral public administration can be broadly described is an interdisciplinary research field that studies public administration topics by connecting insights from public administration with psychology and the wider behavioral sciences (Grimmelikhuijsen *et al.*, 2017). An example of a study that takes such a behavioral public administration approach is Weibel *et al.* (2010). Weibel and her colleagues analyze a key public administration topic (pay for performance in the public sector) by combining insights from public administration (including Public Service Motivation) and psychology (such as self-determination theory). They show among else that pay for performance has a positive effect when tasks are not interesting, but a negative effect in the case of interesting tasks. Their findings help to explain the modest success of pay for performance in the public sector.

The example of Weibel *et al.* (2010) does not stand on its own. A behavioral public administration approach has been used to study a variety of important societal issues. For instance, it has been used to analyze discrimination in the public sector (Hopkins, 1980; Jilke *et al.*, 2018), red tape (Kaufmann & Feeney, 2014), corruption in the public sector (Olsen *et al.*, 2019; White, 1999), climate change (Liu *et al.*, 2017), and motivation and burnout of public employees (Bakker, 2015; Resh *et al.*, 2018; Wright, 2014).

The first goal of this overview chapter is to provide a background on the development of the research field of behavioral public administration. The next section is devoted to this. It shows that various public administration scholars – including Simon (1947), Waldo (1965), Jones (2003), and Olsen (2015) – have stressed for connecting psychology and public administration. Yet until the early 2010s, public administration did not work systematically on this connection. This has changed profoundly, with the development of various overview articles (Battaglio *et al.*, 2019; Grimmelikhuijsen *et al.*, 2017; Kasdan, 2019), dedicated special issues in general public administration journals

(James *et al.*, 2017; Tummers *et al.*, 2016), and the development of journals like the *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration* (Jilke *et al.*, 2018). This is highly related to a parallel development of behavioral public policy scholarship (John & Stoker, 2019; Shafir, 2013; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

The second goal of this overview chapter is to show the potential of behavioral public administration. It shows that behavioral public administration can help in testing and extending psychological concepts and theories in political-administrative settings. For instance, Bellé et al. (2018) and Bækgaard (2017) tested to what extent prospect theory – developed by the psychologists Kahneman and Tversky (1979) - is applicable in political-administrative settings. In addition, behavioral public administration can also test and extend theories from public administration. More specifically, it can help in exploring and testing the microfoundations of macro or meso level theories (Jilke, 2015b), such as theories on coproduction (Alford, 2009; for tests see Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013; Hattke & Kalucza, 2019), and isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; for tests see George *et al.*, 2019; Bellé *et al.*, 2019). Furthermore, behavioral public administration can develop new theories and concepts. This has probably been less widespread than the previous two uses, but is nonetheless already apparent in for instance concepts such as Public Service Motivation (Perry, 1999), policy alienation (Tummers, 2012), and administrative burden (Herd & Moynihan, 2019). Finally, behavioral public administration can help in tackling practical public problems, such as how to increase diversity in the public sector (Linos, 2018) and how to get citizens to coproduce services with the state (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013). Combining insights from psychology and public administration with rigorous research designs can benefit to tackle practical public problems.

The third goal is to highlight potential avenues for future research into behavioral public administration. It shows that it could pay to devote substantial attention to cumulative knowledge in behavioral public administration, moving beyond single studies to truly large collaborations on important societal topics (see for instance in psychology *Open Science Collaboration*, 2015). In addition, it is also beneficial if behavioral public administration scholars broaden their methodological toolkit to answer different kinds of research questions, not only focusing on causal inference questions via experiments but also concerning description (for instance by using surveys, see Moynihan, 2018) and prediction (for instance by using machine learning, Anastasopoulos & Whitford, 2018).

The Development of Behavioral Public Administration

This section provides a background on the development of the research field of behavioral public administration (see for a detailed discussion Grimmelikhuijsen *et al.*, 2017). One of the most prominent advocates for a connection between public administration and psychology is Herbert Simon, who received The Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences, more commonly known as the Nobel Prize in Economics, in 1978. Simon received the Nobel Prize for his groundbreaking research into decision processes in economic organizations. Simon shows convincingly that we are not completely rational. He argues that in a world so rich of information and when so little time is available, it pays to be a so-called 'satisficer'. Satisficing is a blend of the two words satisfy and suffice. Satisficers opt of what is 'good enough'. This stands in contrast to people who aim to maximize. These 'maximizers' aim to fully consider all options, rate them, and then go for the best choice available. Maximizing can pay in terms of objective outcomes, but it does seem to come with a cost to well-being. Iyengar and colleagues (2006) compared choice-making strategies of maximizers and satisficers. Maximizers are constantly looking for ways to improve their lives. They would probably agree with statements like "*No matter how satisfied I am with my job, it's only right for me to be on the lookout for better* *opportunities*” and “*I never settle for second best”*. Iyengar and colleagues measured to what extent students were maximizers or satisficers. They were then followed when they searched for jobs. The maximizing students were objectively better off: they landed jobs with 20% higher starting salaries. However, these students were less satisfied than satisficers with their jobs, and experienced more negative feelings during the job hunt.

The satisficing concept builds on insights from cognitive and social psychology. It is just one example of a more general vision that Simon had of the connection between public administration and psychology. Simon saw a large gap between the psychological knowledge about learning and choice processes and the type of knowledge that is needed for the formation of administrative theory. He therefore proposed to set a symbolic marking stone between psychology and public administration (Simon, 1955). At least scholars from both disciplines then knew about each other's existence and travelers could travel from one side to the other.

After Simon's call for setting a marking stone (Olsen, 2015), several researchers undertook the journey. They departed from their own discipline and traveled to the other discipline. For instance, in an article in *Public Administration Review*, Buchanan (1974) combines theories from social psychology with insights from public and business administration to analyze why business executives consistently report more favorable attitudes toward their organizations than government managers. A few years later the same journal published a study that uses insights from developmental psychology an applied this to job and organizational satisfaction in the public sector (Schott, 1986). It shows that job satisfaction will steeply decline when people reach 41-45, as they will probably suffer from a mid-career crisis. In addition, in the *Journal of Public Administration, Research and Theory*, Bretschneider and Straussman (1992) use cognitive psychology to explain why people are overconfident in assessing the underlying risk inherent in policy-relevant statistical estimates.

Simon's call shows that the connection between public administration and psychology is not a fad or new-fashioned wish. Yet until a few years ago, public administration did not seem to work very systematically on this connection. There were some examples – as shown in the previous paragraph – but the connection was not strong.

In an effort to deepen the dialogue between public administration and psychology, Grimmelikhuijsen, Olsen, Jilke, and Tummers developed an interdisciplinary field that combines insights from psychology and public administration (Grimmelikhijsen *et al.*, 2017). In line with '*behavioral economics'*, they called it "*behavioral public administration*". They explicitly do not argue for an overtake, but for an addition to public administration. Public administration remains an interdisciplinary discipline that uses insights from other disciplines, such as law, sociology, political science, and economics.

Grimmelikhuijsen et al. (2017:46) define behavioral public administration as "the interdisciplinary analysis of public administration from the micro-level perspective of individual behavior and attitudes by drawing on recent advances in our understanding of the underlying psychology and behavior of individuals and groups." They note that the definition has three main components. First, the unit of analysis are individuals and groups of citizens, employees, and managers within the public sector. Second, it emphasizes the behavior and attitudes of these people. Third, most importantly, it integrates insights from psychology and the behavioral sciences into the study of public administration. This means that behavioral public administration is not bound by its methods. Although many BPA studies use experiments, this is not a requirement at all. For instance, a recent study by Thomann et al. (2018) uses QCA and survey techniques, but can be qualified as a BPA study as it focuses on individual (here: teachers and healthcare professionals), analyzes their attitudes (here: there attitudes towards a specific policy) and uses insights from public administration and psychology (here: respectively street-level bureaucracy and Herzberg's motivation theory). Furthermore, studies that use experiments but do not substantively combine insights from public administration and psychology would not be qualified as BPA (for instance Porter & Rogowski, 2018).

In their article in *Public Administration Review* (Grimmelikhuijsen *et al.*, 2017), they analyzed to what extent there was already a connection between the two disciplines. In the 1990s, there was only modest attention in public administration journals for theories and concepts from psychology. However, there is a distinct positive trend. The average number of articles using insights from psychology was steadily increasing . Public administration scholars increasingly used theories and concepts from psychology in a political-administrative setting. For instance, Bellé, Cantarelli, and Belardinelli (2018) analyze the applicability of the prospect theory (developed by the psychologists Kahneman and Tversky, 1979) in the context of the public sector (compare also Bækgaard, 2017 with Bellé *et al.*, 2018 for boundary conditions). Psychologists also contribute to the debate. As an example, Tybur and Griskevicius (2013) show that public administrators who aim to change behavior – such as escalating violence – should use the deep-seated ancestral nature of humans, instead of ignoring it or working against it. Psychologists and public administration scholars also collaborate. Public administration scholar Brad Wright and psychologist Adam Grant (2010) for instance analyze the state of Public Service Motivation research and chart new directions for scholarship that complements and advances the field.

The Uses of Behavioral Public Administration

The foregoing section discussed the development of behavioral public administration. This section looks at four potential ways in which behavioral public administration can be useful for science and society. These are: 1) testing and extending psychological methods and concepts, 2) testing and extending public administration methods and concepts, 3) developing new theories and concepts by combining psychology and public administration, and 4) tackling practical public problems. To illustrate these uses, this section provides various examples, and discuss one key example for each use at length.

Testing and Extending Psychological Concepts and Theories

Behavioral public administration can help in testing and extending psychological concepts and theories in political-administrative settings. A behavioral public administration approach has been used to analyze key psychological theories such as motivated reasoning (Bækgaard & Serritzlew, 2016; James & Van Ryzin, 2016) and the theory of planned behavior (Kroll, 2015). Moreover, psychological and public administration theories have also been integrated, such as when Bakker (2015) connected the job-demands resources theory – coming from work and organizational psychology – with the public administration concept of Public Service Motivation. In order to illustrate how a behavioral public administration approach can help in testing and extending psychological concepts and theories, this subsection details how the choice overload hypothesis, a key psychological theory, can be tested and extended in political-administrative settings.

Psychologists Iyengar and Lepper (2000) proposed the *choice overload hypothesis,* which states that the provision of extensive choices may be seen as initially desirable, but proves to be unexpectedly demotivating in the end. Choice can become too much of a good thing. As the French say: "*Trop de choix tue le choix*": too many choices kill the choice.

Iyengar and Lepper conducted a number of experiments to analyze whether and if so, at what point, adding choices backfires. They among else found that people are more likely to purchase gourmet jams or chocolates when they were offered a limited array of 6 choices rather than 24 or 30 choices. They were also more satisfied with their choice in the condition when they only had 6 choices. This goes against rational choice theory, were more options would always be better.

Behavioral public administration scholars have tested and extended the choice overload hypothesis in political-administrative settings. For instance, Jilke *et al.* (2015) analyze to what extent the choice overload hypothesis is applicable in public services. They note that there has been a push to liberalize the provision of core public services, such as education and health care, and this would create more choice and competition, and hopefully higher quality services at lower costs. This aligns with *New Public Management* doctrines (Hood, 1991). A core example is electricity provision. This was previously often state-owned or a state-regulated monopoly. Citizens then by definition had no choice. In the 21st century, the market has been deregulated in many countries. Jilke and his colleagues provide the example of the State of New York, where people had around 41 electricity providers available to choose from.

They test and extend the choice overload hypothesis by investigating how increasing the number of electricity providers affects people's motivation to switch providers after service failures. In two experiments, they show that people are less willing to switch from poor performing providers if there are a large number of providers. This is in line with the choice overload hypothesis. In addition, they also add to theory development by showing that it is applicable in important service delivery settings. Much choice overload studies analyzed quite simple decisions for private goods, such as jams or chocolate. Instead, Jilke *et al.* analyze whether is also holds for a core public service –

electricity – that is probably quite a bit more important than buying a particular type of jam. Moreover, in a related study on the mobile telephony market, Jilke (2015a:77) shows that especially the less educated can be worse off if there is too much choice, noting that "once the number of service providers reaches a threshold of eight service providers, less educated service users become less likely to switch." This also adds to the literature by showing how different types of citizens are affected by increased choice.

Testing and Extending Public Administration Theories

The previous subsection shows how a behavioral public administration approach can be used to test and extend psychological theories to study topics of interest to public administration. In addition, behavioral public administration scholars are also testing and extending theories from public administration. Core public administration theories and concepts that have been studied using a behavioral public administration approach include accountability (Schillemans, 2016), representative bureaucracy (Riccucci *et al.*, 2016; Van Ryzin *et al.*, 2017; Bækgaard & George, 2018), bureaucratic reputation (Lee & Van Ryzin, 2019), red tape (DeHart-Davis & Pandey, 2005), and discretion (Thomann *et al.*, 2018). This subsection highlights how one core meso-level theory – isomorphism – can be analyzed using a behavioral public administration approach.

Isomorphism is derived from the Greek 'isos' (identical) and 'morphe' (form) (Bellé *et al.*, 2019). For instance, Fay and Zavattaro (2016) shows how isomorphic forces work in higher education. When one university innovates via a branding initiative, other universities will feel pressure to adopt similar innovations. In a seminal article, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) make a distinction between three mechanisms that result in homogeneity across organizations: coercive isomorphism, mimetic isomorphism, and normative isomorphism.

Coercive isomorphism is the pressure on organizations from other actors on which the organization depends. A clear example of coercive isomorphism are central exams. If a country adopts central exams, this means that schools are required to attend to certain guidelines such as prescribed by the Ministry of Education. Schools will therefore become more homogeneous.

Not all institutionalization processes stem from coercive isomorphism. Uncertainty is also an important cause why organizations look more like each other. Mimetic isomorphism is a standard response to uncertainty. When goals of organizations are ambiguous – as is the case in many public organization (Chun & Rainey, 2005) – organizations can start to imitate other organizations.

A third source of isomorphism is normative isomorphism. This happens when professionalization pressures ensure that organizations resemble each other. Organizations look more alike because they employ people who are professionalized in the same way, belong to similar professional associations, and use similar accreditation mechanisms.

Bellé and colleagues (2019) note that disentangling these three types of isomorphism is difficult, as they often co-occur in real-life settings. They therefore disentangle these three types in a hypothetical setting and test whether public sector employees workers make managerial decisions on the grounds of technical superiority or as the result of exposure to isomorphic pressures. They conducted eight survey vignette experiments trials with over 700 public employees to test whether and to what extent isomorphic pressures affect decision making.

They found that when asked to choose between two equally performing systems, public employees in their sample were inclined to favor the alternative that was encouraged by either a coercive, a mimetic, or a normative pressure. There were no clear differences between the types of isomorphism. More importantly, employees gave in to isomorphic pressures, even when it was clear that the encouraged option was inferior to alternatives. This provides a microfoundation to a meso-level theory. In addition, Bellé *et al.* showed that isomorphic pressures could also be neutralized. When employees had evaluated the inferiority of the ‘isomorphic’ option with numerical data - rather than through a textual prompt— they no longer followed the crowd. In these instances, isomorphic pressures were neutralized. This adds to the literature in showing ways in which public organizations can inoculate themselves against isomorphic pressures.

Developing New Theories and Concepts

As the examples in the two previous subsections show, behavioral public administration scholars test and extend theories and concepts from psychology and public administration. In addition, these scholars also integrate insights from psychology and public administration to develop new theories and concepts. Examples include the development of the theory of authority (Barnard, 1938), Public Service Motivation theory (Perry, 2000; Vandenabeele *et al.*, 2018), and administrative leadership (Van Wart, 2003). This section discusses the concept of coping during public service delivery in detail, given that the combination of psychology and public administration was very clear when developing the concept.

Building upon the seminal work “street-level bureaucracy” by Lipsky (1980), Tummers *et al.* (2015) note that public service providers – including teachers, social workers and physicians - often experience stress in their work. Various public administration scholars have investigated how public service providers cope with this stress and how this affects their clients. However, a proper conceptualization is lacking. For instance, scholars use different terms for the same phenomenon, such as "strategies of survival" and "approaches". There is no clear definition and demarcation of the coping concept. It varies from working overtime, to drinking a bottle of wine every night, to becoming aggressive towards citizens.

Tummers *et al.* (2015) aimed to define and conceptualize coping during public service delivery. To achieve this, they combine insights on coping from clinical psychology (particularly the definition by Lazarus, 1966 and the category system by Skinner *et al.*, 2003) and public administration (particularly the focus on client-oriented coping by Lipsky, 1980 and the field work by Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2003). They define coping during public service delivery as behavioral efforts frontline workers employ when interacting with clients, in order to master, tolerate or reduce external and internal demands and conflicts they face on an everyday basis. In addition, they highlight three different "families" of coping during public service delivery. First, public service providers can "move towards" clients. An example is a teacher who will work even harder when faced with work pressure, as otherwise her students may suffer. In the short term, this may be good for the students, but in the longer term she may burn out from regular overwork (Van Loon *et al.*, 2015). Second, public service providers may "move away" from clients. An example is rationing. This can be done by denying access to public services, for instance by stating: "the office is very busy today, please return tomorrow". Third, public service workers may "move against" clients. This can be done when public service workers rigidly follow rules or even become aggressive towards clients.

The work by Tummers *et al.* (2015) moves coping during public service delivery from a sensitizing to a more definitive concept (Blumer, 1954). This helps in building upon each other's work, for instance by studying the same concept in different sectors or countries. This can be seen by studies that use the new conceptualization (Rayner & Lawton, 2018; Savi & Cepilovs, 2017).

Tackling Practical Public Problems

Testing and extending psychological and public administration theories and concepts as well as developing new theories and concepts can be beneficial for the scholarly discipline of public administration. In addition, behavioral public administration can also help in tackling practical public problems. Its combination of using insights from psychology and public administration with a strong experimental methodology can help tackling practical public problems. This does of course not deny the value of other methodological approaches (Zhu *et al.*, 2019), and behavioral public administration scholars do not solely rely on experimental research designs (for instance Thomann, 2018). A behavioral public administration approach has been used to study tackle practical public problems such as finding employment for welfare benefit claimants (Sanders & Kirkman, 2019), increasing coproduction of citizens (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013), and how to motivate public employees (Bellé, 2015). More generally, the societally relevant literature on nudges (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008) can be linked to behavioral public administration (for instance Battaglio et al., 2019; Hallsworth et al., 2018; Thomann, 2018).

This chapter highlights the value of a behavioral public administration approach to tackle one pivotal public problem: diversity. Managing diversity has been a key priority for public administrators in the past decades (Riccucci, 2018). To address this issue, Linos (2018) analyzes how the public sector can increase diversity when hiring police officers. To analyze why people do or do not apply for public sector jobs, she uses key theories from psychology, including stereotype threat (Steele, 1997) and self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Furthermore, she uses key public administration concepts, most notably Public Service Motivation (Perry & Hondeghem, 2018).

In a field experiment in collaboration with the police department in Chattanooga, Tennessee, she analyzes how sending various types of postcards could encourage people to apply to the police force. All postcards had some common characteristics that are potentially increasing applications: they were personalized (including the name of the sender and receiver) and had a photo and signature of a black male police officer. The postcards also differed by highlighting various aspects of the job, such as that police officers can make a difference in society (Service postcard), that police work was challenging (Challenge postcard), that police work would be meaningful for you and your community (Impact postcard), and that joining the police means you opt for a career and not 'just a job' (Career postcard).

Linos found that people who received a postcard were significantly more likely to apply for a police job, as compared to people in the control group who received nothing. More importantly, the results show that the 'Service' postcard (related to Public service motivation, PSM) was ineffective at attracting candidates that would not have applied anyway. Rather, messages that focus on the personal benefits of applying to the job—either emphasizing the challenge of the job (Challenge postcard) or the career benefits (Career postcard)—are three times as effective at getting people to apply. The Impact postcard was not really impactful. Career and challenge messages were particularly effective for people of color and for women, which supports the goal to increase diversity of applicants. This experiment shows how psychological and public administration theories can be rigorously tested in real life settings. It also shows the results can also be quite unexpected, as many people may at first hand might have estimated that Public Service Motivation messages would be quite effective. Linos convincingly shows that this is not the case.

Future Research in Behavioral Public Administration

In the coming years, a behavioral public administration will hopefully continue to help in furthering scientific progress and tackle important societal issues, including reducing administrative burden for citizens (Herd & Moynihan, 2019), reducing discrimination in public services (Andersen & Guul, 2019), and improving sustainability (Preuss & Walker, 2011). In this final section, future research lines are indicated that can further strengthen the field.

First, it could pay to devote substantial attention to ‘cumulative’ knowledge in behavioral public administration. Many studies in (behavioral and non-behavioral) public administration are still one shot studies that do not build neatly on the work of others. They use for instance slightly different concepts, different operationalizations, and different methods, as the example on coping during public service delivery showed. This makes it hard to build up each other’s work. There are however exceptions. One of the prime examples is the work on Public Service Motivation. Scholars collaborate intensively when studying this concept, and truly build upon each other’s work (for instance Kim *et al.*, 2012). Other areas where such collaborations and even replications (Walker *et al.* 2019) occur are in the field of coproduction (Andersen *et al.*, 2019), representative bureaucracy (Riccucci *et al.*, 2016; Van Ryzin *et al.*, 2017) and performance information (George *et al.*, 2017). It would be beneficial if scholars started to build more upon each other’s work, so that the validity of theories and its boundary conditions can be established. Large scale collaborations could be helpful in this regard (for instance multi-lab replications, Simons *et al.*, 2014).

Highly related to the notion cumulative knowledge is to systematically link macro and micro perspectives (see also Jilke, 2018). In other words, how does the institutional context affect individual and group attitudes and behavior? When scholars and practitioners are interested in behavior and not in attitudes, it would also be beneficial to measure ‘real’ behavior, and not intended behavior, given that the gap between intentions and behavior is not negligible (Sheeran, 2002). Connecting the institutional context with individual and group attitudes and behavior can highlight the boundary conditions of psychological and public administration theories and maybe uncover invariant laws (Simon, 1990). This is crucial for a context-rich field like public administration. There are some studies that explicitly connected macro and micro perspectives (for instance Baekgaard, 2017; Baekgaard et al., 2017; Jilke et al., 2018; Villadsen & Wulff, 2018). However, these studied are still one-shot, and it would be beneficial to test boundary conditions by using the same design in various institutional contexts and on a larger scale.

In addition to developing cumulative knowledge and linking macro and meso perspectives, it is also beneficial to broaden the field in terms of methods. Most studies in behavioral public administration have used experiments (but see for exceptions Thomann *et al.*, 2019; Miao *et al.*, 2019). However, generally speaking the choice of a method depends on the research question. The use of experiments is a positive development as they are the 'gold standard' for research questions dealing with causal inference, for instance when we want to study the impact of leadership training on motivation of public employees (Jensen *et al.*, 2019). However, public administration scholars and practitioners are not only interested in causal inference. It can also be very important to know for instance how large a problem is, such as the problem of corruption or discrimination in the public sector in a specific country. Here, survey techniques that aim to limit social desirability can be used (Rosenfeld *et al.*, 2016). Behavioral public administration scholars have used such techniques to a lesser extent (but see Bromberg *et al.*, 2018). In addition, some societal problems are not about causality or description, but about prediction. For instance, what are the chances that a defendant will flee or commit a (new) crime? Here, machine learning techniques are useful, as illustrated by the impressive study of Kleinberg and colleagues (2017) on jail-or-release decisions by judges. Behavioral public administration scholars are just starting to use such techniques (for instance Anastasopoulos & Whitford, 2018).

Concluding, improving the connection between public administration and psychology is not a fad or new-fashioned wish. Starting with Simon (1947), various scholars have repeatedly stressed that psychology and public administration should be well-connected. Little has happened for a long time, but from the 2010s onwards, because of among else the rise of behavioral public administration (Grimmelikhuijsen *et al.*, 2017), a larger group of scholars and practitioners combine insights from public administration and psychology. They use, extend, and combine theories, concepts, and methods from the two disciplines. Furthermore, this connection can also be beneficial for practice (see for instance Hallsworth *et al.*, 2018).

Further Readings

Battaglio, R. P., Belardinelli, P., Bellé, N., & Cantarelli, P. (2019, in press). Behavioral Public Administration ad fontes: A Synthesis of Research on Bounded Rationality, Cognitive Biases, and Nudging in Public Organizations. *Public Administration Review*.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S., Olsen, A. L., & Tummers, L. (2017). Behavioral public administration: Combining insights from public administration and psychology. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(1), 45-56.

Moynihan, D. (2018). A Great Schism Approaching? Towards a Micro and Macro Public Administration. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration* 1(1), 1-8.

Simon, H. A. (1947/1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: Macmillan.

References

Alford, J. (2009). *Engaging public sector clients: from service-delivery to co-production*. London: Springer.

Anastasopoulos, L. J., & Whitford, A. B. (2018). Machine learning for public administration research, with application to organizational reputation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *29*(3), 491-510.

Andersen, S. C., & Guul, T. S. (2019). Reducing Minority Discrimination at the Front Line—Combined Survey and Field Experimental Evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 29*(3), 429-444.

Andersen, S. C., Nielsen, H. S., & Thomsen, M. K. (2019, in press). How to Increase Citizen Coproduction: Replication and Extension of Existing Research. *International Public Management Journal*.

Baekgaard, M. (2017). Prospect theory and public service outcomes: Examining risk preferences in relation to public sector reforms. *Public Administration*, *95*(4), 927-942.

Bækgaard, M., & George, B. (2018). Equal Access to the Top? Representative Bureaucracy and Politicians' Recruitment Preferences for Top Administrative Staff. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *28*(4), 535-550.

Bækgaard, M., & Serritzlew, S. (2016). Interpreting performance information: Motivated reasoning or unbiased comprehension. *Public Administration Review, 76*(1), 73-82.

Baekgaard, M., Christensen, J., Dahlmann, C. M., Mathiasen, A., & Petersen, N. B. G. (2017). The role of evidence in politics: Motivated reasoning and persuasion among politicians. *British Journal of Political Science*, 1-24.

Bakker, A. B. (2015). A job demands–resources approach to public service motivation. *Public Administration Review, 75*(5), 723-732.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The Function of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Battaglio, R. P., Belardinelli, P., Bellé, N., & Cantarelli, P. (2019, in press). Behavioral Public Administration ad fontes: A Synthesis of Research on Bounded Rationality, Cognitive Biases, and Nudging in Public Organizations. *Public Administration Review*.

Bellé, N. (2015). Performance-related pay and the crowding out of motivation in the public sector: A randomized field experiment. *Public Administration Review, 75*(2), 230-241.

Bellé, N., Belardinelli, P., Cantarelli, P., & Mele, V. (2019, in press). On iron cages and suboptimal choices: An experimental test of the micro-foundations of isomorphism in the public sector. *International Public Management Journal.*

Bellé, N., Cantarelli, P., & Belardinelli, P. (2018). Prospect Theory Goes Public: Experimental Evidence on Cognitive Biases in Public Policy and Management Decisions. *Public Administration Review, 78*(6), 828-840.

Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory?. *American Sociological Review, 19*(1), 3-10.

Bretschneider, S., & Straussman, J. (1992). Statistical laws of confidence versus behavioral response: how individuals respond to public management decisions under uncertainty. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 2*(3), 333-345.

Bromberg, D. E., Charbonneau, É., & Smith, A. (2018). Body-Worn Cameras and Policing: A List Experiment of Citizen Overt and True Support. *Public Administration Review, 78*(6), 883-891.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Government managers, business executives, and organizational commitment. *Public Administration Review, 34*(4):339-347.

Chun, Y. H., & Rainey, H. G. (2005). Goal ambiguity and organizational performance in US federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory, 15*(4), 529-557.

DeHart-Davis, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2005). Red tape and public employees: Does perceived rule dysfunction alienate managers?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 15*(1), 133-148.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 147-160.

Fay, D. L., & Zavattaro, S. M. (2016). Branding and isomorphism: the case of Higher Education. *Public Administration Review, 76*(5), 805-815.

George, B., Baekgaard, M., Decramer, A., Audenaert, M., & Goeminne, S. (2019, in press). Institutional isomorphism, negativity bias and performance information use by politicians: A survey experiment. *Public Administration.*

George, B., Desmidt, S., Nielsen, P. A., & Baekgaard, M. (2017). Rational planning and politicians' preferences for spending and reform: replication and extension of a survey experiment. *Public Management Review, 19*(9), 1251-1271.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S., Olsen, A. L., & Tummers, L.G. (2017). Behavioral public administration: Combining insights from public administration and psychology. *Public Administration Review, 77*(1), 45-56.

Hallsworth, M., Egan, M., Rutter, J., & McCrae, J. (2018). *Behavioural Government: Using behavioural science to improve how governments make decisions*. The Behavioural Insights Team.

Hattke, F., & Kalucza, J. (2019). What influences the willingness of citizens to coproduce public services? Results from a vignette experiment. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 2(1), 1-14.

Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2019). *Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. *Public Administration, 69*(1), 3-19.

Hopkins, A. H. (1980). Perceptions of employment discrimination in the public sector. *Public Administration Review, 40*(2):131-137.

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(6), 995.

Iyengar, S. S., Wells, R. E., & Schwartz, B. (2006). Doing better but feeling worse: Looking for the "best" job undermines satisfaction. *Psychological Science, 17*(2), 143-150.

Jakobsen, M., & Andersen, S. C. (2013). Coproduction and equity in public service delivery. *Public Administration Review, 73*(5), 704-713.

James, O., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2016). Motivated reasoning about public performance: An experimental study of how citizens judge the affordable care act. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 27*(1), 197-209.

James, O., Jilke, S. R., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2017). Behavioural and experimental public administration: Emerging contributions and new directions. *Public Administration, 95*(4), 865-873.

Jensen, U. T., Andersen, L. B., & Jacobsen, C. B. (2019). Only When We Agree! How Value Congruence Moderates the Impact of Goal-Oriented Leadership on Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review, 79*(1), 12-24.

Jilke, S. (2015a). Choice and equality: are vulnerable citizens worse off after liberalization reforms?. *Public Administration, 93*(1), 68-85.

Jilke, S. (2015b). *Essays on the microfoundations of competition and choice in public service delivery*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Jilke, S. (2018). Microfoundations, Microfoundations: Addressing 'Big Questions' through a Behavioral Approach toward Public Administration. *Concept Paper Minnowbrook 50th Anniversary Conference.*

Jilke, S., Meier, K. J., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2018). Editorial. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 1*(1).

Jilke, S., Van Dooren, W., & Rys, S. (2018). Discrimination and Administrative Burden in Public Service Markets: Does a Public–Private Difference Exist?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 28*(3), 423-439.

John, P., & Stoker, G. (2019, in press). Rethinking the role of experts and expertise in behavioural public policy. *Policy & Politics.*

Jones, B. D. (2003). Bounded rationality and political science: Lessons from public administration and public policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 13*(4), 395-412.

Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2): 263–91

Kasdan, D.O. (2019, in press). Toward a theory of behavioral public administration. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*.

Kaufmann, W., & Feeney, M. K. (2014). Beyond the rules: The effect of outcome favourability on red tape perceptions. *Public Administration, 92*(1), 178-191.

Kim, S., Vandenabeele, W., Wright, B. E., Andersen, L. B., Cerase, F. P., Christensen, R. K., ... & Palidauskaite, J. (2012). Investigating the structure and meaning of public service motivation across populations: Developing an international instrument and addressing issues of measurement invariance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 23*(1), 79-102.

Kleinberg, J., Lakkaraju, H., Leskovec, J., Ludwig, J., & Mullainathan, S. (2017). Human decisions and machine predictions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133*(1), 237-293.

Kroll, A. (2015). Explaining the use of performance information by public managers: A planned-behavior approach. *The American Review of Public Administration, 45*(2), 201-215.

Lazarus, R.S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lee, D., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2019). Measuring bureaucratic reputation: Scale development and validation. *Governance, 32*(1), 177-192.

Linos, E. (2017). More than public service: A field experiment on job advertisements and diversity in the police. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 28*(1), 67-85.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Liu, X., Stoutenborough, J., & Vedlitz, A. (2017). Bureaucratic expertise, overconfidence, and policy choice. *Governance, 30*(4), 705-725.

Maynard-Moody, S. W., and M. C. Musheno. 2003. *Cops, teachers, counselors: Stories from the front lines of public service*. MI: University of Michigan Press.

Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Cooper, B. (2018). How leadership and public service motivation enhance innovative behavior. *Public Administration Review, 78*(1), 71-81.

Mosher, F.C. (1968). *Democracy and the Public Service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olsen, A. L. (2015). “Simon Said,” We Didn't Jump. *Public Administration Review, 75*(2), 325-326.

Olsen, A. L., Hjorth, F., Harmon, N., & Barfort, S. (2019, in press). Behavioral dishonesty in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.*

Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, *349*(6251), aac4716.

Perry, J. L. (2000). Bringing society in: Toward a theory of public-service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *10*(2), 471-488.

Perry, J.L., & Hondeghem, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Porter, E., & Rogowski, J. C. (2018). Partisanship, bureaucratic responsiveness, and election administration: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *28*(4), 602-617.

Preuss, L., & Walker, H. (2011). Psychological barriers in the road to sustainable development: evidence from public sector procurement. *Public Administration, 89*(2), 493-521.

Rayner, J., & Lawton, A. (2018). Are We Being Served? Emotional Labour in Local Government in Victoria, Australia. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 77*(3), 360-374.

Resh, W. G., Marvel, J. D., & Wen, B. (2018). The persistence of prosocial work effort as a function of mission match. *Public Administration Review, 78*(1), 116-125.

Riccucci, N. M. (2018). *Managing Diversity In Public Sector Workforces*. London: Routledge.

Riccucci, N. M., Van Ryzin, G. G., & Li, H. (2016). Representative bureaucracy and the willingness to coproduce: An experimental study. *Public Administration Review, 76*(1), 121-130.

Rosenfeld, B., Imai, K., & Shapiro, J. N. (2016). An empirical validation study of popular survey methodologies for sensitive questions. *American Journal of Political Science, 60*(3), 783-802.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68.

Sanders, M., & Kirkman, E. (2019, in press). I've booked you a place, good luck: A field experiment applying behavioral science to improve attendance at high impact recruitment events. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration, 2*(1):1-9.

Savi, R., & Cepilovs, A. (2017). Central decisions, decentralized solutions: Comparing the implications of central cutback policy for the agency level in Estonia and Latvia. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 19*(2), 139-154.

Schillemans, T. (2016). Calibrating Public Sector Accountability: Translating experimental findings to public sector accountability. *Public Management Review, 18*(9), 1400-1420.

Schott, R. L. (1986). The psychological development of adults: Implications for public administration. *Public Administration Review, 46*(6), 657-667.

Shafir, E. (Ed.). (2013). *The behavioral foundations of public policy*. New Haven: Princeton University Press.

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-behavior relations: a conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *12*(1), 1-36.

Simon, H. A. (1947/1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: Macmillan.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *69*(1), 99-118.

Simon, H. A. (1990). Invariants of human behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *41*(1), 1-20.

Simons, D. J., Holcombe, A. O., & Spellman, B. A. (2014). An introduction to registered replication reports at perspectives on psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*(5), 552-555.

Skinner, E. A., Edge, K., Altman, J., & Sherwood, H. (2003). Searching for the structure of coping: a review and critique of category systems for classifying ways of coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(2), 216.

Steele, C.M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*(6), 613.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Thomann, E. (2018). "Donate your organs, donate life!" Explicitness in policy instruments. *Policy Sciences, 51*(4), 433-456.

Thomann, E., van Engen, N., & Tummers, L. G. (2018). The necessity of discretion: A behavioral evaluation of bottom-up implementation theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *28*(4), 583-601.

Tummers, L. G. (2012). Policy alienation of public professionals: The construct and its measurement. *Public Administration Review*, *72*(4), 516-525.

Tummers, L. G., Bekkers, V., Vink, E., & Musheno, M. (2015). Coping during public service delivery: A conceptualization and systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *25*(4), 1099-1126.

Tummers, L. G., Olsen, A. L., Jilke, S., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G. (2016). Introduction to the virtual issue on behavioral public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 3*(1), 1-3.

Tybur, J. M., & Griskevicius, V. (2013). Evolutionary psychology: a fresh perspective for understanding and changing problematic behavior. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(1), 12-22.

Van Loon, N. M., Vandenabeele, W., & Leisink, P. (2015). On the bright and dark side of public service motivation: The relationship between PSM and employee wellbeing. *Public Money & Management*, *35*(5), 349-356.

Van Ryzin, G. G., Riccucci, N. M., & Li, H. (2017). Representative bureaucracy and its symbolic effect on citizens: a conceptual replication. *Public Management Review, 19*(9), 1365-1379.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a public administration theory of public service motivation: An institutional approach. *Public Management Review*, *9*(4), 545-556.

Vandenabeele, W., Ritz, A., & Neumann, O. (2018). Public service motivation: state of the art and conceptual cleanup. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe* (pp. 261-278). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Villadsen, A. R., & Wulff, J. N. (2018). Is the Public Sector a Fairer Employer? Ethnic employment discrimination in the public and private sectors. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, *4*(4), 429-448.

Waldo, D. (1965). The administrative state revisited. *Public Administration Review, 25*(1), 15-30.

Walker, R. M., Brewer, G. A., Lee, M. J., Petrovsky, N., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2019, in press). Best practice recommendations for replicating experiments in public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Weibel, A., Rost, K., & Osterloh, M. (2009). Pay for performance in the public sector—Benefits and (hidden) costs. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 20*(2), 387-412.

White Jr, R. D. (1999). Are women more ethical? Recent findings on the effects of gender upon moral development. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 20*, 9(3), 459-472.

Wright, B. E. (2004). The role of work context in work motivation: A public sector application of goal and social cognitive theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 20*, 14(1), 59-78.

Wright, B. E., & Grant, A. M. (2010). Unanswered questions about public service motivation: Designing research to address key issues of emergence and effects. *Public Administration Review, 70*(5), 691-700.

Zhu, L., Witko, C., & Meier, K. J. (2019). The Public Administration Manifesto II: Matching Methods to Theory and Substance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 29*(2):287-298.