

MAN 680: Challenges in Public and Nonprofit Management – Case Study Seminar

Chair of Business Administration, Public & Nonprofit Management

1	Module description	2
2	Learning and qualification outcome	2
3	Organizational information	2
4	Module details.....	3
4.1	Proof of Performance.....	4
4.2	General Requirements of the Students	4
4.3	Requirements for the Wiki article	4
4.4	Requirements for the Case Presentation	4
4.5	Requirements for the Written Seminar Work.....	5
5	Case Studies	5
	Case Study 1: Drishti Eye Hospitals: Balancing Financial and Social Goals	5
	Case Study 2: Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy	5
	Case Study 3: Vox Capital: Pioneering Impact Investing in Brazil	6
	Case Study 4: The Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths.....	6
	Case Study 5: Emergency Response to a Long-Term Crisis? Médecins sans Frontières and HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia.....	6
	Case Study 6: Mothers of Rotterdam: Scaling a Social Services Program in the Netherlands	6
	Case Study 7: Acindar and Its Corporate Volunteer Program	7
	Case Study 8: Measured Approach: TEGV Assesses Its Performance & Impact on Educational Enrichment Programs.....	7
	Case Study 9: Christine Lagarde: Being a Public Servant	8
	Case Study 10: Megaprojects & the Role of the Public: Germany's Embattled 'Stuttgart 21' Rail Project.....	8
6	Literature (for Wiki articles).....	8

1 Module description

Worldwide public and nonprofit organizations make an important contribution to society. In order to face the increasing economization and globalization in the public and nonprofit sector, organizations need to professionalize. Combined with the public and nonprofit-specific organizational purpose, these tendencies pose particular challenges to public and nonprofit management. These will be highlighted by analyzing scientific papers and by discussing practical cases and project work.

2 Learning and qualification outcome

By the end of the module students will be able to:

- explain the particularities of public and nonprofit management,
- apply general management methods in the public and nonprofit sector,
- evaluate the development of specific concepts for public and nonprofit organizations,
- discuss hypotheses and findings in the field of public and nonprofit management,
- critically analyze scientific papers.

Moreover, key competencies such as presentation competence, working with academic papers and team competencies shall be acquired

3 Organizational information

Kick-off: 3 March 2021, 08:30 am–11:45 am (Zoom link via Portal2)
(*presence required*)

Consultation hours: 17/18 March 2021 (Zoom link will be provided)
(*presence required*)

Paper/Case processing: 9 April 2021, 11:59 am (Deadline)
(*self-study*)

Block (I – X): 12 April – 14 April 2021 & 19 – 21 April 2021
(*presence required*) 08:30 am – 11:45 am (Zoom link via Portal2)

Written seminar work: 4 June 2021, 11:59 am (Deadline)
(*self-study*)

Form of assessment: Wiki article (individual work; 10 %); case presentation (group work; 40 %); written seminar work (group work, individually written chapters; 50 %)

Registration:	Registration is administered centrally via the Portal2 (official registration period in February/March 2021); no registration possible after the kick-off on 3 March 2021.
Module materials:	ILIAS
Credits:	6 ECTS (= 180 working hours: attendance of seminar (20) + case processing (60) + preparation for Wiki article (20) + writing seminar paper (80))

Contact details

Lecturer:	Benedikt Englert
Email:	benedikt.englert@uni-mannheim.de
Phone:	+49 621 181-1723
Office hours:	by appointment

4 Module details

There will be a kick-off session to start the seminar MAN 680 on 3 March 2021. The lecturer will introduce the fundamentals of public and nonprofit management. Moreover, he will clarify the seminar content and administrative details. In the kick-off session students will be assigned to a case study and scientific paper for the wiki article. Before the kick-off, students may opt for their prioritized case study until 2 March, 11:59 am. (Excel sheet with prioritization on ILIAS; upload of prioritization also on ILIAS; 1: highest priority, 10 lowest priority).

On 17/18 March 2021, the instructor offers a case and group-specific Q&A session to answer questions. The final slides for the case presentations need to be provided by 9 April 2021, 11:59 am the latest (pdf-format via ILIAS upload).

During the block seminar days (12 – 14 April & 19 – 21 April 2021; 08:30 am – 11:45 am), we will discuss several different challenges of public and nonprofit management and listen to the case presentations and discussions of the groups. The order of presentations will follow the module schedule for all seminar dates, which will be presented in the kick-off session. The maximum presenting time allowed is 30 minutes. Each presentation will be followed by a general Q&A session. Afterwards, the presentation group will moderate 10-15 minutes discussion on the case and the general topic.

Following the seminar sessions, the students will individually compose a seminar thesis, in which they will discuss the cases based on the particular theoretical-conceptual foundations of the respective content areas (please view chair-specific guidelines for the composition of scientific work). The written seminar work (5000-6000 words, including tables and figures; excluding bibliography) is due on 4 June 2021 (11:59 am) via ILIAS (Word or pdf-file).

4.1 *Proof of Performance*

The proof of performance is composed of the parts: Wiki article (individual work; 10 %); case presentation (group work; 40 %); written seminar work (group work, individually written chapters; 50 %).

	Share of final grade
Wiki article	10 %
Case presentation	40 %
Written seminar work	50 %
Total	100 %

4.2 *General Requirements of the Students*

The contents of the seminar will be developed through case studies based on current scholarly literature in the field of public and nonprofit management. Aside from the input given by the instructors, the presentation and critical discussion of the cases play a major role during the compulsory sessions. Consequently, we expect proper preparation and active attendance of all students during the seminar sessions.

Because the case studies and the majority of the scholarly literature for the topics are in English, competency of the English language, as well as the readiness to critically deal with topic-specific practical challenges and scientific literature, are prerequisites for participation in the seminar.

Prerequisite for a successful completion of the seminar is regular attendance. Excused absence during seminar sessions is allowed for a maximum of 180 minutes if no proof of performance is to be delivered during these sessions.

4.3 *Requirements for the Wiki article*

In order to lay the conceptual basis for the subsequent case discussion, each student creates a wiki article on a scientific article. The scientific article belongs to the subject area of the case study to be worked on. In the wiki article, the problem, research question, conceptual basis and central findings are to be presented. Assessment criteria are the critical reflection of the scientific article, clear and transparent presentation of results, consistency and relevance.

4.4 *Requirements for the Case Presentation*

The students are to present a case study on specific challenges in public and nonprofit management. Key aspects of the cases should be reported, as well as critically reflected and discussed based on guiding questions for the central problems. To support the speech, power-point-presentations are highly recommended. The duration of the presentation is limited to 30 minutes. Each presentation will be followed by a general Q&A session. Afterwards, the presentation group will moderate 10-15 minutes discussion on the case and the general topic.

Assessment criteria are the content, structure, and delivery of the presentation as well as how questions and feedback are handled.

4.5 *Requirements for the Written Seminar Work*

Goal of the seminar thesis is to reflect the students' ability to critically – and in a written form – discuss the practical challenges of public and nonprofit management through case studies on the basis of topic-specific theoretical-conceptual foundations. To support this process, students can make use of existing scientific management literature (use insights from Wiki articles). The structure of the seminar thesis follows the provided guiding questions. The allocation of the respective parts is to be highlighted. The outline for the thesis can be discussed in the Q&A session with the instructors on 17/18 March 2021.

Assessment criteria are the content, systematic approach, scientific language and formal aspects of the thesis. The theses have to be in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Chair for Public and Nonprofit Management (see homepage).

5 Case Studies

Case Study 1: Drishti Eye Hospitals: Balancing Financial and Social Goals

In 2011, after decades of the eye-care needs of India's semi-urban and rural population being largely ignored by both government and commercial enterprises, the corporate team of Drishti established two eye hospitals to address these unmet needs. However, Drishti faced some tough challenges in expanding its operations. Given that Drishti's hospitals were located in semi-urban and rural areas, attracting and retaining highly-trained professional staff was very difficult. Drishti also needed to consider the implications of accessing equity capital to pursue its social goals. With its business model showing positive results, should Drishti opt for rapid growth or achieve slower growth by using internally generated funds? In the pursuit of financial goals, would Drishti need to compromise on any of its social goals?

Case Study 2: Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy

The Google.org: For-Profit Philanthropy case introduces a distinct social enterprise structure, a combination of a philanthropic division of a for-profit corporation and a nonprofit foundation. The case provides an up-to-date, in-depth description of Google.org, one such hybrid, and a brief overview of Salesforce.org, a comparable hybrid. This case provides an opportunity to explore the tensions between the for-profit and nonprofit entities that inevitably arise in such structures, as well as factors that contribute to these tensions and solutions that have been attempted to address them. The case revolves around the tension caused when a non-entrepreneurial entity, Google.org, is created within the entrepreneurial culture of Google. Unlike most entrepreneurial ventures, Google.org is flush with cash; like many, it lacks cohesion around mission and vision.

Case Study 3: Vox Capital: Pioneering Impact Investing in Brazil

Vox Capital was the first certified impact investing fund in Brazil. Founded in 2009, it provides early-stage capital for companies offering innovative and scalable solutions to enhance the lives of low-income Brazilians, while aiming to simultaneously generate attractive market-rate financial returns for investors. This case examines the evolution of Vox Capital, across understanding the landscape, launching, raising funds, selecting investees, structuring deals, building investee capacities, tracking performance, developing internal systems, and advancing the field of impact investing.

Case Study 4: The Mosquito Network: Collaborative Entrepreneurship in the Fight to Eliminate Malaria Deaths

“The Mosquito Network” describes the appointment and work of Ray Chambers, a retired private equity entrepreneur, as the United Nations’ Special Envoy for Malaria. The A case covers the modern history of efforts to combat malaria and the beginnings of Chambers’s involvement in the cause. The case is about leadership skills and techniques required for organizing a complex network of private, non-profit, and for-profit enterprises in a combined effort to solve a global health problem.

Case Study 5: Emergency Response to a Long-Term Crisis? Médecins sans Frontières and HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia

Medecins sans Frontieres (MSF, Doctors without Borders) is an organization that responds to humanitarian crises throughout the world with medical staff and supplies. The organization also acts as an advocate for those it serves, providing “testimony” (temoignage) about the plight of those caught up in humanitarian crises. In the late 1990s MSF began caring for people with HIV/AIDS and in 2000 began the first efforts to provide anti-retroviral (ARV) drugs to HIV-infected people in developing countries. The case describes these efforts, and, in particular, an initiative in Ethiopia by MSF Holland. The discussion of the situation in Holland focuses on the reasons why MSF began an ARV program in Ethiopia and what its future was likely to be. The case highlights the problems facing a highly decentralized organization oriented towards emergency response, which is, nevertheless, engaged in a long-term intervention. As such, it raises questions about the alignment between the organization’s mission, structure, and the requirements of a particular program. It also highlights questions about organizational decision making both in terms of entry into a new initiative and exit from it. Finally, it provides an example of organizational effectiveness as advocacy – how proving the impossible is possible moves policy makers to act. The case is appropriate for classes on strategic management and operations management.

Case Study 6: Mothers of Rotterdam: Scaling a Social Services Program in the Netherlands

The case of Mothers of Rotterdam - an entrepreneurial social service program that helps the cities disadvantaged pregnant women based in the Netherland- deals with opportunities, obstacles and stakeholder-management in the upscaling process of a social service program.

Some of the relevant questions this case addresses are: How do you turn an innovative start-up program into a structured professional program without losing the passion and energy that comes from its founders? How do you go from a start-up to a more structured, formalized organization?

The case goes on to unfold the story of Mothers of Rotterdam from its inception through the board of directors meeting. The program's stakeholders, eager to broaden the impact of Mothers of Rotterdam grapple with how the program can best be scaled up. Of significance is the role of the organization's charismatic founder, Barend Rombout, who is credited with driving the program's successful—if unorthodox—approach to social service delivery.

Case Study 7: Acindar and Its Corporate Volunteer Program

A family-owned business, Acindar was one of the most important steel companies in Argentina. After the 2001-2002 Argentine economic crisis, it yielded its controlling stake to a new investor--Belgo Mineira, a Brazilian company of Austrian origin. Arturo Acevedo Jr., the founder's grandson, kept his managerial position as company CEO and president. Acindar Foundation, through the initiative of the company's founder Arturo Acevedo (grandfather) and in its capacity as corporate social policy enforcer, engaged in comprehensive educational, health, and environmental activities for 40 years. Depicts the changes resulting from the incorporation of the new shareholders to the company and how they reflected on the foundation's management and the corporate HR area. The triggering factor was an initiative to develop a corporate volunteer program similar to the one Belgo Mineira had implemented in Brazil--a project that integrated foundation, corporate, and HR management efforts at each production plant.

Case Study 8: Measured Approach: TEGV Assesses Its Performance & Impact on Educational Enrichment Programs

This case traces the evolution of thinking about, and the implementation of, performance assessment at one of Turkey's largest and most respected nonprofit organizations, the Educational Volunteers Foundation of Turkey (TEGV). TEGV delivers a broad array of educational enrichment programs to low income children across Turkey through a team of volunteers. In contrast to many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) across the world, which have adopted performance measurement reluctantly, as a necessary but onerous condition of receiving grant funds, TEGV embraced the idea early, for its own organizational purposes. In the course of telling TEGV's performance assessment story, the case includes detailed descriptions of two different approaches to program review and two broader impact studies. It includes 17 pages of exhibits-most of which provide samples of study results for students to review and discuss. TEGV's approach to assessment has been varied, creative and has evolved over time. Students of performance evaluation will likely see both pluses and minuses in the nature of each assessment described in this case, ensuring a rich and lively discussion.

Case Study 9: Christine Lagarde: Being a Public Servant

This case covers the career of Christine Lagarde from 2005 to 2011 after she joins the French Government. After serving several grueling years as Finance Minister during the financial crises that started in 2007/2008, she is being considered as the next Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). As the first female head of the IMF, she would lead a very complex, 187-member organization typically run by economists. The ability to shape better outcomes to some of the world's thorniest problems appeals to her, but she needs to carefully consider the risks.

Case Study 10: Megaprojects & the Role of the Public: Germany's Embattled 'Stuttgart 21' Rail Project

In February 2010, Germany's national railway broke ground on a project that had been under negotiation for more than 20 years, the Stuttgart segment of the European Magistrale, a 930-mile cross-Europe high-speed rail line that would one day extend from Paris through Munich and Vienna to Budapest and Bratislava. At long last, the German national railway, the state of Baden-Württemberg, and the city of Stuttgart had come to agreement on the routing and station design of the megaproject. Yet within the year, the project would spark the largest citizen demonstrations Germany had seen since the reunification of the country. The Stuttgart 21 opponents were diverse, and so were their concerns, but nearly all were united by one overriding contention: that political elites had conceived the plan without public input and had later refused to take citizen objections seriously. The case provides basic background and context for this controversy, then describes four kinds of public participation that took place in the course of developing the project: (1) a city-sponsored open-participation process in 1997 allowing citizens to weigh in on the neighborhood re-development portions of the project; (2) a petition drive by opponents to hold a city referendum on the project, later followed by mass demonstrations; (3) a state-sponsored mediation process between supporters and opponents of the project; and (4) a state election followed by a state referendum on the project.

6 Literature (for Wiki articles)

Hybrid Organizing

- Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing Research on Hybrid Organizing – Insights from the Study of Social Enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397–441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.893615>
- Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C., & Model, J. (2014). Harnessing Productive Tensions in Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Work Integration Social Enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6), 1658–1685. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0903>

- Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 364–381. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0431>
- Hustinx, L., & De Waele, E. (2015). Managing Hybridity in a Changing Welfare Mix: Everyday Practices in an Entrepreneurial Nonprofit in Belgium. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(5), 1666–1689. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9625-8>

Corporate Philanthropy

- Besharov, M. L. (2014). The Relational Ecology of Identification: How Organizational Identification Emerges When Individuals Hold Divergent Values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1485–1512. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0761>
- Davies, I. A., & Doherty, B. (2019). Balancing a Hybrid Business Model: The Search for Equilibrium at Cafédirect. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157(4), 1043–1066. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3960-9>
- Gautier, A., & Pache, A.-C. (2015). Research on Corporate Philanthropy: A Review and Assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(3), 343–369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1969-7>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating Shared Value: How to Reinvent Capitalism - and Unleash a Wave of Innovation and Growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77.

Impact Investing

- Barnett, M. L., & Salomon, R. M. (2003). Throwing a Curve at Socially Responsible Investing Research: A New Pitch at an Old Debate. *Organization & Environment*, 16(3), 381–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026603256285>
- Glänzel, G., & Scheuerle, T. (2016). Social Impact Investing in Germany: Current Impediments from Investors' and Social Entrepreneurs' Perspectives. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1638–1668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9621-z>
- Höchstädter, A. K., & Scheck, B. (2015). What's in a Name: An Analysis of Impact Investing Understandings by Academics and Practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132(2), 449–475. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2327-0>
- Martin, M. (2015). Building Impact Businesses through Hybrid Financing. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2015-0005>

Partnerships & Network Governance

- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-Private Partnerships: Perspectives on Purposes, Publicness, and Good Governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.584>
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2007). Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015>

- Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR Through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design and Institutionalisation of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(S2), 413–429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9743-y>
- Van Ham, H., & Koppenjan, J. (2001). Building Public-Private Partnerships: Assessing and Managing Risks in Port Development. *Public Management Review*, 3(4), 593–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616670110070622>

Strategic Management

- Hudson, B. A., & Bielefeld, W. (1997). Structures of Multinational Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 8(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.4130080105>
- Johansen, M. S., & Sowa, J. E. (2019). Human Resource Management, Employee Engagement, and Nonprofit Hospital Performance. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 29(4), 549–567. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21352>
- Jones, M. B. (2007). The Multiple Sources of Mission Drift. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2), 299–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764007300385>
- Lindenberg, M. (1999). Declining State Capacity, Voluntarism, and the Globalization of the Not-for-Profit Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1_suppl), 147–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089976499773746492>

Scaling Social Business

- Bloom, P. N., & Chatterji, A. K. (2009). Scaling Social Entrepreneurial Impact. *California Management Review*, 51(3), 114–133. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166496>
- Cannatelli, B. (2017). Exploring the Contingencies of Scaling Social Impact: A Replication and Extension of the SCALERS Model. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(6), 2707–2733. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-016-9789-x>
- Heinecke, A., & Mayer, J. (2012). Strategies for Scaling in Social Entrepreneurship. In C. K. Volkmann, K. O. Tokarski, & K. Ernst (Hrsg.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business* (S. 191–209). Gabler Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-7093-0_10
- Mair, J., Battilana, J., & Cardenas, J. (2012). Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneurial Models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 353–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1414-3>

Corporate Volunteering

- Rodell, J. B., Booth, J. E., Lynch, J. W., & Zipay, K. P. (2017). Corporate Volunteering Climate: Mobilizing Employee Passion for Societal Causes and Inspiring Future Charitable Action. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1662–1681. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0726>
- Rodell, J. B., Breitsohl, H., Schröder, M., & Keating, D. J. (2016). Employee Volunteering: A Review and Framework for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 55–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315614374>

- Rodell, J. B., & Lynch, J. W. (2016). Perceptions of Employee Volunteering: Is It “Credited” or “Stigmatized” by Colleagues? *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 611–635. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0566>
- Samuel, O., Wolf, P., & Schilling, A. (2013). Corporate Volunteering: Benefits and Challenges for Nonprofits: *Corporate Volunteering. Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(2), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21089>

Volunteer Management and Performance Measurement

- Bagnoli, L., & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring Performance in Social Enterprises. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009351111>
- Englert, B., Thaler, J., & Helmig, B. (2020). Fit Themes in Volunteering: How Do Volunteers Perceive Person–Environment Fit? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 49(2), 336–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019872005>
- Speckbacher, G. (2013). The Use of Incentives in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(5), 1006–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012447896>
- Studer, S. (2016). Volunteer Management: Responding to the Uniqueness of Volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(4), 688–714. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015597786>

Public Service Motivation

- Andersen, L. B., Heinesen, E., & Pedersen, L. H. (2014). How Does Public Service Motivation Among Teachers Affect Student Performance in Schools? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(3), 651–671. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut082>
- Gould-Williams, J. S., Mostafa, A. M. S., & Bottomley, P. (2015). Public Service Motivation and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Person-Organization Fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 25(2), 597–622. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut053>
- Ritz, A., Brewer, G. A., & Neumann, O. (2016). Public Service Motivation: A Systematic Literature Review and Outlook. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 414–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12505>
- Wright, B. E., Christensen, R. K., & Pandey, S. K. (2013). Measuring Public Service Motivation: Exploring the Equivalence of Existing Global Measures. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(2), 197–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.817242>

Citizen Participation

- Branden, T., & Honingh, M. (2016). Distinguishing Different Types of Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12465>
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x>

- Thomsen, M. K., Baekgaard, M., & Jensen, U. T. (2020). The Psychological Costs of Citizen Coproduction. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(4), 656–673. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa001>
- Walters, L. C., Aydelotte, J., & Miller, J. (2000). Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4), 349–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00097>