

FALSE GLOBALISM:
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES
IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Alasdair Roberts

University of Massachusetts Amherst

alasdair.roberts@gmail.com

Forthcoming in *Administrative Theory & Praxis*

December 6, 2024

ABSTRACT. In 2012, two keystone scholarly institutions in United States (US) public administration, NASPAA and *Public Administration Review* (PAR), began describing themselves as global enterprises, concerned with research and teaching on a globally inclusive basis. At first glance, this promise of a shift from national to global focus might reassure Global South scholars concerned about longstanding US hegemony in public administration scholarship. However, these claims about a shift toward globality are unsupported by the evidence that has accumulated over the past decade. Neither NASPAA nor PAR has adequately addressed barriers to participation by the Global South in their activities, and neither has strong incentives to do so. In fact, false claims about global inclusivity may reinforce US dominance within the field of public administration around the world. To promote diversity and inclusion within public administration scholarship, we must begin by questioning globality claims made by institutions like NASPAA and PAR, and adopting an approach to dialogue built on the principle of epistemic pluralism.

KEYWORDS: Public administration theory, globalization, hegemony

THE ERA OF FALSE GLOBALISM

For many years, United States (US) scholarship in public administration has had a profound influence on scholarship in the field in the Global South.¹ For example, Sofi Ali and Anita Rao have argued that Indian scholarship in public administration has been "monopolized ... by practices and thought prevalent in the United States" (Ali and Rao 2000, 174). Similarly, Alex Brillantes and Maricel Fernandez have described "a crisis of identity of public administration in the Philippines" caused by the "the inordinate influence of American public administration theory" (Brillantes Jr and Fernandez 2013, 82). Shamsul Haque has noted the "hegemonic intellectual presence of American public administration" throughout Asia (Haque 2013, 270). US scholars "dominate the PA research agenda" in South America as well (Peci and Fornazin 2016, 101).

At best, the dominance of US scholarship within the Global South has been a mixed blessing. On one hand, Global South scholars have benefited from the theoretical and methodological innovations of their US counterparts. On the other, there is widespread recognition that the U.S. literature reflects US values and priorities, and often has "limited practical value" in other contexts (Sharma 2008, 244; Torneo 2020). Bidyut Chakrabarty describes Indian public administration as a field "in bondage" to the

¹ Following the suggestion of reviewers, I generally use "United States" or "US" rather than "American" throughout this paper, although I refer to citizens of the United States as Americans, following conventional usage. "Global South" is a commonly used phrase that "refers broadly to the regions of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Oceania" (Dados and Connell 2012, 12).

"ethnocentric bias" of US scholarship (Chakrabarty 2014, 10). Others have characterized the dominance of US scholarship as a form of epistemic imperialism (Moloney, Sanabria-Pulido and Demircioglu 2023).

At first glance, recent developments within the scholarly field of US public administration might reassure Global South scholars concerned about US dominance. Over the last fifteen years, there have been many calls for the field to adopt a "global perspective" that would allow more room for voices from the developing world (Hou, Ni et al. 2011; Gulrajani and Moloney 2012). Indeed, two of the most important institutions within the US scholarly field of public administration appear to have responded to these calls by redefining themselves as global rather than US-national enterprises. The first institution is NASPAA, which has set standards for US public administration degree programs since the 1970s. The second institution is *Public Administration Review* (PAR), which has been the main journal in the US field for eighty years. As we shall see, both institutions now emphasize their "global mission" and commitment to the "global community." I will refer to such institutional statements as *globality claims*. Globality, according to Merriam-Webster, is "the condition of being global" (Merriam-Webster 2024).

The fact that these two keystone institutions now make globality claims may seem like good news. Unfortunately, these globality claims cannot be substantiated. In other

words, they are false claims. After more than a decade, NASPAA and PAR are still controlled by US scholars and schools, with support from allies in a handful of other countries located mainly in the Global North. Neither institution has taken significant steps to identify and remove barriers to participation from scholars in the Global South. In fact, both institutions face financial and other incentives to maintain the status quo rather than promoting true global inclusion.

Rather than challenging epistemic imperialism, this new talk about globalism may actually reinforce it. By asserting that there is a unified global field of public administration, NASPAA and PAR deny the possibility that there may be many fields, varying by region, each with its own priorities and approaches. And by asserting leadership within this unified global field, NASPAA and PAR position themselves more firmly as instruments for propagating US priorities and approaches. Alternative perspectives about the research agenda are suppressed, while the reality of US dominance is obscured by unsubstantiated claims about global inclusion. Scholars in the Global South should question these globality claims closely, and insist on dialogue built on the principle of epistemological pluralism. This would promote genuinely inclusive conversation among scholars of public administration around the world.

WHAT DOES GLOBALITY REQUIRE?

To determine whether globality claims are true or false, we need criteria for assessing globality. In other words: What exactly does it mean for an organization to be global with respect to its mission, activities, and membership? Neither NASPAA nor PAR has explained what it means to be a global organization or offered benchmarks for determining when global status has been achieved. This fact alone suggests a lack of seriousness about global inclusion. It also places the burden on observers to devise their own definition of globality, as a preface to assessing the truthfulness of globality claims.

We can begin by making some distinctions. A *global* organization must be something more than a *national* organization, that is, an organization primarily concerned with one country rather than several. An organization may still be national even if it has some interests in other countries. For example, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) has some non-U.S. members and cooperation agreements with organizations in other countries. However, these forms of international engagement are incidental to ASPA's main purpose of promoting public administration within the United States. ASPA defines itself a national organization, led by a National Council and National Office, which annually convenes a National Conference (ASPA 2020).

Organizations whose core interests and membership span more than one country can be described as *international*. If only two countries are involved, however, the better label might be *bilateral* rather than international. The Union of International Associations (UIA) says that an *international* organization should involve at least three countries, and cautions that "voting power must be such that no one national group can control the organization" (UIA 2024).

There must also be a distinction between *international* and *global* organizations. There are more than 190 countries in the world today, and it would be absurd to count an organization as global if it encompassed only three of them (United Nations 2024). Moreover, we should be interested not just in the number of countries represented, but population within those countries. An organization that included the world's hundred least populous countries would account for less than five percent of the world's population (World Population Review 2024). For that reason, we ought to be reluctant to call it truly global.

The geographical distribution of countries that are involved in an organization is also relevant. For example, the Council of Europe (which includes forty-six countries) and the African Union (which includes fifty-five) are merely *regional* rather than *global* organizations, even though the number of participating countries is relatively large. Joseph Nye argues that organizations should be counted as regional if membership is

limited by geographical continuity, and quasi-regional if membership is mainly limited to a geographic area, even if there are some members from outside that area (Nye 1971, 8).

How broad should be the geographic reach of a global organization? To answer that question, we can look at other ways in which the concept of globality has been applied. Globalization has been described as a process that involves "the creation of structures and processes that span the entire globe" (Donnelly and Whelan 2020, 276). Similarly, the global economy has been defined as one that "reaches into every corner of the world," while global civil society has been defined as a system of non-governmental organizations "that straddle the whole earth" (Keane 2003, 8; Hertenstein 2019, 7). We can see that the essence of globality is comprehensiveness. No major region of the world is excluded.

We are now in a position to form an opinion about globality requires. The membership of a global organization ought to include a large number of countries, encompassing a substantial proportion of the world's population, representing most if not all of the world's main regions. The main activities of the organization ought to have similar range. Decision-making power within the organization should also be distributed broadly among countries and regions. Just as an organization is not counted as international by UIA standards if one country dominates, we should not count an

organization as global if it is effectively controlled by a small number of countries, or one or two regions, with minimal influence from the rest of the world.

Developing a more precise definition of a global organization is possible but unnecessary for present purposes. Even with this general definition, it is clear that neither NASPAA nor PAR passes the globality test.

NASPAA: A GLOBAL INSTITUTION?

Before 2012 NASPAA defined itself as a national organization. It was founded in 1970 to promote "collective effort" by graduate public affairs programs in the United States, and the acronym comes from its original name, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (Henry 2015, 164).

Forty years later, NASPAA leaders developed broader ambitions. In 2011, NASPAA president Nadia Rubaii said that it was "time for NASPAA to stop talking about becoming a global leader in quality public affairs education and accreditation *and accept that it already is*" (Rubaii 2012, 5; emphasis added). The following year, NASPAA told its accrediting body, the U.S. Council on Higher Education Accreditation, that it intended to begin accrediting programs outside the United States (NASPAA 2012, 8). NASPAA said that it had adopted a new name—the Network of Schools of Public Policy,

Affairs, and Administration—that "better reflects NASPAA's transition to a global organization, removing the word 'national'" (NASPAA 2014a, 1).

Over the next decade, NASPAA leaders repeatedly identified the organization as a global enterprise. In 2014, president Ethel Williams described NASPAA as an organization with "global constituents" that set "the global standard in public service organization" (Williams 2014, 12-13). In 2015, president J. Edward Kellough described NASPAA as a "global organization" and a "global community" (Kellough 2015, 9 and 12). In 2016, president Michelle Piskulich described NASPAA as "a global nonprofit organization" with a "global mission," "operating on a global scale" and a "global stage" (Piskulich 2016, 12). In 2017, president Jack Meek described NASPAA as a "global institution" with "global reach" (Meek 2018, 138, 141, and 149). In 2019, president Robert Orr described NASPAA as a "global leader" (Orr 2019). In 2023, president Trevor Brown said: "We are a global organization" (Brown 2023). On social media, NASPAA says that it "sets the global standard in public service education." (NASPAA 2024d). Similarly, the homepage of its website says: "The global standard in public service education" (NASPAA 2024a).

These claims about global inclusivity must be contrasted against the realities of governance within NASPAA. The organization is effectively controlled by U.S. institutions, just as it was before 2012. NASPAA has never had a president from an

institution located outside the United States (NASPAA 2024b). Its eighteen-member executive council is also dominated by U.S. institutions, which controlled sixteen positions on the council between 2022 and 2024, or eighty-eight percent of votes. The president and executive council are elected during NASPAA's annual business meeting, at which each member institution has one vote. In 2024, NASPAA had 317 voting members, of which ninety percent were from the United States.

The persistence of US control within NASPAA is further illustrated by the composition of its committees.² The most important of these is the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA), which makes accreditation decisions. COPRA has never had a chair affiliated with a non-U.S. institution (NASPAA 2023c). In 2024, U.S. institutions claimed sixteen of seventeen seats on COPRA, or ninety-four percent of votes. COPRA applies standards that are developed by the Standards Committee, which in 2024 was comprised entirely of members from U.S. institutions. NASPAA had twenty other active committees and sections in 2024, with a total of 86 members. Ninety-one percent of these members were from U.S. institutions.

U.S. dominance is also evident in the composition of site visit teams. Site visitors are the "eyes and ears" of COPRA, responsible for judging the veracity of a program's

² Data on committee composition was drawn from the NASPAA website on January 27, 2024. <https://www.naspaa.org/about/governance/committees-sections>.

application for accreditation and investigating COPRA's concerns (NASPAA 2022c, 4; NASPAA 2024c). None of NASPAA's 101 site visitors in 2021-2022 were affiliated with institutions outside the United States (NASPAA 2022a, 43). Eighty-one of eighty-four site visitors in 2022-23, and all twenty-eight chairs of site visit teams, came from US institutions (NASPAA 2023a).

NASPAA's annual conferences are also mainly US affairs. Of the thirty-seven individuals who served on conference planning committees in 2022 and 2023, thirty-three were affiliated with U.S. institutions (NASPAA 2022a, 36; NASPAA 2023a, 82). In 2022, the most recent year for which data is available, ninety-five percent of conference attendees came from U.S. institutions (NASPAA 2023c, 3). In an internal review conducted by NASPAA in 2023, non-U.S. scholars said that "conversations at NASPAA conferences and committees are too US-focused. The concerns that rise to the top of committee agendas tend to be US concerns and non-US programs feel left out of the conversation" (NASPAA 2023c, 6).

NASPAA conducts advocacy work as well, again with a US orientation. Its Policy Issues Committee, "charged with identifying issues and formulating recommendations for NASPAA action," has been composed entirely of faculty from U.S. institutions since at least 2020 (NASPAA 2023c). Since 2020, NASPAA has issued statements about police violence against Black Americans, executive orders issued by the Trump administration,

and the 2021 attack on the U.S. Capitol. NASPAA has never issued statements about controversies outside the United States. In the 2023 internal review, non-US scholars asked why "NASPAA is more outspoken on national issues but not on international issues. It is not clear to international members why that is the case" (NASPAA 2023c, 6).

NASPAA's 2023 strategic plan states that NASPAA will "develop a lobbying strategy and federal legislative agenda with a list of policy issues and funding requests to support our schools" (NASPAA 2023d). Since NASPAA represents itself as a global rather than a national organization, we could ask: *which* federal legislature? Of course, NASPAA is referring to the US Congress. The implication is that future advocacy will be limited to the United States.

In sum, the evidence shows clearly that NASPAA is not a "global organization," operating on a "global stage," and representing a "global community." Applying the UIA criteria mentioned earlier, NASPAA cannot be counted as an international organization, let alone a global one, because one national group holds an overwhelming share of voting power (UIA, 2024). The UIA specifically excludes organizations that represent themselves as international but which operate "on budgets derived almost wholly from the United States members. This again disqualifies NASPAA from inclusion in UIA's *Yearbook of*

International Organizations.³ NASPAA's non-U.S. activities are incidental to its main purpose. It is a U.S. national organization, governed by and for its US constituents.

PAR: ANOTHER "GLOBAL LEADER"?

Just as NASPAA once described itself as a U.S. national organization, *Public Administration Review* (PAR) was once considered a U.S. national journal. In 2006, editors Richard Stillman and Jos Raadschelders described PAR as "the premier American journal" (Stillman and Jos 2006, 1). A few years later, however, PAR also redefined itself as a global enterprise. Again, the evidence on globality for PAR does not support the claim. At best, PAR is an international or quasi-regional journal.

The first claim to global status came in 2011. As Stillman and Raadschelders completed their editorial service, they observed that the field of public administration was now "internationally and globally interconnected," and that one-fifth of submissions to PAR now came from outside the United States. PAR, they said, had positioned itself as "the leading global journal for interdisciplinary public administration" (Stillman and Raadschelders 2011, 925 and 930).

³ In 2022, forty-five percent of NASPAA revenue came from membership dues, and forty-six percent from its annual meeting (NASPAA 2022b, 9). Given what we know about the composition of membership and conference attendance, it is likely that about eighty-five percent of NASPAA revenue is generated within the United States.

PAR's next editorial team shared this view. In 2016, editor-in-chief James Perry described PAR as "the preeminent global professional journal in public administration" (Perry 2016, 699). In another editorial, Richard Feiock concurred that PAR was "the global leader in public administration" and "the preeminent global professional journal in public administration" (Feiock 2016, 378). In 2017, Feiock and co-editor Gregg Van Ryzin described PAR as "the leading global professional journal of public administration" (Feiock and Van Ryzin 2017, 319). At the end of his term, Perry said that PAR was "truly a global journal," pointing out that half of the articles it published came from international contributors (Perry 2017a, 811).

In 2018 another editorial team continued the theme. PAR announced that it was "dedicated to engaging the global public administration community" and that it "serves a wide range of audiences globally" (PAR 2017, 633). In 2022, editor-in-chief Jeremy Hall defined PAR as "a global journal ... [that] represents stakeholders from around the world" (Hall 2022b, 613). The following year, Hall said that PAR was "a global leader in producing timely, action-focused, and rigorous research that is relevant to the practice of public administration worldwide." PAR, he said, addresses "global topics" and has "global reach" (Hall 2023, 5).

Claims about globality made by PAR and other journals have been viewed skeptically by some scholars. Several studies published in 2011, the year that PAR first

claimed global status, showed how research in leading journals came predominately from a small number of countries: principally the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and China (Fitzpatrick, Goggin et al. 2011, 827; Hou, Ni et al. 2011, i47; Walker 2011, i55-i56). In a 2010 PAR commentary, Kim Moloney and Nilima Gulrajani also noted the absence of research on public administration in the developing world (Moloney and Gulrajani 2010). In a 2012 survey, Moloney and Gulrajani observed that PAR in particular "has not been a key outlet for empirical research on the administrations of developing countries"—a finding that they found "surprising" given "PAR's commitment to international and comparative administration" (Gulrajani and Moloney 2012, 81).

In 2013, Shamsul Haque criticized the "marginalization of Asian scholars in major public administration journals" (Haque and Turner 2013, 244). In a PAR commentary eight years later, Haque and co-authors Zeger van der Wal and Caspar van den Berg described "structural and institutional inequalities in knowledge production" that privilege scholars in the United States and Western Europe while disadvantaging scholars in the developing world (Haque, van der Wal and van den Berg 2021, 346). A 2023 PAR study reviewed fourteen thousand articles published in twenty-one journals from 2000 to 2019. It confirmed the "overwhelming dominance of Western countries" and "the limited

geographical dispersion of PA scholarship which marginalizes non-Western countries, particularly those in the Global South" (Hattke and Vogel 2023, 1547-48).

Much of this research has been directed at public administration journals in general, and not PAR specifically. However, data from the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) database allows us to narrow our focus. Since 2017, JCR has collected information about the institutional home of authors who contribute to journals listed in the database, including PAR. The following analysis is based on all articles published in PAR over six years, from 2017 to 2022.

A simple table showing the top ten contributing countries gives reason for concern about PAR's claim to global inclusivity (Table 1). Fifty-five percent of contributors to PAR between 2017 and 2022 worked in US universities. Just four countries—the United States, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and China—accounted for almost three-quarters of contributors. English-speaking and European countries accounted for 84 percent of contributors. Table 1 does not include any countries from South Asia, Africa, or Central and South America.

Table 2, showing contributors by region, provides more evidence of exclusion within PAR. Africa is almost completely overlooked. Of fifty-four African nations, only South Africa was represented in PAR in this period. South and South-eastern Asia, which hold one-third of the world's population, accounted for only 1.4 percent of PAR contributors.

Central and South America, Eastern Europe, and the non-anglophone parts of Oceania were largely excluded as well.

We can also look at the representation of Global South (GS) countries within PAR in this period. In 2022 the most populous GS country was China, with 1.4 billion people. About four percent of PAR contributors were based in China, which is low relative to population but much better than any other large GS country. After China, the ten most populous GS nations were:

India (population 1.4 billion): *No contributors to PAR in this period*
Indonesia (275 million): 0.2 percent of articles
Pakistan (236 million): 0.3 percent of articles
Nigeria (219 million): *No contributors in this period*
Brazil (203 million): 0.6 percent of articles
Bangladesh (170 million): 0.1 percent of articles
Mexico (129 million): 0.9 percent of articles
Ethiopia (123 million): *No contributors in this period*
Philippines (116 million): *No contributors in this period*
Egypt (111 million): *No contributors in this period*

In sum, these ten countries—home to almost forty percent of the world's population—accounted for only two percent of PAR contributors between 2017 and 2022.

It is sometimes suggested that a focus on contributor location is misleading because scholars in Global North institutions may be writing about the Global South. However, evidence published in PAR makes clear that scholars located in the Global North usually write about the Global North (Hattke and Vogel 2023, 1548). In any case, it would be necessary for an implausibly large majority of Global North scholars to write about the

Global South to redress the current imbalance in content. Moreover, there is a compelling argument that scholars in Global South institutions should be allowed to speak for themselves about the governance of their own countries.

Should PAR's claims about global inclusivity be taken seriously? The near-total omission of one continent, Africa, is enough to dismiss it. If that were not sufficient, we could add the neglect of South Asia or gross underrepresentation of the Global South more generally. PAR might qualify as an international journal, although we might still wonder whether Americans alone exercise effective control over its operations, which would mean that it fails the UIA test for international status. At best PAR is a quasi-regional journal, as Nye defines that term. Its pages are dominated by the United States, other anglophone countries, and parts of Western Europe. PAR is not a global journal.

OBSTACLES TO GLOBAL INCLUSION

What stops these two enterprises, NASPAA and PAR, from achieving globality? There are limits to what we can say conclusively because neither enterprise has studied the question properly. This is another sign that global inclusivity has not been taken seriously. The editors of PAR have never investigated the systemic barriers to global

inclusion.⁴ A NASPAA committee published an assessment of its "global position" in 2023, shortly before NASPAA was scheduled for review by its own supervisory body, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, which had approved NASPAA's transformation to global status in 2014 (NASPAA 2023c). However, this review was modest in scale, especially when compared to NASPAA's project to "fight against anti-black racism, discrimination, and inequity," launched in 2020 in response to the murder of George Floyd (NASPAA 2020b, 1). That initiative involved the hiring of a consultant and the adoption of an action plan to make NASPAA a "model organization" in dismantling systemic racism (NASPAA 2023c). No action plan was adopted following the 2023 "global position" report.

One obvious barrier to global inclusion in NASPAA is the cost of participating in the organization. The 2023 review acknowledged that NASPAA's non-U.S. programs "tend to be in well-funded and elite institutions" and that NASPAA is "out of reach for under-funded and public institutions" outside the United States (NASPAA 2023c, 6). The total cost of participation includes the annual membership fee, the cost of sending administrators and faculty to NASPAA's annual conference, and costs associated with the

⁴ In 2023, PAR's editorial team declined a suggestion that a committee of editorial board members should do this (PAR 2023).

accreditation process. Even within the United States, small programs have struggled with costs of participation (NASPAA 2014b, 4-6).

For non-U.S. programs, participation costs are further increased because NASPAA annual conferences are always held within the United States. Attending the conference means obtaining a visa for almost anyone living outside Europe. Although NASPAA held conferences online during the Covid pandemic, it returned to in-person conferences afterward. Two distinguished scholars, James Perry and Shahjahan Bhuiyan, observe that this decision had "far-reaching implications: It eliminates many aspirants from developing countries to participate in the conference for gaining new knowledge through exchange of views and ideas with the scholars of the Global North" (Bhuiyan and Perry 2023, 4).

The appeal of participation for non-U.S. programs is further diminished by the US focus of NASPAA's activities. As we have seen, NASPAA conferences are largely designed by and for U.S. participants. The 2023 review observed that NASPAA's accreditation standards are also "geared more toward an American audience which makes it harder for international programs to feel included" (NASPAA 2023c, 9).

Finally, NASPAA's governance structures are not designed to promote international representation. When elections are held for the Executive Council, no seats are reserved for non-U.S. representatives. Similarly, NASPAA does not reserve non-U.S.

seats on COPRA or other committees, or on its site visit teams. Nor has NASPAA established ex officio seats on its key decision-making bodies to allow representation of non-U.S. voices. NASPAA has no international advisory panel. An International Committee formed in 2012 was disbanded in 2018 (NASPAA 2023c, 5).

PAR, like other journals, engages in several practices that reduce the likelihood of broader global representation in its pages. Journal editors generally play a passive role, depending most of the time on authors to take the initiative in submitting manuscripts, rather than soliciting contributions. Without strong editorial direction, the future flow of submissions is unlikely to deviate from the past flow. At the same time, PAR (again, like many other journals) works exclusively in English. Non-native English speakers often complain that reviewers for English-language journals show bias against their work and that editorial support before submission or at the production stage is minimal (Romero-Olivares 2019).

Journals in public administration also impose an epistemological constraint on contributors. The usual advice to authors is that their work must "connect to the literature" or "contribute to the literature" (Thatcher and Fisher 2022). Following this theme, a PAR editor told prospective authors in 2024 to be sure that their work "is connected to the public administration research (citing articles published in major PA journals such as PAR, JPART, PMR, etc.)," adding that "articles published in the most

recent one or two years are good examples of papers that the journal will accept"(PAR 2024). The motivation for such advice seems sensible: knowledge will be refined more quickly if scholars work on the same set of problems. But this advice reinforces path dependence in research. New articles cannot easily deviate from already-published articles, which are written mainly by scholars in the Global North and focused on Global North problems. Scholars in the Global South are faced with a Hobson's choice: write about a problem important in their country that does not connect to the "existing literature," or write about a problem that is prominent in the existing literature but of secondary importance in their country. Global South scholars also face the practical difficulty that their institutions may be unable to afford subscriptions to journals that are regarded as the main outlets for the current literature.

Finally, scholars in the Global South face a methodological constraint. Western journals of public administration puts more emphasis on quantitative methods than they once did, and methods of data collection and analysis have become increasingly sophisticated. Scholars in the Global South may have difficulty in meeting the rising expectations of reviewers about methods and data. At the same time, journals including PAR have adopted policies designed to improve rigor and transparency, such as preregistration of experiments and publication of datasets, that create additional administrative burdens for Global South scholars (Perry 2017b).

INCENTIVES TO MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO

Beneath these practical obstacles to inclusion there lies a more fundamental problem. Neither NASPAA nor PAR has a strong motivation to globalize their operations. On the contrary, both enterprises have good reasons to maintain the status quo.

Consider NASPAA's situation. Real globalization would mean that the community of US schools could no longer determine the content of conference programs, accreditation standards, and priorities for advocacy. It is doubtful that any U.S. member of NASPAA would be prepared to accept this reality. Only a few of the larger U.S. schools have significant international interests, and even then international activities are usually of secondary importance. One of the things that large U.S. schools want from NASPAA is a forum in which they can promote their work to other U.S. schools whose votes determine the influential *US News & World Report* rankings, and in which their doctoral students can search for employment within the United States.

Most of NASPAA's U.S. members are small programs that serve their states or localities and have no significant international interests.⁵ If NASPAA activities were truly globalized, the appeal of NASPAA membership and conference attendance for these programs would likely be diminished, and their participation in NASPAA would likely

⁵ A 2023 NASPAA study noted "an inadequate understanding of the value of global engagement by some NASPAA member schools and their faculty" and noted the need to help "American schools understand the value of international engagement" (NASPAA 2023c, 6)

decline. This would have important financial implications for NASPAA. In 2021, two-thirds of NASPAA revenues came from membership and conference fees (NASPAA 2022b, 9). While NASPAA might gain revenues from new non-U.S. members, this gain would be exceeded by losses due to the defection of small U.S. programs.

Financial considerations also deter NASPAA from delivering its annual conference and business meeting online, which would boost non-U.S. participation. Conference revenues declined by forty percent when NASPAA shifted to an online format during the COVID pandemic (NASPAA 2020a, 9; NASPAA 2021, 9). Of course, the pandemic itself may have contributed to this decline. But it is noteworthy that NASPAA has avoided the online format since the pandemic (Bhuiyan and Perry 2023, 4).

Similarly, it is doubtful that ASPA—the national organization that owns PAR—would accept the sort of changes in the journal that true globalization would require. Suppose that PAR capped articles from the United States at twenty percent, which would be roughly one-third of the current level but still disproportionate based on population. US scholars would protest vigorously, because publication in journals like PAR is essential to career advancement, and any significant cap on US contributions would mean a dramatic increase in the rejection rate for US manuscripts (Volcker Alliance 2017, 17). At the same time, ASPA's practitioner members, especially those based in state and local government, would question the journal's relevance to their work.

For PAR editors there is an additional consideration. PAR prides itself as a "top-ranked" journal in public administration (UCF 2019). Rank is determined by a journal's impact factor, which is a measure of the frequency with which articles in one journal are referenced within articles published by other journals. If PAR began publishing many articles on themes relevant to the Global South, but other journals persisted with "the existing literature," then the likelihood of cross-journal citation would decline, and so would PAR's ranking. A significant decline in ranking could be self-reinforcing, because PAR might be removed from the lists that are used by higher education authorities in some countries to assess the productivity of researchers. In addition, subscriptions to lower-ranked journals are more likely to be cancelled by university libraries. This would affect ASPA's finances. We do not know exactly how much PAR's publisher pays ASPA annually in royalties from PAR specifically, but we do know that total royalty revenues for ASPA were about thirty percent of its budget in 2021 (ASPA 2022, 9-10).

HOW GLOBALITY CLAIMS BOLSTER US PRIVILEGE

Claims about global inclusivity made by NASPAA and PAR are contradicted by the evidence. Still, these claims have an impact. They shape how scholars around the world think about the field of public administration, in ways that may reinforce US hegemony.

Institutions that have pretensions to global leadership encourage uniformism in thought rather than epistemological pluralism (Healy 2003, 694). They promote the idea that there is unified worldwide field of public administration, with a single research agenda and corpus of knowledge, rather than a diversity of national or regional fields, each having its own agenda and corpus. Next, these institutions conflate the US field with the global field, so that US priorities are elevated as priorities for the whole world, and a predominantly US literature is transformed into "the global literature." In this way, false claims about globality lay the foundation for continued dominance by US scholars and institutions.

Uniformism is evident in the way that NASPAA talks about its work. Throughout its communications, there are references to "the field of public service education" and "the field of public affairs education." There is presumed to be one field, not many, and this single field is presumed to be global in scope, because NASPAA speaks and acts as a "global institution." NASPAA's accreditation standards are predicated on the assumption that it is possible to articulate criteria for assessing public affairs programs that are applicable everywhere. The standards include a set of public service values that all accredited programs must respect (NASPAA 2019, 2).

NASPAA's standards emphasize diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) (NASPAA 2019, 2, 5-7). However, DEI is defined in a distinctive way that reflects US priorities. In

recent years, a priority for U.S. institutions has been action against anti-Black racism. In 2020, the NASPAA Executive Council responded to the murder of George Floyd by promising that it would "do all in our power ... as a global standard in public service education ... to dismantle systemic racism and discrimination" (NASPAA 2020c). Similarly, a 2023 NASPAA task force called for more "intentional actions [by NASPAA] ... in the fight against anti-Black racism" (NASPAA 2023b, 4). Of course, every society suffers from problems of discrimination, but discrimination in other countries may not be based principally on race, and human rights abuses other than discrimination may be more pressing in other countries. NASPAA gives scant attention to these possibilities. A 2023 NASPAA study found that non-US schools were frustrated by its U.S.-centric diversity requirements (NASPAA 2023c, 9).

Also concerning are the omissions in NASPAA's "global standard." NASPAA does not require that accredited programs demonstrate a commitment to academic freedom, democracy, and other human rights. This omission makes it easier for NASPAA to accredit programs in authoritarian states like China. NASPAA justifies this omission by insisting on "a separation between quality public affairs programs and the political systems they operate under" (NASPAA 2023c, 5). In other words, NASPAA's "global standard" propagates the venerable politics-administration dichotomy and rejects the

more modern view that the practice of public administration is "closely intertwined" with the overall character of a political regime (Waldo 1948, 122; Terry 2000, 2).⁶

PAR also promotes uniformism rather than pluralism with regard to the study and practice of public administration. PAR articles refer routinely to "the field," "the research agenda," and "the literature": all singular rather than plural nouns. Because PAR represents itself as a global journal, the implication is that all these elements (field, agenda, literature) are truly global in scope. Of course, this is not the case. As we have seen, there is ample evidence that research in journals like PAR reflects the preoccupations of scholars in a few anglophone and Western European countries. Sometimes, PAR articles make assertions about "the research agenda" based on observations about the United States alone.

PAR also promotes a normative agenda that reflects US priorities. In 2020, PAR's editors responded to "recent events in the United States"—the Floyd murder and Black Lives Matter movement—by insisting that "research on diversity and inclusiveness must be a goal of public administration" (Battaglio and Hall 2020, 918-919). A 2022 PAR editorial restated the "paramount" importance of social equity within the discipline given "recent times" in the United States (Hall 2022c, 5). Another 2022 editorial also

⁶ By contrast, standards developed by the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration require that programs be "absolutely committed" to democratic institutions and human rights (UN DESA/IASIA Task Force 2008, 5 and 11).

emphasized the "very present need for reexamining, refurbishing, and rejuvenating Public Administration (PA) scholarship on race and gender" given the "imperfections ... [of] U.S. history" (Hall 2022a). Clearly, action against anti-Black racism should be a priority within US public administration. Whether it should be the topmost priority for the field globally is a separate question. Pluralists would argue against any single ordering of priorities.

CHALLENGING FALSE CLAIMS

False globalism is a new and problematic phenomenon in US public administration. Before 2010, neither NASPAA nor PAR had pretensions to global status. Since 2010, however, both enterprises have asserted their global status routinely. No criteria for assessing globality have been proffered by either enterprise, and evidence against the claims is overwhelming. NASPAA and PAR are still US institutions, or at best quasi-regional institutions. By claiming global status, these institutions reinforce the idea that there is a single field of public administration, and promote a conception of that field that reflects US priorities. Perversely, false claims about globality may have the effect of reinforcing US hegemony over the global conversation about public administration.

How should scholars in the Global South respond to this state of affairs? One approach would be to demand that NASPAA and PAR transform themselves into truly

global institutions. Under this approach, both organizations would be required to define what they mean by globality, produce a concrete plan of action for achieving true global participation, and develop precise measures for gauging progress toward that goal. Among other things, this approach would require reform of governance structures and practices so power is shared much more broadly.

This approach is unlikely to be adopted, because it would require US scholars and schools to surrender control over both NASPAA and PAR, and it would be against their interest to do this. In addition, there are normative reasons why we should view this approach with skepticism. Global institutions are likely to insist on a global agenda for teaching and research, and any advocate of epistemological pluralism should regard such a project with skepticism.

There is another reform path that is more practicable and normatively defensible. NASPAA and PAR should return to what they were before 2010: US organizations that have international interests, but are mainly concerned with the field of US public administration. Questions of hegemony and exclusion would become less pressing if these two enterprises defined their ambitions with more humility. This would not preclude either organization from taking steps to expand their international engagement. Indeed, they ought to take such steps. It is important to recognize, however, that there is a

critical difference between expanding international engagement and asserting global leadership. It is the difference between dialogue and dominance.

This alternative path would promote a worldwide conversation among scholars and practitioners that is built on the principle of epistemological pluralism. (For overviews of the extensive literature on epistemological pluralism, see: (Healy 2003; Miller, Baird et al. 2008; Suri 2013). A broader argument for the recognition of pluralism in governance is made by (Unger 2022).) Such an approach would require US scholars to recognize that the US field and US literature -- too often described simply as "the field" or "the literature" -- is merely one of several fields and literatures, each reflecting distinctive regional or national preoccupations. This pluralist approach would create room for other voices. It would allow Global South scholars to participate in dialogue on their own terms. The first step toward this healthier approach is by recognizing and challenging false claims about globality.

TABLE 1: TOP 15 CONTRIBUTING COUNTRIES TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW, 2017-2022			
Country	Number of contributions	Percent of total	Cumulative Percent
USA	558	55.6%	55.6%
Netherlands	65	6.48%	62.1%
United Kingdom	61	6.08%	68.2%
China	42	4.19%	72.4%
Denmark	34	3.39%	75.8%
Australia	29	2.89%	78.7%
South Korea	27	2.69%	81.4%
Italy	20	1.99%	83.3%
Belgium	18	1.79%	85.1%
Germany	16	1.60%	86.7%
Canada	10	1.00%	87.7%
Israel	10	1.00%	88.7%
Spain	9	0.90%	89.6%
Switzerland	9	0.90%	90.5%
France	9	0.90%	91.4%
Contributor data from Journal Citation Reports, based on location of contributor's home institution.			

TABLE 2: CONTRIBUTORS TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW, 2017-2022, BY REGION AND SUB-REGION				
Region/Sub-region	Number of contributors	(a) Percent of total contributors	(b) Percent of world population	Ratio (a)/(b)
Africa	5	0.5%	17.7%	0.03
Eastern Africa	—	—	5.8%	—
Middle Africa	—	—	2.4%	—
Northern Africa	—	—	3.2%	—
Southern Africa	5	0.5%	0.9%	0.58
Western Africa	—	—	5.2%	—
Americas	588	58.6%	12.5%	4.69
Northern America	568	56.6%	4.8%	11.91
Central America	9	0.9%	2.2%	0.40
South America	11	1.1%	5.5%	0.20
Caribbean	—	—	2.8%	—
Asia	106	10.6%	59.4%	0.178
Central Asia	2	0.2%	1.0%	0.209
Eastern Asia	75	7.5%	21.1%	0.354
South-eastern Asia	10	1.0%	8.5%	0.117
Southern Asia	4	0.4%	25.1%	0.016
Western Asia	15	1.5%	3.7%	0.409
Europe	270	26.9%	9.5%	2.843
Eastern Europe	4	0.4%	3.7%	0.107
Northern Europe	112	11.2%	1.3%	8.297
Southern Europe	31	3.1%	1.9%	1.599
Western Europe	123	12.3%	2.5%	4.948
Oceania	34	3.4%	0.6%	6.039
Australia and New Zealand	34	3.4%	0.4%	8.618
Polynesia/Melanesia/Micronesia	—	—	0.2%	—
Contributor data from Journal Citation Reports, based on location of contributor's home institution. Regions based on the United Nations Statistics Division geoscheme. Population shares based on 2021 data from the United Nations' <i>World Population Prospects</i> .				

SOURCES

- Ali, Sofi and Anita Rao (2000). Reinventing Public Administration for 21st Century. Indian Journal of Public Administration 46(2): 169-188.
- ASPA (2020). Bylaws of the American Society for Public Administration. Washington, DC, ASPA.
- ASPA (2022). IRS Form 990 Tax Year 2021. Washington, DC, ASPA.
- Battaglio, R. Paul and Jeremy L. Hall (2020). The Umbrella Metaphor. Public Administration Review 80(6): 917-920.
- Bhuiyan, Shahjahan and James L. Perry (2023). Building Global Public Administration Knowledge: Leveraging the Power of Collaboration. Public Administration Review 84(3): 426-431.
- Brillantes Jr, Alex B. and Maricel T. Fernandez (2013). Theory and Practice of Public Administration in the Philippines: Concerns for an Identity Crisis. Asian Journal of Political Science 21(1): 80-101.
- Brown, Trevor (2023). A Message from the Executive Council President. Washington, DC, NASPAA.
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut (2014). The Study of Public Administration in India: A Chequered Journey (?). Indian Journal of Public Administration 60(1): 1-18.
- Dados, Nour and Raewyn Connell (2012). The Global South. Contexts 11(1): 12-13.

- Donnelly, Jack and Daniel J. Whelan (2020). International Human Rights. New York, Routledge.
- Feiock, Richard C. (2016). Managing Growth, Enhancing Quality, and Increasing the Impact of PAR. Public Administration Review 76(3): 377-378.
- Feiock, Richard C. and Gregg G. Van Ryzin (2017). Moving Forward and Preparing for Transition. Public Administration Review 77(3): 319-320.
- Fitzpatrick, Jody, Malcolm Goggin, Tanya Heikkila, Donald Klingner, Jason Machado and Christine Martell (2011). A New Look at Comparative Public Administration. Public Administration Review 71(6): 821-830.
- Gulrajani, Nilima and Kim Moloney (2012). Globalizing Public Administration: Today's Research and Tomorrow's Agenda. Public Administration Review 72(1): 78-86.
- Hall, Jeremy L. (2022a). In Search of Social Equity in Public Administration: Race, Gender, and Some “Class”-Ey New Ideas. Public Administration Review 82(3): 381-385.
- Hall, Jeremy L. (2022b). Public Administration for a New Season: Reflecting on Neglected Rural Concerns. Public Administration Review 82(4): 613-618.
- Hall, Jeremy L. (2022c). Social Equity in Action: Welcoming PAR's Newest Editorial Board Members. Public Administration Review 82(1): 5-6.

- Hall, Jeremy L. (2023). Global Topics, Global Reach: Welcome to PAR's Newest Editorial Board Members. Public Administration Review 83(1): 5-6.
- Haque, M. Shamsul (2013). Public Administration in a Globalized Asia. Public Administration and Development 33: 262-274.
- Haque, M. Shamsul and Mark Turner (2013). Knowledge-Building in Asian Public Administration. Public Administration and Development 33(4): 243-248.
- Haque, M. Shamsul, Zeger van der Wal and Caspar van den Berg (2021). Comparative Studies in Public Administration: Intellectual Challenges and Alternative Perspectives. Public Administration Review 81(2): 344-348.
- Hattke, Fabian and Rick Vogel (2023). Theories and Theorizing in Public Administration: A Systematic Review. Public Administration Review 83(6): 1542-1563.
- Healy, Stephen (2003). Epistemological Pluralism and the 'Politics of Choice'. Futures 35(7): 689-701.
- Henry, Laurin (2015). Education for Public Service: The Origins and Founding of NASPAA. Charlottesville, VA.
- Hertenstein, Peter (2019). Multinationals, Global Value Chains and Governance. New York, Routledge.

- Hou, Yilin, Anna Ya Ni, Ora-orn Poocharoen, Kaifeng Yang and Zhirong J. Zhao (2011). The Case for Public Administration with a Global Perspective. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 21(suppl 1): i45-i51.
- Keane, John (2003). Global Civil Society? Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kellough, J. Edward (2015). NASPAA Presidential Address: NASPAA in a Time of Transition. Journal of Public Affairs Education 21(1): 9-12.
- Meek, Jack W. (2018). Making a Difference: Good Governance in Disrupted States. Journal of Public Affairs Education 24(2): 135-151.
- Merriam-Webster. (2024). "Globality." Retrieved November 17, 2024, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/globality>.
- Miller, Thaddeus R., Timothy D. Baird, Caitlin M. Littlefield, Gary Kofinas, F. Stuart Chapin and Charles L. Redman (2008). Epistemological Pluralism: Reorganizing Interdisciplinary Research. Ecology and Society 13(2): 46-63.
- Moloney, Kim and Nilima Gulrajani (2010). Globalized World, Globalized Research, Version 20.20. Public Administration Review 70: s298-s299.
- Moloney, Kim, Pablo Sanabria-Pulido and Mehmet Akif Demircioglu (2023). Interrogating Hegemonic Embraces: Representative Bureaucracy, Methodological Whiteness, and Non-West Exclusions. Public Administration Review 83(1): 195-202.

NASPAA (2012). Council for Higher Education Accreditation Eligibility Application. Washington, DC, NASPAA. October 1.

NASPAA (2014a). CHEA Recognition Review: Narrative Response. January 22.

NASPAA (2014b). Report of the Value of Accreditation Task Force. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2019). Accreditation Standards. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2020a). IRS Form 990, Tax Year 2019. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2020b). Report of the Task Force on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2020c). Statement of the Executive Council on the Murder of George Floyd. Washington, DC, NASPAA. June 11.

NASPAA (2021). IRS Form 990, Tax Year 2020. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2022a). 2022 Conference Program: The Time Is Now. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2022b). IRS Form 990, Tax Year 2021. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2022c). Official Site Visit Manual. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2023a). 2023 Conference Program. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2023b). DEIJA Action Plan. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2023c). Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on NASPAA's Global Position.

Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA (2023d). Strategic Plan. Washington, DC, NASPAA.

NASPAA. (2024a). Naspaa Home Page. Retrieved January 4, 2024, from www.naspaa.org.

NASPAA. (2024b). Past Naspaa Presidents. Retrieved January 26, 2024, from <https://www.naspaa.org/past-naspaa-presidents>.

NASPAA. (2024c). Site Visitors. Retrieved January 27, 2024, from <https://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/site-visitors>.

NASPAA. (2024d). X Home Page. Retrieved January 26, 2024, from <https://x.com/naspaa>.

Nye, Joseph S. (1971). Peace in Parts: Integration and Conflict in Regional Organization. Boston, Little Brown.

Orr, Robert. (2019). New NASPAA Accreditation Standards Approved. Retrieved January 26, 2024, from <https://www.naspaa.org/new-naspaa-accreditation-standards-approved>.

PAR (2017). Back Matter. Public Administration Review 77(4).

PAR (2023). Email Communication from PAR Editors to the Author, December 19, 2023. Washington, DC, Public Administration Review.

PAR (2024). Linkedin Post: APPAM Panel Discussion on Publication Process and Strategies. November 29.

<https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7266251800788246528/>.

Peci, Alketa and Marcelo Fornazin (2016). The Knowledge-Building Process of Public Administration Research: A Comparative Perspective between Brazil and North American Contexts. International Review of Administrative Sciences 83(1_suppl): 99-119.

Perry, James L. (2016). Continuity and Change in PAR's Editorial Team. Public Administration Review 76(5): 699-699.

Perry, James L. (2017a). Legacy and Stewardship. Public Administration Review 77(6): 811-812.

Perry, James L. (2017b). Practicing What We Preach! Public Administration Review Promotes Transparency and Openness. Public Administration Review 77(1): 5-6.

Piskulich, C. Michelle (2016). NASPAA's Grand Coalition: Sustainability, Values, and Reach. Journal of Public Affairs Education 22(1): 11-16.

Romero-Olivares, Adriana (2019). Reviewers, Don't Be Rude to Nonnative English Speakers. Science (October 3): <https://www.science.org/content/article/reviewers-don-t-be-rude-nonnative-english-speakers>.

- Rubaii, Nadia (2012). Leading by Example: Modeling Global Public Service Excellence. Journal of Public Affairs Education 18(1): 1-8.
- Sharma, G. B. (2008). Professionalising Public Administration Education in India. Indian Journal of Public Administration 54(2): 236-254.
- Stillman, Richard J. and C. N. Raadschelders Jos (2006). Editorial: Why PAR? Public Administration Review 66(1): 1-5.
- Stillman, Richard J. and Jos Raadschelders (2011). Editorial Report on Public Administration Review, 2006–2011: A Global Graduate Seminar, a Privilege, and a Challenge. Public Administration Review 71(6): 925-930.
- Suri, Harsh (2013). Epistemological Pluralism in Research Synthesis Methods. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 26(7): 889-911.
- Terry, Larry D. (2000). Public Administration Review: Sixty Years of Strengthening and Preserving Democracy. Public Administration Review 60(1): 2-4.
- Thatcher, Sherry M. B. and Greg Fisher (2022). From the Editors—the Nuts and Bolts of Writing a Theory Paper: A Practical Guide to Getting Started. Academy of Management Review 47(1): 1-8.
- Torneo, Ador R. (2020). Public Administration Education in the Philippines 1951-2020: History, Challenges, and Prospects. Journal of Public Affairs Education 26(2): 127-149.

UCF. (2019). SPA Professor Presents to the National Academy of Public Administration.

Retrieved February 7, 2024, from <https://ccie.ucf.edu/2019/04/01/spa-professor-presents-to-the-national-academy-of-public-administration/>.

UIA. (2024). Types of International Organizations. Retrieved January 17, 2024, from <https://uia.org/archive/types-organization/toy>.

UN DESA/IASIA Task Force (2008). Standards of Excellence for Public Administration Education and Training, International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration.

Unger, Roberto Mangabeira (2022). *Governing the World without World Government*. New York, Verso.

United Nations. (2024). About Us. Retrieved November 15, 2024, from <https://www.un.org/en/about-us>.

Volcker Alliance (2017). Tenure and Promotion at Schools of Public Affairs. Washington, DC, Volcker Alliance.

Waldo, Dwight (1948). The Administrative State. New York, The Ronald Press.

Walker, Richard M. (2011). Globalized Public Management: An Interdisciplinary Design Science? Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 21(suppl 1): i53-i59.

Williams, Ethel (2014). President's Address: The ABCs of NASPAA: Addressing Challenges, Being the Authoritative Voice in Public Service Education, Continuing to Model Public Service Excellence. Journal of Public Affairs Education 20(1): 9-14.

World Population Review. (2024). "Total Population by Country 2024." Retrieved November 16, 2024, from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries>.