

David P. Carter Biosketch

I am an assistant professor in the Programs of Public Affairs at the University of Utah's Department of Political Science, and affiliated faculty with the Global Change and Sustainability Center (GCSC). As an educator I am most concerned with helping to foster analytically minded and equity-oriented public service professionals, and my instruction is increasingly centered from a critical digital pedagogy perspective. As a researcher, I am most focused on what some refer to as matters of "public affairs," in reference to the intersection of public policy and public administration, as well as related scholarship, such as nonprofit and voluntary action studies.

More specifically, my research examines public policy design and program administration, with a focus on regulatory policies and programs. Most of this research is motivated by one of two questions: (i) How do institutions support and/or undermine coordination between often disparate policy actors? (ii) How does such coordination (or a lack of it) shape public program processes and outcomes? I am a methodological pragmatist - I choose the data and analytical approach best situated to inform the examination in question. My publications accordingly feature a range of methods, from large-*n* quasi-experimental studies to qualitative in-depth interviews.

My research on institutions (defined as the shared rules and/or norms that govern collective behavior) began with a project in which a number of collaborators and I developed a new approach to analyzing policy designs based on concepts from Elinor and Vincent Ostrom's institutional analysis and development (IAD) framework. My coauthors and I captured the project's progress across several coauthored articles, including in *Public Administration* (2015), *Policy Sciences* (2015), *Urban Affairs Review* (2016), and the *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* (2017), and we detailed the method in full in a 2016 *Journal of Theoretical Politics* article, as part of a special issue dedicated to the memory of Elinor Ostrom. We more recently summarized applications of the method in a 2019 *Policy Studies Journal* review article "Institutional Analysis with the Grammar of Institutions."

My research on the coordination of disparate policy actors is most readily observed in my work on United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) organic certification. I have pursued questions such as how organizational form shapes how independent agents (certifiers) administer regulatory standards (*Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 2016), the services they offer (*Public Management Review*, 2017), and their regulatory and substantive expertise (*Administration & Society*, 2019). I have also examined how inspectors understand their responsibilities and how certifier and inspector cohorts coordinate through professional associations (*Regulation & Governance*, 2017 and 2019), how regulated entities select from among certifier alternatives in "regulatee choice" contexts (*Public Administration*, 2017), and how regulatees' values shape both their decision to be certified organic (*Public Administration*, 2018) and their perceptions of organic policy impacts (*Review of Policy Research*, 2019). I compiled many of the findings of this research alongside new insights in a sole-authored, blind-reviewed book, *Regulation by Proxy: How the USDA Relies on Public, Nonprofit, and For-Profit Intermediaries to Oversee Organic Food in the U.S.*, published in 2019 by Lexington.

The two themes-how institutions support/undermine coordination and how coordination shapes program processes and outcomes-run throughout my other work. For example, in one of three papers examining U.S. child welfare, Dallas Elgin (3M Research) and I examined how centralization shapes welfare outcomes performance (*Governance*, 2018). In the next, we documented that privatization improves children's likelihood of experiencing desirable outcomes (family reunification) and simultaneously exposes them to a higher risk of undesirable ones (aging out of the system; *Public Management Review*, 2019). The themes are further developed as the core of a newer research agenda - understanding collective action among climbers - as evidenced by a 2019 *International Journal of the Commons* article on how rock climbers use social norms to encourage climber compliance with U.S. Forest Service rules, and a forthcoming *Journal of Outdoor Recreation & Tourism* article outlining an agenda for studying the self-governing challenges facing climbers.