

John C. Ronquillo
University of Georgia

American Indian Tribal Governance and Management: Public Administration Promise or Pretense?

A Novel Research Design for Native American Tribal Governance

Research on tribal governance in the United States is scarce within modern public administration scholarship. Nonetheless, tribal governance is a pre-Columbian practice that predates the U.S. Constitution and federal law. Drawing from several disciplines, John C. Ronquillo of the University of Georgia demonstrates that interdisciplinary sources offer rich information for present-day public administration research about Native American tribes. Tribal governance literature is definitely not “missing,” but instead is moderately “unassembled” as a subfield of public administration. Building on what is available, the author suggests several key issues within tribal governance in need of urgent academic attention.

The mere complexity paired with the distinctive nature of tribal governance certainly merits more study in academe, but is its relevance restricted solely to the public administration context? Clearly it is not, as a profusion of interdisciplinary work on tribal government and leadership, tribal justice and law, native nation sovereignty, American Indian public policy, and a host of otherwise associated topics have been completed in the past several decades (Aufrecht and Case 2005; Barker 1998; Bruyneel 2007; Fouberg 2000; Horse Capture, Champagne, and Jackson 2007; Jorgensen 2007; Luna-Firebaugh 2007; Smith 2000; Taylor 1972).

John C. Ronquillo is a doctoral candidate in the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia. His primary research interests are public and nonprofit management, innovation and organizational change, social entrepreneurship, and diversity. He previously worked in the areas of social impact assessment, intergovernmental relations, and public policy analysis, including projects that involved several American Indian communities in Arizona.
E-mail: johnron@uga.edu

The call for action to include and increase research on American Indian tribal governance and management in the field of public administration has been issued before.¹ While it has yielded modest action in public administration proper, there is at least an apparent increase in the awareness of these issues as they are related to the discipline. American Indians have a unique status in the U.S. government and legal system, and an equally unique history in their development as tribes and bands into sovereign communities—even nations—with canons of laws and rights of self-rule independent of many rules of federal, state, and local government (Aufrecht 1999; Frantz 1999; Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2008; O’Brien 1989; Ortiz 2002; Snipp 1986; Wilkins 2002). There is no other group in the United States for which an analogous model can be provided in terms of cultural identity and self-governance, and yet, as some have previously pointed out, there seems to be an absence of academic studies on American Indian tribal governance in the field possibly most suited for it (Aufrecht 1999; Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson 2006; Ortiz 2002).

Luton noted that “we probably should begin to include the history of Native American governance” (1999, 216) in the public administration literature. Aufrecht (1999) soon followed and was another who claimed that tribal governance in American public administration literature was “missing.” This was followed by Ortiz’s (2002) article on tribal governance and federal government in the context of laws and treaties. A third article by Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson (2006) expanded into the general lack of studies involving social equity in the United States and other countries, but also highlighted the absence of indigenous issues in public administration. Denhardt and Denhardt noted that tribal management is “emerging as a growing and significant field in public administration” (2008, 46), although evidence in research still seems to be lacking.

The overall premise of this article is simple: tribal governance in American public administration is not quite missing, but it is merely unassembled, or often unrecognized by certain groups of scholars.

The overall premise of this article is simple: tribal governance in American public administration is not quite missing, but it is merely unassembled, or often unrecognized by certain groups of scholars. The purpose of this article is not necessarily to negate Aufrecht (1999) or the others laying claim to the absence of tribal governance in public

administration, but rather to illustrate that public administration is a discipline influenced by many others in the social sciences, much as the field of American Indian studies also has an interdisciplinary nature.

A Review of Previous Studies

Aufrecht's (1999) article is perhaps the most comprehensive in terms of calling attention to the absence of American Indian tribal governance in public administration. His documentation consisted of a review of 36 basic introductory public administration texts; of those that had indexes, only one had any reference to American Indians. In his search for journal articles on the issue, he found only one "significant" article on American Indian tribal governance in a public administration journal—a 1996 piece by Dolores Brosnan in the *American Review of Public Administration* on tribal gaming (Aufrecht 1999; Brosnan 1996). A similar literature search was performed for this article for any additional articles published since 1999; the results yielded articles by Ortiz (2002),² Mays and Taggart (2005), Aufrecht and Case (2005), Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson (2006), and an administrative profile in *Public Administration Review* authored by King and Beeby (2008).

Mays and Taggart (2005) center their study on tribal gaming in New Mexico, with its "associated high economic and political stakes," and state that the time has come to incorporate tribal governments into the intergovernmental relations framework. Ortiz's article is a thorough examination of tribal governance and public administration in the context of laws and treaties and goes into detail on cases that shaped the current landscape of tribal relations with the federal and state governments. Additionally, he wrote on tribes as sovereign entities, their jurisdiction in both civil and criminal cases, and the special status of certain tribes (Ortiz 2002). Aufrecht and Case's (2005) study also examines legal aspects—perhaps most importantly, a review of the Marshal trilogy of U.S. Supreme Court cases that are central to the foundations of American Indian law.

Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson's piece does not focus exclusively on tribal governance but asserts the nonexistence of academic studies on indigenous communities in public administration for nearly six decades. In fact, in one of the article's tables, it shows that *no* article on indigenous issues was authored from 1940 to 1999,³ and likewise compares the same issues and lack of scholarship in Brazil, Canada, and Australia (Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson 2006). While discussing race and ethnicity, the authors state that only Brazil features a racial reality similar to the United States. It is worth pointing out here that other Anglophone countries in addition to the United States—specifically Australia and Canada—have similar issues concerning indigenous populations, and though the purpose of this article is not necessarily one of a comparative nature, it would be well worth it for future studies to include the status of indigenous issues in government on a comparative scale (see, e.g., Dillon 1983; Forbes 1998; Hamilton and Maddison 2007; Niezen 2000).

These studies all claim that American Indian tribal governance in public administration

is absent. Why, then, despite these observations of absence, has the momentum seemingly not accelerated in public administration research? Does Native American governance necessitate a large niche within public administration literature? Some may argue that no single academic discipline can encapsulate the interdisciplinary nature of the subject. Nevertheless, American Indian tribal governance in public administration merits more study. Many have cited the fact that scholars have ignored the subject of tribal governance in academia (Aufrecht 1999; Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson 2006; Ortiz 2002), but scholars have also ignored the numerous works previously viewed outside the scope of public administration that would be beneficial to future studies of tribal governance and management.

Additional Existing Research on Tribal Governance

There are significant instances of tribal governance in public administration in academic studies and institutions of higher education alike. The explicit label of "public administration" may not be used throughout these instances, though numerous other key topics found in public administration are visible. For example, in preparing for this article, a literature search was performed to find related studies on bureaucracy and found numerous sources that discussed the subject (Barker 1998; Bays and Fouberg 2002; Broome and Christakis 1988; Cohen 1953; Fowler 2002; Frantz 1999; Harvard Project 2008; Horse Capture, Champagne, and Jackson 2007; Jorgensen 2007; Prucha 1981; Smith 2000; Stuart 1979; Thornton 1998; Wilkins 2003). Many of the discussions on bureaucracy were centered on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and with good reason, as it is one of the oldest federal government agencies in existence (Stuart 1979). A more recent study by Cornell and Jorgensen (2007) focuses exclusively on tribal bureaucracy and administrative challenges. In it, the authors state,

[I]t is one thing to make decisions. It is another to implement them effectively. Tribal legislatures can determine what needs to be done and pass laws in support of the nation's goals. Tribal courts or other mechanisms can resolve internal disputes and address conflicts arising in relationships between nations and outsiders. But in many cases, neither of these is the end of the matter. The nation still has to act, and often it is the nation's executive or administrative arm—the tribal bureaucracy—that has to make sure the wishes of the legislature are carried out and the decisions of the court are enforced. It is up to the tribal administration to ensure that tribal operations are conducted in ways that serve the nation's interests and satisfy its citizens: in short, to move from decisions to effective implementation (2007, 146).

[T]ribal governance in public administration is so important . . . [because of] the bilateral or multilateral relations between and among tribal communities and the U.S. federal government, states and local government, best summed up as intergovernmental relations. . . .

Another significant aspect of why tribal governance in public administration is so important are the bilateral or multilateral relations between and among tribal communities and the U.S. federal government, states and local government, best summed up as intergovernmental relations (Aufrecht 1999; Bays and Fouberg 2002; Bruyneel 2007; Champagne 1983; Harvard Project 2008; Hicks 2007; Mays and Taggart 2005; Stuart 1979; Taylor 1972).⁴ It has been illustrated that a growing number of public administrators

are becoming aware of the nature of tribal sovereignty (Bays and Foberg 2002; Foberg 2000; Fowler 2002; Harvard Project 2008; O'Brien 1989), and that the number of experts on specific Indian-related legislation is growing, although there are claims that most are ignorant of key legal precedents that established the rights of tribal governments (Aufrecht 1999).

Ortiz (2002) noted that federal recognition of a tribe is administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the U.S. Department of the Interior, and may grant additional benefits to tribes, including federally administered health care and educational programs. Public service delivery, however, is in a state of transformation, and many programs and services for American Indian communities that once were under the authority of the federal government are being taken over by tribal governments (Adams, Lee, and Lipsky 2007). Scholars note, however, that while American Indian communities have progressed tremendously, many populations continue to experience disproportionately high rates of unemployment, lower rates of educational attainment, and higher rates of adverse health effects (Adams, Lee, and Lipsky 2007; Harvard Project 2008). The rapidly changing nature of intergovernmental relations, as well as the complexities and evolution of social service delivery among tribal governments, again, underline the importance of researching such topics in Native American governance as it pertains to public administration.

Earlier Contributions to Native American Governance in Public Administration

Though most likely not viewed through the lens of public administration in Aufrecht's (1999) terms, there are a handful of influential texts that have provided insight in past studies, and may very well lead to useful studies in the future. In 1970, Theodore W. Taylor—a scholar who published in journals of public administration and policy—was recommended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to serve as a federal executive fellow at the Brookings Institution from July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971.⁵ The culmination of his yearlong term of residence was a book-length study entitled *The States and their Indian Citizens* (1972). Taylor had extensive knowledge of Indian affairs as he completed his doctoral dissertation on "The Regional Organization of Indian Affairs" (1959), and served as a management planning officer with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the 1950s and as deputy commissioner in the 1960s (Taylor 1972). His study consisted of a canvass of all states to compile a comprehensive list of statutes, executive orders, and other administrative arrangements for the Native American citizens, which subsequently resulted in the assembly of this information for the first time in "handbook" format. Additionally, he also circulated a questionnaire among tribal chairmen throughout the country in order to assess attitudes on services from local, state, and federal governments, which also contributed significantly to the study (Taylor 1972).

It should also be noted that Taylor enlisted the help of three notable names in the field of public administration to review his manuscript who were also Brookings senior fellows at the time: Herbert Kaufman, James L. Sundquist, and David T. Stanley.⁶ In addition to those reviewers, Taylor cites George A. Graham, former executive director of the National Academy of Public Administration and former chairman of the 1948 Hoover Commission Task Force on Indian Affairs, as an influence on the study in its initial phases

(Taylor 1972). Taylor's groundbreaking study reviewed crucial and controversial topics in American Indian tribal governance, including assimilation, tribal relationships with other governments, the federal termination of special relationships with American Indians, the distribution of social services, and the potential and future of self-determination among American Indian communities (Taylor 1972). While perhaps not an homage to public administration proper, it encompasses much of the matter that management, bureaucracy, and policy scholars tend to concern themselves with, and in essence is a significant contribution to tribal governance in public administration.

In 1979, Paul Stuart, a newly minted PhD trained in history and social welfare, published *The Indian Office: Growth and Development of an American Institution, 1865–1900*. The idea for this study stemmed from Stuart's time spent as a social worker in the Community Mental Health Program for the Pine Ridge Service Unit of the U.S. Indian Health Service in the late 1960s (Stuart 1979). At the beginning of his study, he wrote,

In a period of considerable administrative turmoil in Indian affairs, many of us had occasion to think a great deal about government organizations, American Indians, and the frequently uneasy relations between the two. The separation of health programs from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1955 and the development of Community Action and other "Great Society" programs in the mid-1960s, some of us thought, would provide Indian groups with much needed flexibility in dealing with and obtrusive, rule-bound bureaucracy.

But what was this bureaucracy which we believed needed "shaking up"? One of the oldest agencies of the federal government, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had been in existence for over a century . . . The late nineteenth century seemed a crucial period in the development of the Indian Bureau. (1979, xv)

And thus Stuart produced a 35-year history of the institutionalization, growth, and development of the Indian Office. He wrote that his interest in the administration of Indian affairs had led him to study the works of social scientists engaged in the study of complex organizations, including those of business and management historian Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., organizational theorist Charles Perrow, and noted public administration scholar Philip Selznick (Stuart 1979). There is no doubt, then, that these scholars and others were instrumental in influencing other works of Stuart's that focused on American Indians and social change, public policy and U.S. agencies, and federal administration (Stuart 1991, 1994a, 1994b).

There are, however, probably very few persons as well versed in American Indian affairs as historian Francis Paul Prucha, who is one of the most widely cited scholars in Indian policy and best known for his two-volume work *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Prucha 1981, 1984, 1988, 2000).⁷ His interest in Indian policy came about through previous research on the activities of the U.S. Army in the American West. He claimed that military commanders played a role as law enforcers who dealt a great deal with Indian affairs, and that as he delved deeper into the subject, he noted that there was still much work to

be done in terms of U.S. relations with Indians and felt that prior coverage on the subject was inadequate (Prucha 1981). By carrying out his research as a historian, he also influenced many other disciplines in the social sciences with clear applications to public administration.

In 1970, the National Archives convened a Conference on Research in the Administration of Public Policy, and Prucha was asked to discuss the topic, though he admitted that his expertise was mostly confined to policy formulation as opposed to implementation and administration (Prucha 1981). Though slightly uncertain as to how to proceed at the conference, he directed his comments toward suggestions about what research was needed in the area of Indian policy, and what resources were available to those interested in carrying it out. Despite his professed lack of administrative knowledge, he captured the crux relatively well when he said,

Historical research in the administration of public policy entails two elements. There is first the formulation and determination of the policy, the definite course of action which guides and determines present and future decisions. Then there is the administrative execution of the policy. Neither of these can be studied effectively without the other, for a policy can be fully understood only by watching it unfold in practice; evaluation of the policy depends upon a knowledge of the problems and kinks in its administration; and changes in policy frequently come from faults or difficulties discovered in the field as the policy is applied. (1981, 14)

After the 1970 conference, Prucha noted that there was an increase in the scholarship on Indian office bureaucracy and administration, most notably *The Indian Office: Growth and Development of an American Institution, 1865–1900* by Paul Stuart (Stuart 1979; Prucha 1981). And as many did before and after him, Prucha noted that more of such studies were needed.

Prucha, along with Taylor and Stuart, laid critical foundations for tribal governance in the field of public administration, irrespective of their own disciplinary training. Here, the point should be reiterated that public administration has been influenced by many other disciplines, or rather, that numerous scholars of public administration did not receive their own training—either professional or academic—in public administration, but rather in other social sciences such as political science, sociology, and economics (see, e.g., Bertelli and Lynn 2006; Fry 1989; Shafritz, Hyde, and Parkes 2004). There have been those who have claimed a lack of American Indian tribal governance in public administration journals and academic texts, primarily that of Aufrecht (1999) and also Ortiz (2002) and Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson (2006), who seem to echo similar sentiments. It should be illustrated, however, that in these three analyses, the authors neglected to consult any works by Theodore W. Taylor, Paul Stuart, or Francis Paul Prucha, which, if examined, obviously could have resulted (and now have resulted) in differing opinions on the status of American Indian tribal governance in public administration.

Recent Contributions to Tribal Governance Literature

As organizations, institutions, and the relationships between American Indian tribes and communities evolve and progress, so must the academic studies that revolve around them. Eileen Luna-Firebaugh's (2007) book on tribal policing provides a thorough examination of the structure of law enforcement in Indian Country and gives an intricate look at this level of so-called frontline or street-level bureaucracy that is uniquely tied to tribal courts in American Indian communities. The book covers the history of tribal policing, its legal institutions and structures, policing models, personnel, and accountability within tribal communities, to name a few topics. She notes that “[m]any tribal police departments have difficulty receiving assistance from other law enforcement agencies when they need it. Tribal police departments often do not have mutual-aid agreements with surrounding agencies, nor are tribal officers generally cross-deputized” (2007, 4). She then goes into great detail on other infrastructure challenges, and provides a work that is very comprehensive in content and makes a significant contribution to the literature in tribal governance and management.

In terms of tribal governance, recent publications by scholars associated with the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (see, e.g., Begay, Cornell, and Kalt 1998; Harvard Project 2008; Jorgensen 2007) have quickly become the most comprehensive research in American Indian issues in government, economic development, leadership, and other topics important in American Indian communities, including land issues, gaming, international relations, and the environment (Harvard Project 2008).

In terms of tribal governance, recent publications by scholars associated with the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development have quickly become the most comprehensive research in American Indian issues in government, economic development, leadership and [other topics] including land issues, gaming, international relations, and the environment.

The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development was founded by Stephen Cornell and Joseph P. Kalt in 1987. It is formally affiliated with the Harvard University Native American Program, and has long been housed at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Through this collaboration, Cornell and Kalt have published numerous research articles and reports on issues in Native American governance and economic development (see Cornell and Kalt 1992, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2000). They currently direct the project with Manley A. Begay, Jr. The Harvard Project also collaborates in numerous research and advisory capacities with the Native Nations Institute for Leadership, Management, and Policy (which Begay serves as faculty chair) at the Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy at the University of Arizona (directed by Cornell). This network of scholars, which has grown to some dozen or more beyond Cornell, Kalt, and Begay, is one of the largest such networks in the country, and it is providing some of the most sophisticated research and outreach activities for American Indian communities in the United States (see, e.g., Adams, Lee, and Lipsky 2007; Jorgensen 2007; Taylor and Grant 2007; Taylor and Kalt 2005).

The most recent volume by the Harvard Project, *The State of the Native Nations; Conditions under U.S. Policies of Self-Determination*, was published with the intent to survey the state of American Indian nations and communities in the early stages of the twenty-first

century primarily for federal, state, and local policy makers (Harvard Project 2008). The premise of the book is thus articulated:

Indeed, looking across the more than 560 tribes that comprise Indian Country, the picture is indeed one of diversity—of societies and cultures, of governments and leadership, or organizations and activities, or socioeconomic status and prospects, and of trends and concerns. Nonetheless, there are identifiable common threads that tie America's 4.1 million Native Americans together. The task of this book is to highlight patterns and identify themes that are relevant to the state of contemporary Native America. (Harvard Project 2008, xix)

The book is a compendium of American Indian issues, with chapters on tribal government, tribal jurisdiction, tribal relations with federal and state governments, and international relations. Additionally, there are chapters on native lands, natural resources, education, health, housing, public safety, and culture. There is no shortage of information in this volume, and it is sure to be an influential text not only for tribal governance scholars in public administration, but across all pertinent disciplines.

American Indian Tribal Governance in Institutions of Higher Education

In terms of actual education in tribal governance and management within public administration, there is relatively little opportunity to pursue a specialized track in tribal governance or management beyond the tribal or community college level (for a full list, see the appendix.) There are a handful of tribal colleges that offer associates degrees in tribal or public administration. Fort Berthold Community College in North Dakota is one of the few colleges to offer an associate's degree in public tribal administration. Navajo Technical College in Crownpoint, New Mexico, offers an associate's degree in applied sciences in public administration that specifically gears its program toward training future government employees of the Navajo Nation, and Sinte Gleska University in South Dakota offers two bachelor's degrees in business administration and Lakota history and culture with concentrations in tribal management and government (American Indian Higher Education Consortium 2008).

In terms of master's-level education, there currently is only one program in the United States that offers a master of public administration degree with a concentration in tribal governance—The Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington.⁸ This unique program has been in existence for approximately ten years and recruits students not only from the Puget Sound area and Pacific Northwest, but also from tribes much further away, including Gila River/Maricopa, Aleut, Apache, Tlingit, Lakota, Taos Pueblo, Hawaii, and the Philippines (J. Chandler, personal communication, March 1, 2008). With such geographic diversity in these initial cohorts, it may be well worth it to other programs in states closer to American Indian populations to examine the possibility of establishing similar tracks.

At one time, Arizona State University also had a master of public administration program

with a concentration in tribal governance and management, roughly around the time of the late 1970s and early 1980s (R. Perry and J. Cayer, personal communication, December 3, 2007). According to the annual report of the now-defunct Native American Public Administration Program at Arizona State, the program obtained a Title IX grant to conduct an assessment of the need for public administration education among tribal governments, which at the time demonstrated that employment opportunities for American Indians with training in public administration were ample (Winchell and Esse 1981). Apparently the university offered the degree locally—on site on the Navajo Nation—as opposed to a campus-based program. Because of some unfortunate circumstances—the death of the former program director and the loss of important program files, documents, and archives—relatively little is known about how the program met its demise. There were attempts to revive a similar program in the 1990s with an Arizona State presence in various American Indian communities, though none seemed to take flight, and the program became defunct.

Given the number of American Indians in Arizona (and other states with a significant presence of native communities), it would seem as if there would still be an interest in tribal governance, especially in light of recent events. At the time of this writing, the Tohono O'dham tribe is waiting on a federal response to a request to take 135 acres of tribal-purchased land in the Phoenix metropolitan region into the reservation system in order to build a resort and casino, despite a request from Governor Jan Brewer to not proceed (Watters 2010).

Former Navajo Nation president and current Arizona state representative Albert Hale introduced a bill in the state legislature that would regulate the use of traditional American Indian rituals off tribal lands, an initiative prompted by the deaths of two people in 2009 who participated in a sweat lodge ceremony near Sedona, Arizona, with an additional 19 people falling ill. The bill would require the Arizona Department of Health Services to adopt rules to regulate the practices with consultation by the Arizona Commission on Indian Affairs (Del Puerto 2010). These are but two examples, as there are many others that exhibit American Indian communities interacting with other local and state governments, as well as the federal government.

Regardless of the status of current trends in tribal governance in public administration and higher education, the increase in research in American Indian studies, tribal governance, and the changing paradigms of tribal relations with external parties merits the attention of scholars and graduate program administrators as a potential track in their respective programs where appropriate. The addition of such a track would only enhance and make programs more comprehensive in terms of the many forms of governance in the United States.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this article, it has been argued and evidence shown that American Indian tribal governance is not missing in the discipline of public administration. While a profusion of journal

American Indian tribal governance is not missing in the discipline of public administration. . . . [F]or the most part, the literature exists but is “not assembled,” nor for the most part has it been considered in the realm of public administration proper. Now is the time to do so.

articles in the field's most recognized journals is for the most part lacking, the foundations of tribal governance were put in place several decades ago by public administration and other disciplinary scholars in numerous books and journals in other disciplines. Beyond this, professional reports and analyses, legal opinions, consulting reports, and intergovernmental agreements also stand to provide valuable information that research articles often do not cover. It is claimed that, for the most part, the literature exists but is "not assembled," nor for the most part has it been considered in the realm of public administration proper. Now is the time to do so. Previous research, both scholarly and professional, should be accepted for what it is and what it has the potential to do for the benefit of American Indian tribal governance and management in public administration, rather than be dismissed on the basis of discipline.

There is much relevance in the studies completed by Aufrecht (1999), Ortiz (2002), and Oldfield, Candler, and Johnson (2006), along with many others. More studies on tribal governance must be conducted within the realms of public administration, and the imperative elements that Aufrecht set forth as to why tribal governance should be included are still highly relevant. They are (1) to assist U.S. public administrators, (2) to serve American Indian (Native American) constituents, (3) to ensure that research on American Indians is done ethically, and finally, (4) to enrich public administration theory (Aufrecht 1999). However, none of this can be done without borrowing from other disciplines (e.g., American Indian studies, Native American law, etc.) or considering certain works from previous decades, nor can it be done with a lack of interest in the subject.

Aufrecht made several speculations about why the topic is missing, but primarily the main reason it is absent is one of perception and that our models of the world that we bring into our study of public administration do not include American Indian cultures as living, viable social and political entities (Aufrecht 1999). Unfortunately, there are still many stereotypes of American Indian cultures that permeate the fields in the social sciences. Social scientists acknowledge this problem, and counter those assertions with the fact that tribes have come a long way and have developed sophisticated models of governments and various other forms of social enterprise (Jorgenson 2007; Harvard Project 2008; Ortiz 2002).⁹ The history between American Indian cultures and governments is not full of instances of pleasantry and cordiality, and as such, research that is carried out among American Indian populations should be done so in a very sensitive and ethical manner (Aufrecht 1999; Broome and Christakis 1988; Ortiz 2002; Snipp 1986). Nevertheless, research is still necessary throughout a variety of disciplines—including, and perhaps most importantly, within public administration.

In addition to Aufrecht's (1999) outlined assumptions as to why the topic is missing, I would also assert that interests are largely based on the geographic distribution of tribes. If American Indian communities are not in a specific vicinity of scholars, then the interest in researching topics of importance to American Indians will most likely be low. This, however, should be moot to public administration researchers. Aufrecht stated that Woodrow Wilson looked to Europe for models of administration rather than to American Indians as his work in the development of the public administration

field became more interesting to other scholars (Aufrecht 1999). While American Indian issues were in the limelight at the time, I can only assume that Wilson's personal preferences led him—as well as many other scholars—to the "sophistication" of Europe. Times have changed, however, and tribes have progressed tremendously and transformed from primitive forms of governance into modern political and bureaucratic entities. With more than 560 federally recognized tribes in the U.S. (Harvard Project 2008), it would seem to be a good time to take advantage of the opportunities available on the domestic front. Tribal governments provide prime opportunities to conduct research in myriad ways, but scholars are not finding nor taking those opportunities. The problem, then, is not the absence of tribal governance studies in public administration, but rather the absence of interest in public administration scholars who will research or promote the topic.

The groundwork has been built for current and future scholars of public administration to carry forward and engage in research that is critical not only for American Indian communities, but also for the field of public administration. Studies on intergovernmental relations, environmental regulation, natural resource issues, public service delivery, personnel issues, diversity, and management and other topics found in public administration are ample in Indian Country, and it is up to us as scholars and practitioners to make the change and incorporate it into the field it easily and perhaps most naturally falls into. Consider it, perhaps, an opportunity for the reciprocity of learning. Opportunities for research abound, but will scholars take the chance to find them? That is a question that can either be answered by heeding the call to action and initiating the crucial research in this area, or by turning our backs on American Indian communities, harming not only them, but also the comprehensiveness and inclusiveness of public administration scholarship.

Acknowledgments

A previous version of this article was presented at the Native American and Indigenous Studies Conference, Athens, Georgia, April 10–12, 2008. The author thanks David Pitts, Hal Rainey, and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments. Any errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.

Notes

1. As Aufrecht (1999) pointed out in his study, he used the term "Native American" because he felt that it was more inclusive than "American Indian," as the former can apply to a broader base of indigenous cultures in the United States who do not identify themselves as Indians (e.g., Native Alaskans and Hawaiians). As the topic of this article is more closely aligned with persons of Indian blood who are members of federally recognized tribes, the term "American Indian" will be used because it is also the term most used by Indian people in reference to themselves (see Luna-Firebaugh 2007).
2. In addition to his 2002 article, James Ortiz also authored "The Tribal Environment: Solid Waste in Indian Country" in a 2003 edition of *Environmental Management*.
3. Neither Brosnan's (1996) nor Aufrecht's (1999) article were included. The authors do not include any representative bureaucracy studies that either mention or directly involve American Indians (labeled Native Americans) as research subjects (e.g., Selden 1997).
4. This citation lists only a partial sampling of the works that contained sections on intergovernmental relations of tribal governments. All American Indian literature

reviewed for this article contained elements of this topic within the respective text.

5. The Brookings Institution also had roots in the former Graduate School of Economics and Government in Washington, D.C., and played a role in the development of American Public Administration in the early twentieth century (see Bertelli and Lynn 2006).
6. Stanley also had prior American Indian administrative experience with the U.S. Indian Health Service (see Taylor 1972).
7. This is only a sampling of his work reviewed specifically for this article. Prucha is the author of more than 25 books, many of which are on the subject of American Indian policy.
8. See <http://www.evergreen.edu/mpa/mpatribal>. At the time of this article's writing, other institutions have also been rumored to have an interest in adding tribal management tracks to their curricula.
9. Some of these examples can be found within the Harvard Project's Honoring Nations Program, which is an awards program that recognizes innovative advances in tribal public administration. See http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/honoring_nations.html.

References

- Adams, Alyce S., Andrew J. Lee, and Michael Lipsky. 2007. Governmental Services and Programs: Meeting Citizens' Needs. In *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*, edited by Miriam Jorgensen, 223–45. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- American Indian Higher Education Consortium. 2008. <http://www.aihec.org> [Accessed March 26, 2008].
- Aufrecht, Steven E. 1999. Missing: Native American Governance in American Public Administration Literature. *American Review of Public Administration* 29(4): 370–90.
- Aufrecht, Steven E., and Davis S. Case. 2005. Indians 78, Washington State 0: Stories about Indians and the Law. *Public Administration Review* 29(4): 450–61.
- Barker, Michael L. 1998. *Policing in Indian Country*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Bays, Brad A., and Erin Hogan Foubert, eds. 2002. *The Tribes and the States: Geographies of Intergovernmental Interaction*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Begay, Manley A., Stephen Cornell, and Joseph P. Kalt. 1998. Making Research Count in Indian Country: The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 3(1): 42–51.
- Bertelli, Anthony M., and Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. 2006. *Madison's Managers: Public Administration and the Constitution*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Broome, Benjamin J., and Alexander N. Christakis. 1988. A Culturally Sensitive Approach to Tribal Governance Issue Management. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 12(2): 107–23.
- Brosnan, Dolores. 1996. Indian Policy, Indian Gaming, and the Future of Tribal Economic Development. *American Review of Public Administration* 26(2): 213–29.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Champagne, Duane. 1983. Organizational Change and Conflict: A Case Study of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 7(3): 3–28.
- Cohen, Felix S. 1953. The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950–1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy. *Yale Law Journal* 62(3): 348–90.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Joseph P. Kalt, eds. 1992. *What Can Tribes Do? Strategies and Institutions in American Indian Economic Development*. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, University of California.
- . 1995. Where Does Economic Development Really Come From? Constitutional Rule among the Contemporary Sioux and Apache. *Economic Inquiry* 33(3): 402–26.
- . 1997. Successful Economic Development and Heterogeneity of Governmental Form on American Indian Reservations. In *Getting Good Government: Capacity Building in the Public Sectors of Developing Countries*, edited by Merilee S. Grindle, 257–96. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute for International Development.
- . 1998. Sovereignty and Nation-Building: The Development Challenge in Indian Country Today. *American Indian Research and Culture Journal* 22(3): 187–214.
- . 2000. Where's the Glue? Institutional and Cultural Foundations of American Indian Economic Development. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 29(5): 443–70.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Miriam Jorgensen. 2007. Getting Things Done for the Nation: The Challenge of Tribal Administration. In *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*, edited by Miriam Jorgensen, 146–72. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- del Puerto, Luige. 2010. Hale Files Bill to Regulate Native American Rituals. *Arizona Capitol Times*, January 19.
- Denhardt, Robert B., and Janet V. Denhardt. 2009. *Public Administration: An Action Orientation*. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Dillon, M. C. 1983. A Terrible Hiding? Western Australia's Aboriginal Heritage Policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 44(4): 486–502.
- Forbes, J. 1998. Native Title in Canada and Australia. *Quadrant* 42(3): 56–63.
- Foubert, Erin Hogan. 2000. *Tribal Territory, Sovereignty, and Governance: A Study of the Cheyenne River and Lake Traverse Indian Reservations*. New York: Garland.
- Fowler, Loretta. 2002. *Tribal Sovereignty and the Historical Imagination: Cheyenne-Arapaho Politics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Frantz, Klaus. 1999. *Indian Reservations in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fry, Brian R. 1989. *Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Hamilton, Clive, and Sarah Maddison, eds. 2007. *Silencing Dissent: How the Australian Government Is Controlling Public Opinion and Stifling Debate*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. 2008. *The State of the Native Nations: Conditions under U.S. Policies of Self-Determination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hicks, Sarah L. 2007. Intergovernmental Relationships: Expressions of Tribal Sovereignty. In *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*, edited by Miriam Jorgensen, 246–71. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Horse Capture, George, Duane Champagne, and Chandler C. Jackson, eds. 2007. *American Indian Nations: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Jorgensen, Miriam, ed. 2007. *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- King, Cheryl Simrell, and Megan Beeby. 2008. Colleen Jollie, State Tribal Liaison: A Story of Transformational Change. *Public Administration Review* 68(6): 1142–50.
- Luna-Firebaugh, Eileen. 2007. *Tribal Policing: Asserting Sovereignty, Seeking Justice*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Luton, Larry S. 1999. History and American Public Administration. *Administration & Society* 31(2): 205–21.
- Mays, G. Larry, and William A. Taggart. 2005. Intergovernmental Relations and Native American Gaming: A Case Study on the Emergence of a New Intergovernmental Relations Participant. *American Review of Public Administration* 35(1): 74–93.
- Niezen, Ronald. 2000. Recognizing Indigenism: Canadian Unity and the International Movement of Indigenous Peoples. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42(1): 119–48.
- O'Brien, Sharon. 1989. *American Indian Tribal Governments*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Oldfield, Kenneth, George Candler, and Richard G. Johnson III. 2006. Social Class, Sexual Orientation, and toward Proactive Social Equity Scholarship. *American Review of Public Administration* 36(2): 156–72.

- Ortiz, James. 2002. Tribal Governance and Public Administration. *Administration & Society* 34(5): 459–81.
- . 2003. The Tribal Environment: Solid Waste in Indian Country. *Environmental Management* 31(3): 355–64.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. 1981. *Indian Policy in the United States: Historical Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1984. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1988. *The Indians in American Society: From the Revolutionary War to the Present*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- , ed. 2000. *Documents of United States Indian Policy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Selden, Sally Coleman. 1997. *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness of a Government Agency*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Shafritz, Jay M., Albert C. Hyde, and Sandra J. Parkes, eds. 2004. *Classics of Public Administration*. 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson.
- Smith, Dean Howard. 2000. *Modern Tribal Development: Paths to Self-sufficiency and Cultural Integrity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Snipp, C. Matthew. 1986. The Changing Political and Economic Status of the American Indians: From Captive Nations to Internal Colonies. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 45(2): 145–57.
- Stuart, Paul. 1979. *The Indian Office: growth and Development of an American Institution, 1865–1900*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- . 1991. Organizing for Self-Determination: Federal and Tribal Bureaucracies in an Era of Social and Policy Change. In *American Indians: Social Justice and Public Policy*, Ethnicity and Public Policy, vol. 9, edited by Donald E. Green and Thomas V. Tonneson, 83–108. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin System, Institute on Race and Ethnicity.
- . 1994a. Government Agencies. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, 210–14. New York: Garland.
- . 1994b. U.S. Federal Administration and Agencies. In *The Native North American Almanac*, edited by Duane Champagne, 537–47. Detroit, MI: Gale Research.
- Taylor, Jonathan, and Kenneth W. Grant II. 2007. Managing the Boundary between Business and Politics: Strategies for Improving the Chances of Success in Tribally Owned Enterprises. In *Rebuilding Native Nations: Strategies for Governance and Development*, edited by Miriam R. Jorgensen, 175–96. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Taylor, Jonathan, and Joseph P. Kalt. 2005. *American Indians on Reservations: A Databook of Socioeconomic Change Between the 1990 and 2000 Censuses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development.
- Taylor, Theodore W. 1959. The Regional Organization of Indian Affairs. PhD diss., Harvard University.
- . 1972. *The States and Their Indian Citizens*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Thornton, Russell, ed. 1998. *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Watters, Carrie. 2010. Tohono O’odham Rejects Gov. Brewer’s Plea to Drop Casino. *Arizona Republic*, January 22.
- Wilkins, David E. 2002. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2003. *The Navajo Political Experience*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Winchell, Dick G., and Robert J. Esse. 1981. Annual Report, Native American Public Administration Program Center for Public Affairs, Arizona State University. http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED233846&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED233846 [accessed December 13, 2010].

Appendix: American Indian Tribal Colleges Offering Degrees Related to Public Administration

Institution	Location	Degree offered	Subject Area	Website
Candeska Cikana Community College	Fort Totten, ND	Associate of applied science	Tribal administration	http://www.littlehoop.edu
Fort Berthold Community College	New Town, ND	Associate of arts	Public tribal administration	http://www.fbcc.bia.edu
Navajo Technical College	Crownpoint, NM	Associate of applied science	Public administration	http://www.navajotech.edu
Nebraska Indian Community College	Macy, NE	Associate of arts	Tribal Leadership	http://www.thenicc.edu
Northwest Indian College	Bellingham, WA	Associate of applied science	Native American studies (concentration in public and tribal administration)	http://www.nwic.edu
Sinte Gleska University	Mission, SD	Bachelor of arts	Business management (concentration in tribal management), Lakota history and culture (concentration in tribal government)	http://www.sintegleska.edu
College of the Muscogee Nation	Okmulgee, OK	Associate of science	Tribal services	http://www.mvsktc.org

Source: American Indian Higher Education Consortium, 2009, <http://www.aihec.org>.