

SMPP 331 (Doctoral) Seminar in Business-and-Public Policy

Department of Strategic Management and Public Policy,
The George Washington University

Professor: Jorge Rivera, Ph.D.

Phone: (202) 994-0163

Office: Fungler Hall, Suite 608

Email: jrivera@gwu.edu

Home page: <http://home.gwu.edu/~jrivera/>

Class Times: Mondays 3:30-6:00 p.m. Monroe 350

Office Hours: Mondays 1:30- 3:00p.m./Wednesdays 3:00- 6:30 p.m. or by appointment

OBJECTIVES

The relationship between business and public policymaking is one of the most critical for business competitiveness and more generally for the prosperity of nations. The main objective of this doctoral seminar is to provide students with the ability to critically evaluate the different streams of the business-and-public policy literature. The seminar also seeks to help students to design sound theory-based research projects for the study of business-and-public policy questions.

FORMAT

Class sessions will be discussion-based and everybody is expected to actively participate. Therefore, students are required not only to complete the readings before class but also be ready to critique them.

GRADING

(1) Class Participation:	30%
(2) Exams:	30%
(3) Research project:	40%
- Statement of Research Problem/Journal Literature/References	5%
- Detailed Outline of Research Problem/Question	5%
- Critique of Your Own Research Problem/Question	5%
- Research Methods for Your Project	5%
- Full Proposal	10%
- Project presentations:	10%

COURSE MATERIALS

1. Readings:

All assigned journal articles will be provided by the professor.

2. Book:

1. John W. Kingdon, *Agenda, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Second Edition (2003).

RESEARCH PROJECT

Throughout the semester you will work on preparing a research proposal. Your proposal can be focused on any business-and-public policy research question –mutually agreed

upon with the professor- and does not have to be your dissertation topic. The assignments are geared toward helping you through the process of preparing a dissertation proposal. The goal of the project is to get you to focus on how to design a sound research project.

1. Your first assignment is to identify a research problem, its related questions, and the appropriate journals and other relevant resources that will aid in your review of the literature. (3 pages maximum, due on Oct. 12)
2. Your second assignment is to write a paper outlining your research problem, contextualizing and justifying it in the extant literature and identifying salient variables and hypotheses. (8 pages maximum, due on Oct. 26)
3. Your third assignment is to critique your own problem/question. (3 pages maximum, due on Nov. 2)
4. Your fourth assignment is to identify the appropriate research methods for your research problem. (4 pages maximum, due on Nov. 16)
5. You will also be required to prepare a presentation of your proposed research. (Due on the last three weeks of class: Nov. 23 to Dec. 7)
6. Finally, your fifth assignment is to hand in a full research proposal that incorporates the feedback from students and professor. (15 pages maximum, due on Dec. 7)

Detailed instructions for each assignment will be provided well in advance during the semester.

GRADING SCALE

The following scale distribution will be used to determine all your grades:

A	= 94.0% - 100%	A-	= 90.0% - 93.9%
B+	= 87.0% - 89.9%	B	= 84.0% - 86.9%
B-	= 80.0% - 83.9%	C+	= 77.0% - 79.9%
C	= 74.0% - 76.9%	C-	= 70.0% - 73.9%
D	= 60.0% - 69.9%	F	= 59.9% and below

CLASS PARTICIPATION

Your active class participation is critical for producing a rich learning environment. The evaluation of participation includes a variety of factors such as:

- Reading the assigned material: The amount of reading for this course is significantly large. All students are required to read all the material for each day.
- Class discussions: Actively and constructively engaging in class deliberations and group activities.

- Attendance: Everyone is expected to be on time and attend all classes. ***Students missing more than two classes, without a legitimate excuse, will earn an "F" for participation.***
- Courtesy: All students are expected to be respectful and courteous to other class members. This includes turning off cell phones, pages, and blackberries, and refraining from checking email on any electronic device.

The participation grade will be determined based on these criteria and I will provide mid-term feedback to each student (see evaluation of participation guide at the end of this syllabus).

EXAMS:

At the beginning of each class, students will be required to write a short essay responding to a question that tests their knowledge of the readings as well as their ability to integrate and criticize them. These essays are excellent preparation for your future comprehensive exams.

COURSE CALENDAR: TOPICS AND READINGS

Week 1, Aug. 31 Introduction to the course/ the public policy process I

Lindblom, C. (1959). The science of "Muddling Through." Public Administration Review, Vol. 19: 79-88.

Lasswell, H.D. (1971). A Pre-View of Policy Sciences. (New York: Elsevier).

- Ch. 2, pp. 14-33. Contextuality: Mapping the Social and Decision Processes
- Ch. 3. pp. Problem Orientation

P DeLeon. 1999. The stages approach to the policy process: What has it done? Where is it going? In Sabatier, P. 1999. Theories of the policy process. Ch. 2.

Sep. 7: No class, Labor Day

Week 2, Sep. 14 The public policy process II: Main theoretical views

Paul Sabatier. 1988. An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. Policy Sciences 21 (1988): 129-168

True, Jones, and Baumgartner. 1999. Punctuated-Equilibrium theory. In Sabatier, P. 2007. Theories of the policy process. Ch. 6.

John W. Kingdon, Agenda, Alternatives, and Public Policies, Second Edition (2003). Ch. 1-4.

Week 3, Sep. 21 Public policy making III: Multiple streams theory/developing countries

John W. Kingdon, Agenda, Alternatives, and Public Policies, Second Edition (2003). Ch. 5-10

Gary Mucciaroni. 1992. The Garbage Can Model & the Study of Policy Making: A Critique. *Polity*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Spring, 1992), pp. 459-482

DL Horowitz. 1989. Is there a third-world policy process? *Policy Sciences* 22: 197-212.

Other suggested readings:

Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, Johan P. Olsen. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1972), pp. 1-25

Sep. 28: No class, attending meeting of the Latin American Environmental Economics Program, Cusco, Peru

Week 4, Oct. 5 Overview of perspectives on business-and-public policy

Hillman, A., Keim, G. and Schuler, D. 2004. Corporate political activity: A review and research agenda, *Journal of Management* 30 (6): 837-857.

Rivera, J., Oetzel, J., de Leon, P., and Starik, M. (2009). Business Responses to Environmental and Social Protection Policies: Towards a Framework for Analysis. *Policy Sciences*, 42:3–32

David Hart. 2004. “Business” is not an interest group: On the Study of Companies in American National Politics. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2004. 7:47–69

Robert A. Dahl. 1959. Business and Politics: A Critical Appraisal of Political Science *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (Mar., 1959), pp. 1-34

Whetten. 1989. What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 1989, Vol. 14, No. 4, 490-495.

S Ghoshal. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practices *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 4(1): 75-91

Pfeffer. 2007. A modest proposal: How we might change the process and product of managerial research. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 Issue 6, p1334-1345.

Weeks 5, Oct. 12 Traditional views on business-and-public policy

First research proposal assignment due today.

R. H. Coase. 1960. The Problem of Social Cost. : *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 3 (Oct.,1960), pp. 1-44.

Williamson, O. 1979. Transaction-Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations. *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Oct., 1979), pp. 233-261

Bonardi, J., Hillman, A. and Keim, G. 2005. ‘The attractiveness of political markets: Implications for firm strategy’, *Academy of Management Review* 30 (2): 397-413

Stigler, G. (1971). The theory of economic regulation. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 2, 3–21.

Levine, M. E. and Forrence, J.L. 1990. 'Regulatory capture, public interest, and the public agenda: Toward a synthesis', *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 6: 167-198

Bonardi, J. P.; Holburn, G.; Vanden Bergh, R. G. 2006. "NonMarket strategy performance: Evidence from U.S. Electric Utilities," *Academy of Management Journal* 49(6): 1209–1228.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, John M. de Figueiredo, and James M. Snyder (2003). "Why Is There So Little Money in Politics?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17: 105-130.

Other suggested readings:

Hillman, A. and Hitt, M. 1999. 'Corporate political strategy formulation: A model of approach, participation, and strategy decision', *Academy of Management Review* 24 (4): 825-842

Bonardi, J. and Keim, G. 2005. 'Corporate political strategies for widely salient issues', *Academy of Management Review* 30 (3): 555-576

Week 6. Oct. 19. Behavioral perspectives

Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman, 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases, *Science* 185, 1124-1130.

Christine Jolls, Cass R. Sunstein, Richard Thaler. 1998. A Behavioral Approach to Law and Economics. *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 50, No. 5 (May, 1998), pp. 1471-1550

Langevoort, Donald C. 1997. Organized Illusions: A Behavioral Theory of Why Corporations Mislead Stock Market Investors (and Cause Other Social Harms). *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 146, No. 2: 101-172.

Levitt, S. D., and J.A. List, 2007. What do laboratory experiments measuring social preferences reveal about the real world? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(2), 153–74.

Michelle L. Chin, Jon R. Bond and Nehemia Geva. 2000. A Foot in the Door: An Experimental Study of PAC and Constituency Effects on Access. *The Journal of Politics* (2000), 62:534-549 Cambridge University Press

**Weeks 7. Oct. 26. Modern sociological conceptions of markets:
Second research proposal assignment due today.**

M. Granovetter, "Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness" *American Journal of Sociology*, 1985; pp. 481-510;

N. Fligstein, "Markets as politics: a political-cultural approach to market institutions", *American Sociological Review* 1996; pp. 656-73.

J. Davis and T. Thompson. 1993. A social movement perspective on corporate control", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 141-73, 1994;

M. Hannan and J. Freeman "The population ecology of organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 929-64;

D. MacKenzie, "Long Term Capital Management and the Sociology of Arbitrage" *Economy and Society*, 2003; 349-380.

H. White, "Where do markets come from?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 1981, pp. 517-47;

Week. 8. Nov. 2. Neo-institutional theory perspectives I
Third research proposal assignment due today.

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. 1983. 'The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields', *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160

Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. 1977. 'Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony', *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 340-363

Oliver, C. 1991. 'Strategic responses to institutional processes', *Academy of Management Review* 16: 145-179.

Hoffman, A. 1999. 'Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry', *Academy of Management Journal* 42: 351-371

Rivera, J. and deLeon, P. (2004). Is greener whiter? The Sustainable Slopes Program and the voluntary environmental performance of western ski areas. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol.32, No.3, p. 417-437.

Other recommended reading:

Scott, R. W. 2008. *Institutions and organizations* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Chapters 1-4.

Week. 9. Nov. 9. Neo-institutional theory perspectives II

Spencer, J. W., Murtha, T. P. and Lenway, S. 2005. 'How governments matter to new industry creation', *Academy of Management Review* 30 (2): 321-337

Kostova, T., Roth, K. & Dacin, T. 2008. Institutional theory in the study of MNCs: A critique and new directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4): 994-1007.

Henisz, W. J. & B. A. Zelner. 2005. Legitimacy, Interest Group Pressures and Change in Emergent Institutions: The Case of Foreign Investors and Host Country Governments. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2): Forthcoming).

Henisz, W. J., B. A. Zelner, & M. F. Guillén. 2005. The Worldwide Diffusion of Market-Oriented Infrastructure Reform. *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 70, No. 6 (Dec., 2005), pp. 871-89770(6).

Kostova, T. & Roth, K. 2002. Adoption of an organizational practice by the subsidiaries of the MNC: Institutional and relational effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 215-233.

Other recommended reading:

Scott, R. W. 2008. *Institutions and organizations* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Chapters 5-10.

Week 10. Nov. 16. Political science perspectives on business-and-public policy: Forth research proposal assignment due today.

1. Examine in detail the tables and graphs available on the website of the Center for Responsive Politics at: <http://www.opensecrets.org/>
- In particular look at the Influence & Lobbying section of the website

Readings:

Charles E. Lindblom. 1982. The Market as Prison. *Journal of Politics*, XLIV (1982), 324-36

David Vogel. 1987. Political Science and the Study of Corporate Power: A Dissent from the New Conventional Wisdom. *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 385-408.

Jin-Hyuk Kim. 2008. Corporate Lobbying Revisited. *Business and Politics*. Volume 10, Issue 2, 2008 Article 3

Jeffrey Milyo; David Primo; Timothy Groseclose. 2000. Corporate PAC Campaign Contributions in Perspective. *Business and Politics*, Volume 2, Issue 1 April 2000 , pages 75 – 88

Jason Webb Yackee and Susan Webb Yackee. 2006. A Bias Towards Business? Assessing Interest Group Influence on the U.S. Bureaucracy. *The Journal of Politics* (2006), 68:128-139.

T Stratmann. 2005. Some talk: Money in politics. A (partial) review of the literature-
- Public Choice, 2005.

Fisman, Ray. 2001. "Estimating the Value of Political Connections," *American Economic Review* 91: 1095-1102.

Weeks 11. Nov. 23. Student research presentations (or “bonus topic”)

Weeks 12. Nov. 30. Student research presentations

**Weeks 13. Dec. 7. Student research presentations
Fifth research proposal assignment due today.**

Evaluation of participation in class¹

“The majority of class time will be devoted to discussion of the assigned and readings. Class participation is evaluated on quality rather than quantity. Comments need not mirror the position of the readings or the professor. You are graded not on the “correctness” of your position, but rather on your analysis of the material and your ability to articulate your ideas. You don’t have to be at the center of every debate, but students who make little or no effort to enter discussions will receive a lower participation grade. Discussion will become lively, heated even. Always respect the positions of others. When you disagree with someone, be sure to criticize the *idea* and not the person. Participation will be graded according to the following criteria:

A

The student in this grade range arrives in class each day thoroughly prepared with comments and questions on the assigned reading. Comments reveal that the student has read carefully; this student occasionally initiates the discussion without waiting for the professor to do so. This student does not, however, try to dominate the class, but listens carefully to the remarks made by fellow class members, and responds as readily to these as to the instructor’s questions.

B

The student in this grade range participates in most discussions, although not as fully or reliably as the student described above. There is evidence of having done the reading. This student pays attention to the comments of the other students.

C

The student in this grade range participates only intermittently, and is more willing to discuss broad, general questions than to engage in concrete analysis of an assigned text. Sometimes unprepared, this student lacks interest in the ideas of other members of the class, neglects to bring the proper text to class, and is often inattentive.

D

The student in this grade range seldom if ever participates.

F

Missing more than 2 class sessions without a legitimate excuse.”

Things that lower your participation grade:

- * Missing class
- * Talking to your neighbor or holding conversations separate from the class discussion
- * Not paying attention in class
- * **A ringing cellphone, checking email or surfing the internet.**

¹ Source: University Honors Program. Social Science Seminar Semester #1 Model Syllabus, Fall 2008.