

**THE ROLE OF EXPERTS IN THE POLICY PROCESS**  
**POS 598 (71336)/PAF 591 (84591)/BIO 598 (see DPT)**

Professor David H. Guston  
Office: Coor 6778; SS 203C  
Hours: Coor W 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.  
SS by arrangement  
[David.guston@asu.edu](mailto:David.guston@asu.edu)  
480-727-8829

Class Meeting: Coor 6778; Monday 1:40 to 4:30

Technical experts are pervasive in contemporary policy making, and yet the scope of their involvement and their formal and informal roles are rarely scrutinized. This course explores the implications for democratic government of reliance on technical expertise in addressing public policy issues. It seeks to convey an understanding of the processes and institutions through which both expertise and public perspectives are incorporated into public policy, and it aims at discovering ways to improve those processes and institutions. The course takes an ecumenical approach with respect to both political institutions and substantive policy areas. Thus it serves as both a specialty course for students from various disciplines interested in the particular problem of experts in the policy process, as well as a generalized resource for other students interested in the application of expert analysis in environmental, health, social, economic, and science and technology policy.

The course is conducted as a seminar – that is, students will take significant responsibility for the dynamics of each class – so it is essential that required reading is done prior to class. To encourage participation, I will assign one student to be the leader for (all or most of) each class. Further, students are asked to 1) come to each class with a short set of comments or questions (~250 words) in reaction to some part of the week’s reading; and 2) present assigned cases or other readings in class. These activities will be part of the class participation component of the grade and will be graded on a “check+, check, check-, 0” scale. There will also be “occasional assignments” that will contribute to the class participation grade (the first is attached to the syllabus). Students will also write a research paper and present their research to the class. The research paper will be on a topic approved by the instructor. See the syllabus below for important dates regarding the development of the paper and the last page of the syllabus for expectations regarding the research paper and presentation. Grading will be based on: class participation, 40%; research paper, 45%; presentation, 15%.

In addition to a course reader, the required books for this class are:

- Bimber, Bruce. 1996. *The Politics of Expertise in Congress: The Rise and Fall of the Office of Technology Assessment* (Albany: SUNY Press).
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 1990. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

21 AUG: The Problem of Expertise: Introduction and Overview

- Dahl, Robert. 1989. *Democracy and its Critics* (New Haven: Yale University Press): chaps. 4 and 5.
- Kass, Leon. 1993. "The problem of technology," in Melzer, Weinberger and Zinman, eds., *Technology in the Western Political Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 1-24.
- Rifkin, William D. with Martin, Brian. 1997. "Negotiating Expert Status: Who Gets Taken Seriously." *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine* (Spring):30-39.

28 AUG: The Problem of Expertise: Models of Influence

- Price, Don K. 1981. "The Spectrum from Truth to Power." In Kuehn and Porter, eds., *Science, Technology, and National Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 95-131.
- Collingridge, David, and Reeve, Colin. 1986. *Science Speaks to Power: The Role of Experts in Policy Making* (New York: St. Martin's Press), pp. 1-34.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 1996. "Is Science Socially Constructed -- And Can It Still Inform Public Policy?" *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2(3):263-76.
- Guston, David H. 2003. "Principal-Agent Theory and the Structure of Science Policy, Revisited: 'Science in Policy' and the US *Report on Carcinogens*." *Science and Public Policy* 30(5):347-57.

4 SEPT: Labor Day – No Class

11 SEPT: Who is an Expert? *Daubert* and the Courts

- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* 509 US 579 (1993).
- Berger, Margaret A. 2005. "What Has a Decade of *Daubert* Wrought?" *American Journal of Public Health* (Supplement 1):S59-S65.
- Select cases to be assigned.

18 SEP: Expert Knowledge and Its Institutions: A Marketplace of Information?

- Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46(1):1-35.
- Weiss, Carol H. 1992. *Organizations for Policy Analysis: Helping Government Think* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications), pp. 1-28.
- Rich, Andrew. 2005. "War of Ideas: Why Mainstream and Liberal Foundations and the Think Tanks They Support are Losing in the War of Ideas in American Politics." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring):18-25.

Novotny, Helga. 2003. "Democratized Expertise and Socially Robust Knowledge." *Science and Public Policy* 30(3):151-56.

Frickel, Scott, and Gross, Neil. 2005. "A General Theory of Scientific/Intellectual Movements." *American Sociological Review* 70(April):204-32.

25 SEPT: Congress, I: Office of Technology Assessment

Bimber, Bruce. 1996. *The Politics of Expertise in Congress: The Rise and Fall of the Office of Technology Assessment* (Albany: SUNY Press).

2 OCT: Yom Kippur – No Class

9 OCT: Congress, II: What Next?

(Paper topics due at this class.)

Morgan, M. Granger, and Peha, Jon M., eds. 2003. *Science and Technology Advice for Congress*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future Press, chaps. 1, 6, 13, and Appendix 3.

Keiper, Adam. 2004/5. "Science and Congress." *The New Atlantis* 7:xx-xxx.

16 OCT: Experts and the Public: A Role for Lay-Citizens?

Guston, David H. 1999. "Evaluating the First U.S. Consensus Conference: The Impact of the 'Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy.'" *Science, Technology & Human Values* 24(4):451-82.

Rowe, Gene and Gammack, John G. "Promise and Perils of Electronic Public Engagement." *Science and Public Policy* 31(1):39-54.

Fischer, Frank. 1999. "Technological Deliberation in a Democratic Society: The Case for Participatory Inquiry." *Science and Public Policy* 26(5):294-302.

Barabas, Jason. 2004. "How Deliberation Affects Policy Opinions." *American Political Science Review* 98(4):687-701.

Brown, Mark. 2001. "The Civic Shaping of Technology: California's Electric Vehicle Program." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 26(1):56-81.

23 OCT: Executive Branch I: Regulatory Science

Jasanoff, Sheila. 1990. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, chapters to be assigned.

30 OCT: Executive Branch II: Regulatory Science Cases

Jasanoff, Sheila. 1990. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisors as Policymakers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, chapters to be assigned.

6 NOV: Executive Branch III: Politicization of Science?

(Annotated bibliography due at this class)

Union of Concerned Scientists. 2004 (March). *Scientific Integrity in Policy Making: An Investigation into the Bush Administration's Misuse of Science*. Cambridge: UCS.

Marburger, John. 2004. "Statement on Scientific Integrity in the Bush Administration."

Union of Concerned Scientists. 2004 (April). "Analysis of the April 2 Document from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy on Scientific Integrity in the Bush Administration."

Union of Concerned Scientists. 2004 (July). *Scientific Integrity in Policy Making: Further Investigation of the Bush Administration's Misuse of Science*. Cambridge: UCS.

National Academy of Sciences. 2004. *Science and Technology in the National Interest: Ensuring the Best Presidential and Federal Advisory Committee Science and Technology Appointments*. Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (Washington, DC: National Academy Press), pp. 1-52, appendices E & F.

Jasanoff, Sheila. 2003. "(No) Accounting for Expertise." *Science and Public Policy* 30(3):157-62.

13 NOV: Boundary Organizations and Knowledge Assessment

Guston, David H. 2001. "Boundary Organizations in Environmental Policy and Science: An Introduction." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24(4):399-408.

Keating, Terry J. 2001. "Lessons from the Recent History of the Health Effects Institute." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24(4):409-30.

Cash, David W. 2001. "In Order to Aid in Diffusing Useful and Practical Information': Agricultural Extension and Boundary Organizations." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24(4):431-53.

Agrawala, Shardul, Broad, Kenneth, and Guston, David H. 2001. "Integrating Climate Forecasts and Societal Decision Making: Challenges to an Emergent Boundary Organization." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24(4):454-77.

Cash, David W., Clark, William C., Alcock, Frank, Dickson, Nancy M., Eckley, Noel, Guston, David H., Jaeger, Jill, and Mitchell, Ron B. 2003. "Knowledge Systems for Sustainable Development." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100(14):8086-91.

Rayner, Steve. 2003. "Democracy in the Age of Assessment: Reflections on the Roles of Expertise and Democracy in Public-Sector Decision Making." *Science and Public Policy* 30(3):163-70.

20 NOV: Rules, Policies, & Procedures

- Guston, David H. In press. "Institutional Design for Robust Knowledge: The National Toxicology Program's *Report on Carcinogens*." In Weingart, Peter, et al., eds., *Yearbook in the Sociology of Science*, 2004.
- Guston, David H. Under preparation. "Parliamentary Procedures for Technology as Legislation." In Hamlett, Patrick and Woodhouse, E.J., eds., *Since Autonomous Technology: Understanding Technics and Politics*.
- Tickner, Joel A. and Wright, Sara. 2003. "The Precautionary Principle and Democratizing Expertise: A US Perspective." *Science and Public Policy* 30(3):213-18.
- Weiss, Charles. 2002. "Scientific Uncertainty in Advising and Advocacy." *Technology in Society* 24:375-86.

27 NOV: Overflow, Catch-up, Research Paper Presentations

4 DEC: Research Paper Presentations

## About the Research Paper

The course requires all students to write a research paper on an issue or case in the role of experts or expertise in policy making. The paper should make some use of a theory, framework, or empirical material from the course reading, but it should be an independent and original application of that material to something from outside of class that you have researched independently.

The paper should be approximately 15-18 double-spaced pages (4000-5000 words; exclusive of notes and references). This length will require you to do both significant research and significant editing. If you are merely describing things that you have read, you will likely go well over the word limit. You should be able to introduce the material and an analytical framework for addressing it in, say, 500 – 750 words; conclude in 500 – 750 words; and spend 3000-4000 words describing and analyzing what you've researched.

All research papers should properly reference their source material. Thus, you must hand in a preliminary annotated bibliography (of at least 10 items). You should use this syllabus as a model for how to write out a bibliographic reference. The basic requirements are that all information must be complete and consistent, enabling your reader to easily identify and track down the source material. To annotate a bibliography, write approximately 50-100 words to summarize the item after it, before moving on to the next (alphabetically listed) item. The annotated bibliography should demonstrate a familiarity with a variety of sources, e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, books, government documents, press accounts, web sites, etc.

Appropriate attribution of material is critical in all academic writing. General guidelines include:

- If the text you are writing has 3 or more important words consecutively taken from a source, you must use quotation marks around that text AND cite that source and its page number.
- If the text you are writing makes a specific and not commonly known point that is derived from a source, you must cite that source. Paraphrasing, no matter what the source, requires citation.
- If the text you are making makes a point, even a specific one, that is commonly known (e.g., if you could find that same point in at least several different sources), you do not need to cite that source. But you still must cite the source if you are using its own language to make the point.

There are two important reasons for rules for attribution. One is, again, to help your reader find anything he or she might want to pursue in greater detail. The other is to give credit where credit is due. Just because something is on the web or “in public domain” does not relieve the responsibility of providing appropriate attribution. Attribution is NOT about the legalities of copyright – it is about the integrity of scholarship.

With regard to style and grammar, your writing should, above all, be clear and correct. Aim for clarity first and elegance later. If you have questions about grammar and style, please consult the Writing Center, which has a set of handouts that are very helpful (<http://www.asu.edu/duas/wcenter/handouts.html>). You should be absolutely sure to proofread your final version at least twice – do not rely on your word processor’s spell check, as there is more to good grammar and good style (and, indeed, good spelling) than spell check.

The paper should follow general conventions of formatting (double-spaced, paginated, left-justified, 12-point serif font, 1” to 1.25” margins).

The in-class presentations need not be very formal – you can use overheads or powerpoint but they are not necessary if you’d rather not – but they should be clear and informative about your research. Your effort should go into making them interesting and understandable to the class, not making them pretty to look at. The length of the presentation will depend on the number of students in the class, but you should plan on allowing plenty of time for questions from me and your colleagues.

Timeline for the research paper:

- 9 October: Paper topics due in class.
- 6 November: Annotated bibliography due in class.
- 27 November: Presentations in class.
- 8 December: Final paper due.

Occasional Assignment #1 (due 28 August)

Identify the following acronyms, all of which involve expertise in the US policy process (note: not all of these can easily be found on Google. Please report how many you knew off hand and how many you had to look up; your grade does NOT depend on that ratio):

1. APA
2. CBO
3. CEA
4. CEQ
5. CRS
6. DSB
7. EPA
8. FACA
9. FDA
10. GAO
11. IOM
12. IPCC
13. NAE
14. NAS
15. NRC (not the nuclear one)
16. NSTC
17. OMB
18. OSHA
19. OSTP
20. OTA
21. PCAST
22. PSAC