

**PUBA 667 Special Topics:
Life Cycle of Rules
Spring 2016**

Christopher Grandy
Public Administration Program
University of Hawaii
grandy@hawaii.edu
956-7060
Office Hours: W 4-5:30
Skype: grandy28
Facetime: grandy@hawaii.edu

Syllabus

Public Administration Program Mission:

The mission of the Public Administration Program is to equip those with public and community responsibilities in Hawaii, the Mainland, and the Asia-Pacific region with knowledge and skills to adapt to changing public service environments and to work collaboratively to solve problems.

The Program does this in a manner informed by the traditions, cultural sensitivity, and inclusiveness special to Hawaii, enabling our graduates to provide leadership and improve communities wherever they serve. Through teaching, research and service, the Program aims to give current and future public service professionals the knowledge and skills they need to be effective leaders in a diverse and globalizing world.

Course Purpose: This course explores the rise, evolution, and demise of rules in organizations and society. "Rules" refers to agreements or dictates that direct specific action in specific situations. There are a variety of purposes of rules, but a basic purpose is to promote coordination among individuals in a joint effort. Rules facilitate joint work. And over time, rules often start to conflict with the evolution of joint purpose, creating frustration. At some point, some rules actually inhibit effective cooperation and have to be abandoned or amended.

Course Learning Objectives: By the end of this course you will:

1. Be able to articulate and provide examples for basic phases of the life cycle of rules.
2. Have analyzed the workings of a rule (or rules) in an organization with which you are familiar.
3. Have developed an understanding of the roles rules play in organizations and society and an appreciation of how they affect the operations of organizations and public policy.

Readings:

[Adams, Guy B. 2011. "The Problem of Administrative Evil in a Culture of Technical Rationality." *Public Integrity* 13\(3\): 275-285.](#)

[Adler, Paul S. and Bryan Borys. 1996. "Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41: 61-89.](#)

[Borry, Erin L. 2013a. "Ethical Dimensions of Green Tape: Do Ethical Climates Influence Green Tape?" Paper Presented to 11th Annual Public Management Research Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, June 2013.](#)

[Borry, Erin L. 2013b. "Red Tape: A New Measurement." Paper Presented to 11th Annual Public Management Research Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, June 2013.](#)

[Bozeman, Barry. 1993. "A Theory of Government 'Red Tape.'" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 3\(3\): 273-303.](#)

[DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009a. "Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Organizational Rules." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 19\(2\): 361-384.](#)

[DeHart-Davis, Leisha. 2009b. "Green Tape and Public Employee Rule Abidance: Why Organizational Rule Attributes Matter." *Public Administration Review*. 69\(5\): 901-910.](#)

[DeHart-Davis, Leisha, Jie Chen, and Todd D. Little. 2013. "Written Versus Unwritten Rules: The Role of Rule Formalization in Green Tape." *International Public Management Journal* 16\(3\): 331-356.](#)

[Ewing, Jack. 2015. "VW Says Emissions Cheating Was Not a One-Time Error." *New York Times*. Dec. 10.](#)

[Huang, Youli, Xixi Lu, Xi Wang. 2014. "The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Employee's Pro-Social Rule Breaking." *Canadian Social Science* 10\(1\): 128-134.](#)

[Jackson, John H. and Susan W. Adams. 1979. "The Life Cycle of Rules." *Academy of Management Review*. 4\(2\): 269-273.](#)

[Kolesnikov-Jessop, Sonia. 2015. "Building Teams by Winning Hearts and Minds." *New York Times*. June 7.](#)

[O'Leary, Rosemary. 2010. "Guerrilla Employees: Should Managers Nurture, Tolerate, or Terminate Them?" *Public Administration Review* 70\(1\): 8-19.](#)

[Tyler, Tom R. 2000. "Social Justice: Outcome and Procedure." *International Journal of Psychology*. 35\(2\): 117-125.](#)

Online Teaching:

A video will be posted on YouTube, and PowerPoint slides will be posted on Lulima, by noon, Monday of each week. Be sure to check the slides in "Normal" view where notes may be added to particular slides where deemed necessary.

Please do the assigned reading and review the slides by noon, Wednesday of each week. Questions and comments may be emailed to me either through Lulima or at grandy@hawaii.edu. I will also be available via phone, Skype or Facetime on Wednesday afternoons from 4 to 5:30. We will figure out whether Skype or Facetime is better for these contacts early in the semester.

Required work:

Each week, you will make a posting on the Discussion section of Lulima. You may post on anything related to the class, including thoughts about the readings, a previous lecture, items in the news, and your weekly assignment (if appropriate). The weekly postings are due by midnight of each Saturday.

Semester Project: Over the course of the semester you will develop an analysis of the life cycle of a rule, or rules, in your organization or an organization with which you are familiar. In general, your task is to explore how the rule arose, what has happened to the rule--and the organization --over time, what problems have arisen related to the rule, and finally discuss whether the rule should be abandoned or modified (and how). It may be a good idea to choose a rule(s) that has existed for some time and that does not seem to be working very well. This would allow you to explore the whole life cycle. You should NOT choose a rule that has been newly adopted--though if the new rule is replacing something that existed before, then the previous rule might be a good candidate.

This is an empirical project, based upon the experience of the organization and the people within it. I expect that most of the material for the project (statement of the rule(s), views as to whether it is working (and why), and so on) will come from the organization and interviews/discussions with people in the organization (or, perhaps, formerly with the organization). These discussions can be sensitive, and you need not identify the organization, nor the people you speak with, by name (though if you can make such identification, that will be helpful). Moreover, you are welcome to refer questions or concerns about the project to me. We are interested in how rules work (and don't work) in organizations; we are not interested in organizational gossip nor in assigning blame.

There will be 6 elements to this project which will contribute to your grade in the course:

- a. By Jan. 25, send me an email describing the organization and rule(s) you intend to focus on for your project. Indicate what led you to choose this rule. Is it something that has been irritating (some) people in the organization? In what ways?
- b. On Feb. 15, you will submit an Initial Project Report to me. This is a short, written report that describes the rule, or rules, you intend to examine, its (their) context in the organization, and it explains why you believe this is interesting and/or significant. The report will also contain an initial assessment of

- information sources. To the extent possible, describe what may be available: Is the rule(s) written down and do you have access to it? Who might you be able to talk to about the origins/purpose of the rule? Who could you talk to about how the rule is working? Or who could be a source for describing problems that are arising from the rule? Again, all of these conversations can be confidential. It is possible that there may be literature (academic or otherwise) about similar rules or situations. If appropriate, use these. I would expect that this initial report would not exceed 6 pages (double-spaced, 12pt. Times Roman, 1" margins all around).
- c. On Mar. 7, you will submit a brief presentation on your project to me and the rest of the class. Please describe the rule, or rules, you are examining. Give your current understanding of the purpose of the rule--what problem(s) does it help solve. If applicable, indicate and describe any problems with, or caused by, the rule. Finally, you may indicate any other related issues that you find interesting. You may submit the presentation in any format with which you are comfortable. I would guess that most people will use PowerPoint. If so, I would expect the presentation to be no more than 8 slides. The purpose of this exercise is to share what you know so far with the rest of the class--and to see what others are working on. There will be a special First Presentation section in the Discussion section of Laulima where you will post your presentations. Each of you must also make at least one comment on each of the other presentations on the Discussion section of Laulima. The comments are due by Friday, March 11, 8:00a.
 - d. On Apr. 4, you will submit the Second Project Report, to me. This will be a more complete analysis of the rule(s) than your initial report and class presentation (above). It is likely to reflect the results of most, if not all, of your interviews/conversations. You should have some discussion about whether, and how, the rule should be modified. Ideally, you will consider possible unintended consequences of your suggested modification. I would expect that this paper will not exceed 12 pages (same format as first paper).
 - e. On Apr. 25, you will submit a final presentation to me and the class on your project. Your goal is to convey to us your final analysis of the rule(s). I encourage you to mention, and comment upon, any other interesting issues that came up in your analysis. As with the earlier presentation, you may use the format that is most comfortable to you. If you use PowerPoint, I would expect the presentation to be no more than 15 slides. These presentations are to be submitted in the Final Presentation section of the Laulima Discussion tool. Also, again, each of you should make a comment on each of the other presentations in this portion of the Discussion section. The comments are due by Friday, April 29, 8:00a.
 - f. On May 2, you should submit a reflection paper about your assignment and this course. You may write about anything on those topics that you wish (with respect to the assignment and course), and here are some possible questions: What has been the most interesting aspect of your semester-long exploration of rules? What has surprised you? What has been less useful to you in this exploration? What suggestions would you make for improving this course in the future? I would not expect this reflection paper to exceed three pages (same format as above).

Course Grade: Your grade in this course will be assigned as follows:

Email report of topic choice (due 1/25)	5%
First Project Report (2/15)	10%
Brief Presentation (3/7)	15%
Second Project Report (4/4)	20%
Final Presentation (4/25)	30%
Reflection Paper (5/2)	10%
Weekly discussion postings, comments on others' work, etc.	10%

Outline/Calendar: (Note that dates refer to the Monday of the relevant week. Typically, my slides and a video will be posted by noon, Monday of the indicated week):

Session	Week of	Topic	Readings
1	1/11	Introduction and Overview	Jackson and Adams
2	1/18	Rule Creation: The need for rules Suboptimal individual maximization Tenuous agreements that break down? Need for a rule that won't be broken-- promise of shares of higher joint output	DeHart-Davis (2009a)
3	1/25	Rule Creation: The promise of rules Potential for higher individual welfare with coordination Incentive of leaders to create/change rules (p. 271 Jackson/Adams) Who participates (if any) in rulemaking? What are the incentives for inclusion/exclusion? Email of project topic choice due	DeHart-Davis (2009b)
4	2/1	Rule Creation: How enforce the rule? What is necessary to prevent renegeing?	Tyler
5	2/8	Rule Creation: Getting people to accept the rule: What they get with rule exceeds what they could get without?	Borri (2013a)
6	2/15	Rules In Action: Written v. Unwritten? What other aspects of rules might be better/worse--carrots rather than sticks?	De-Hart Davis, Chen, Little

		Other reasons for rules? (p. 271 of Jackson and Adams) First written project report due	
7	2/22	Rules In Action: Relief in being able not to fight about the substance of the rule--the rule saves time	Kolesnikov-Jessop
8	2/29	Rules In Action: Abuse of Managerial Discretion--using rules to own benefit Creates doubters and opponents to rules	Ewing
9	3/7	Rules In Action: Brief presentation due	
10	3/14	Rule Rejection/Failure: What changes might lead to sub-par performance of rule Changes in objective function? Changes in individual utility functions?	Bozeman
	3/21	SPRING BREAK	
11	3/28	Rule Rejection/Failure: Identifying reasons for rule violation: Objective function changing? Individual utility functions? How does one know?	Borry (2013b)
12	4/4	Rule Rejection/Failure: What happens to benefits of rule as more and more find it in interest to ignore/cheat? Second written project report due	O'Leary
13	4/11	Rule Rejection/Failure: Why aren't bad (non-functioning) rules fixed more readily? In no one's interest to do so?	Huang, Lu, and Wang
14	4/18	Conclusion / Rule Remediation Rule monitoring? Constant audit? Pay attention to complaints? Create opportunities for complaints? (Bozeman 1993, 292)	Adler and Borys Adams
15	4/25	Final presentation due	
16	5/2	Reflection paper due	

Date Modified: 2/10/2016