

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283850201>

High School Civics Textbooks: What We Know Versus What We Teach about American Politics and Public Policy

Article in *Journal of Political Science Education* · October 2015

DOI: 10.1080/15512169.2015.1072051

CITATIONS

6

READS

2,365

1 author:



David Menefee-Libey

Pomona College

24 PUBLICATIONS 112 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

What We Know vs What We Teach about American Politics and Public Policy

Extended version, April 2014

A briefer version is forthcoming from the *Journal of Political Science Education* in 2015.

David Menefee-Libey
Politics Department
Pomona College
425 North College Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711

email: DMenefee@pomona.edu

office: 909-607-9323

fax: 909-607-1274

David Menefee-Libey is Professor of Politics at Pomona College, and Coordinator of Pomona College's Program in Public Policy Analysis.

The author thanks two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the American Politics Workshop at the University of Wisconsin – Madison in March, 2014. I appreciate comments from Ryan Owens, Ken Mayer, David Canon, Byron Shafer, David Weimer, Howard Schweber and participants in that workshop. I also thank Pomona College student research assistants Charles Herman, Chad Powell, Jeffrey Zalesin, Tena Thau, and Emily Hayes for their excellent work on this project.

What We Know vs What We Teach about American Public Policy

Abstract: Scholars of American politics and public policy recognize the interdependence of governments and corporations in the United States. This article presents research findings that high school civics textbooks, where most Americans first encounter the research and theories of political science, have little to say about this interdependence. This challenges our civic education aspirations, and leaves many Americans without means of understanding or effectively engaging in important current public policy controversies.

Key words: Textbooks, civic education, curriculum, citizenship

If the only guidebooks we had to the American political system were high school civics textbooks, many of the most visible policy controversies of our time would be inexplicable. For example, why, in the midst of the greatest financial crisis in decades, when the U.S. government was running huge budget deficits, did American taxpayers bail out the United Bank of Switzerland? Or how did a twenty-something employee of a management consulting firm have access to thousands if not millions of the most sensitive documents in our federal government's national security data systems? Or how could a Canadian internet service company have become crucial to the roll-out of the most important social policy development in decades? In all of these instances, private actors were deeply entangled in public policy. Yet high school textbooks tell their readers that public policy is the exclusive province of the public sector, of American governments. Public policy may be done for private actors, or to private actors, but not with private actors. Public/private collaboration or entanglement, based on these textbooks, is inexplicable.

In contrast, Americans relying on the research scholarship of politics and public policy might have an easier time understanding these controversies. Scholars of politics

have always been well aware of public policy for and to private actors, but we have also become increasingly aware of public policy done with private actors. Each of the instances above follow a well-established pattern of governments collaborating with private corporations in advancing public purposes, and private corporations in turn collaborating with governments as part of their business strategies. UBS, the United Bank of Switzerland, was one of the largest credit default swap counterparties to the U.S. insurance firm AIG – the American Insurance Group – and thus received \$5 billion of the more than \$100 billion loaned to AIG under the 2008 TARP (Troubled Assets Relief Program) to ward off the collapse of the financial system (Mandel 2009; Wang 2010). Edward Snowden, a former National Security Agency analyst, worked for Booz Allen Hamilton, a major data analysis contractor to the NSA (Kumar 2013). CGI (Conseillers en Gestion et Informatique) Group, the Montreal-based internet services company, won the competitive bidding process to become the lead contractor for the federal health insurance exchanges established under the Affordable Care Act (Markon and Crites 2013b).

Politics and policy scholars investigate these controversies partly as purely academic inquiry, but also in service to democratic capacity-building, to enable citizens to pursue aspirations and solve problems, and to enable legitimate public authorities to make policies and implement them. We publish our research in specialized journals, but one of the most important ways our research reaches citizens is through our schools, colleges, and universities, where we hope that our findings and analyses will shape the curriculum and textbooks they read. This research literature demonstrates that scholars

and practitioners of American politics and public policy conventionally recognize the deep interdependence of governments and private sector organizations, including corporations.

High school civics textbooks, on the other hand, present governments as deeply separate from and often antagonistic toward private sector organizations and businesses, and even the private economy. The texts' near-silence on governmental collaboration with private actors conceals important realities about the American political economy, as well as American public policy, rendering many policies incomprehensible and undermining democratic engagement and effective policy making. But why? And so what? Could and should this be remedied, and if so, how?

This paper has three parts, in which I make two empirical claims and then consider their implications. First, I briefly survey current scholarship on relations between American governments and private sector organizations, particularly corporations. I claim that current scholars of politics and policy are well aware of public-private interdependence. Drawing on the research literature, I sketch out some rough categories of ways governments commonly interact with private actors, and I pay particular attention to our analysis of the ways governments draw on the capacities of private sector organizations – especially corporations – to accomplish public purposes. Governments tend to do this for two reasons: to build and sustain capacity for the social and economic development of the nation, and to directly and indirectly implement public policies they lack capacity to accomplish on their own. Conversely, also drawing on the research literature, I sketch out categories of ways corporations commonly advance their

own purposes through interactions with governments, including shaping public policy, influencing the filling of public offices, and contracting with governments for goods and services.

In the second part of the paper, I present my findings from fifteen of the most widely assigned high school civics textbooks (and, in a subsequent version of the paper, fifteen of the best-selling college textbooks on American politics and government). I looked for descriptions and explanations of these various interactions, and found only partial coverage. My second claim is that the texts tend to give their readers little basis for understanding interdependencies between the public and the private sectors, and particularly between governments and corporations. To begin with, many of them fail even to mention several of the most basic aspects of relations between the public and private sectors. Further, even those that mention any form of collaboration fail to present any coherent explanation. When they do present explanations, they tend to present such relations as zero sum: more governmental action and authority means less private freedom, capacity, and power, and vice versa.

In the third and final section of the paper, I discuss some of the disciplinary and normative implications of these findings. I consider some possible reasons textbook coverage of public-private relations is so inadequate. I then discuss why this might be a problem in normative terms for political scientists in particular, given our stated intention to enable democratic governance and effective policy making. Finally, I suggest some alternative ways scholars of politics and policy might formulate these matters to improve our own research, make our findings more accessible to textbook writers and readers, and improve public understanding of important contemporary controversies.

Research Scholarship on American Public Policy

Relations between public and private action have always been at the heart of American political awareness, and a central concern for scholars of American politics. If, following Judith Shklar, we recognize Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton as among the first scholars of American politics, we note their focus on enabling public action as well as both encouraging and protecting private action (Shklar 1991). The early 20th century founders of the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Society for Public Administration, among others, were certainly aware of these issues as well. Scholars and journals in these fields have consistently explored governmental actions and public policies created for, directed toward, or done in collaboration with private individuals, organizations, institutions, firms, and corporations.

The interdependence of the American public and private sectors is now broadly recognized in the scholarship of politics and public policy analysis. To stay with my opening formulation, scholars have long explored public policies for private actors, policies that enable and protect the development of civil society and the private economy. For civil society, many such policies are embodied in the amended Constitution, guaranteeing freedom of speech, religion, association, and privacy, and empowering governments to establish and maintain public order. Other policies are embedded in law and particularly the tax code, mitigating tax burdens for civil society organizations like religious congregations, charities, and non-profits. For the political economy, policies for the benefit of private actors include those that organize the economy for all: defining rules of property including intellectual property, creating currency, enforcing contracts,

setting market rules, providing public goods and ameliorating externalities, and educating the labor force (Lowi 2001). The Founders recognized that the development of an economy of any scale would require substantial governmental authority and action, and such policies have grown with the nation.

One especially important set of public policies for the benefit of private actors involves corporations. Of course, corporations existed well before the American Revolution, but beginning in the 1820s and especially after the Civil War, American governments at all levels moved to encourage and protect the development of corporations into the most powerful drivers of economic development (Bowman 1996; Maier 1993; Roy 1997). By the end of the 19th century, patterns were set that last to this day: governments grant corporate charters that confer legal personhood, limited liability, and other protections for owners and managers. They also enact tax and other laws that treat corporations differently from “natural persons” and non-corporate business organizations (Pinto and Branson 2009). Governments subsidize corporations and some other business firms as well, providing them with land, access to publicly-owned natural resources, goods, services, education of labor forces, and supportive research, development, and production of new technologies (Mazzucato 2013). In recent years, they have increasingly granted corporations constitutional and legal protections previously reserved for natural persons, as with free speech rights in the familiar *Citizens United vs FEC* case (Supreme Court of the United States 2010). These are all domestic policies, and many have parallels in foreign policy as well.

Allow me to insert a brief diversion here into scholarship on corporations.

Scholars of politics and public policy have long recognized the role of corporations as participants in public policy, dating from the earliest political writing about the Constitution (Maier 1993). More recently, Roy has shown that special-purpose firms of that era served as the initial model for latter day business corporations:

Corporations were originally chartered by governments to accomplish public tasks, to build roads, construct canals, explore and settle new lands, conduct banking, and other tasks governments felt could not or should not be conducted privately. Contrary to the notion that corporations autonomously developed because they competed more efficiently or effectively in the market, governments created the corporate form to do things that rational businessmen would not do because they were too risky, too unprofitable, or too public, that is, to perform tasks that would not have gotten done if left to the efficient operation of markets (Roy 1997, 41).

Or, we could add, if left to governments, which often lack capacities available to corporations.

State governments developed and revised corporate law through the last decades of the 19th century, as they competed with one another to encourage industrialization and employment growth, and accommodated the growing political power of corporate leaders and stockholders (Balogh 2009). Under these laws, and with the encouragement of the U.S. Supreme Court, the nature of corporations changed dramatically, as government-sanctioned monopolies waned and more competitive, finance-driven industrial corporations gained increasing freedom to control their own destinies (Roy 1997). By 1900, several government-created characteristics of corporations became universal, most notably: charters for legal personhood, limited liability, and legal status for managers and boards of directors largely separate from shareholders. Further development of state, national, and international law during the 20th century enabled the development of

multinational business corporations into what Ciepley calls “the world’s dominant institution” (Ciepley 2013, 139). Indeed, Anderson and Cavanagh reported in 2000 that 51 of the world’s largest economic entities were corporations, while 49 were national governments (Anderson and Cavanagh 2000).

Scholars have long recognized the importance of corporations to the American political economy. Just like governments, corporations can be thought of as arenas for, and instruments of, collective action through which people seek to advance their interests and values. They are unlike interest groups or any other private actors in the American political system in the extent to which they are both created by governments, and act as governments themselves (Ciepley 2013). Once created, because of their core role in the economic system, they need not seek further interactions with a government in order to influence it. In the broadest sense, corporations’ performance in generating wealth and economic activity, employing people, producing goods and services, and paying taxes have tremendous consequences for governments in general, and specific political parties and office-holders in particular. This is true not just domestically, but globally (Lowi 2001).

Because the fortunes of those owning and controlling corporations are strongly influenced, in turn, by governmental policies, corporations often participate in governmental policy-making at all levels. They lobby for policies that serve their interests and values, both as individual business firms and as trade associations of firms like the Chamber of Commerce or the National Federation of Independent Business. Employees, shareholders, and paid representatives of business corporations also draft some policy proposals that are ultimately enacted into statute, executive order, or court

decision.¹ The role of corporations also reaches beyond influencing the actions of public office holders, into shaping and determining who holds those offices in the first place. Business corporations participate powerfully in the American system of representative democracy by employing and socializing many of the people who will ultimately serve in elected office, sponsoring and recruiting those people to run for offices, funding and otherwise supporting those candidates in their election campaigns, and employing sometime public officials during periods when they are not in the public sector (Bó 2006; Fang 2014; Menefee-Libey 2000).

Finally, scholars of politics and policy recognize that contracting with governments is often a corporate business strategy. This is true for more than just business corporations: it is conventional to describe the American political economy as divided into three sectors: governments, businesses, and non-profit organizations (Atkinson 2012). Because governments are among the largest purchasers of goods and services, private actors form and manage corporations to win and sustain such contracts (Minow 2002; Stanger 2009; Strange 1996). This phenomenon is visible at all levels of the federal system, as well as internationally.

This scholarship on corporations is relevant because corporations are the main non-governmental collaborators with governments in public policy. Non-profit corporations are important in this regard, especially in the delivery of social services. But business corporations exert far more power in the development and delivery of public policy, and they have become involved in virtually every policy domain.

With these observations about corporations in mind, let me return to scholarship on governments and public policy, particularly what governments do to private actors. Since the times of Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, perhaps the most frequently investigated subjects for American scholars of politics and policy have been policies that tax, regulate, and mandate private behavior for individuals, organizations, and institutions. Obvious examples include corporate taxes and tax subsidies, environmental regulation, and workplace safety mandates. One could find further examples in virtually any issue of almost every political science journal ever published.

Scholars of politics and public policy initially paid less attention to what governments do in collaboration with private actors. This is somewhat surprising, given the signal importance of corporations as partners in developing the canals, roads, railroad and telegraph communication systems that enabled the social and economic development of the nation during the 19th century, as noted above. Such relationships drew increased attention beginning in the 1960s, however, as Great Society policies dramatically increased the scope and reach of the federal government. One magnet for scholarly attention was the growing collaboration of local and regional governments with corporations. This was most visible in social services, carrying forward practices dating back to the earliest days of the welfare state. Local charities, congregations, and religious organizations have always drawn on public support in providing food, shelter, and other social services (S. R. Smith and Lipsky 1993). Private business corporations have likewise always been involved in local economic development, building infrastructure and housing, providing job training, and delivering other services. This role expanded as “public-private partnership” became a common urban policy buzz phrase in the 1960s

and 1970s (Halpern 1995). But government contracting with corporations now reaches into virtually all policy domains.

Another magnet for scholarly attention to government policies with private actors was concern over whether large and complex initiatives could be implemented accurately and in a timely manner. This gave rise to policy implementation as a field of inquiry, led first by Pressman and Wildavsky's famous 1973 study, *Implementation* (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973). In second (Ingram and Mann 1980; Mazmanian and Sabatier 1989; Ripley and Franklin 1986) and third (Goggin et al. 1990; Honig 2006; Kaplan and Corbett 2003) "generations" of implementation studies in the 1980s and 1990s, scholars of political science, public policy analysis, and public administration investigated the evolving relationships between governments and organizations in the private sector. These researchers report that private actors and particularly corporations play an important role in implementation success and failure. In particular, they find that governments lacking capacity to carry out policies often turn to corporations for that capacity, either purchasing goods and services from them or collaborating with them as partners (Donahue and Zeckhauser 2011; Menefee-Libey 2010).

A third magnet for scholarly attention to such collaboration was the drive toward contracting and privatization that began in the late 1970s. Donald Kettl was among the first scholars to recognize a dramatic expansion of these forms of interdependence, writing as the public sector became increasingly unpopular in the 1980s and governments at all levels contracted out important functions like social service delivery and education to both non-profit and for-profit corporations (Kettl 1988). With the popularity of "reinventing government" during the presidential administrations of Bill Clinton in the

1990s and George W. Bush in the 2000s, governments at all levels dramatically expanded the range of delegated policy domains to include prisons, elementary and secondary schools, and security for diplomatic personnel overseas (Bulkley, Henig, and Levin 2010; Morgan and Campbell 2011; Osborne and Gaebler 1992; Stanger 2009). Lester Salamon and others continue to document and analyze the expanding range of collaborative methods, including grants, vouchers, tax incentives, loan guarantees, and the creation of government-sponsored entities like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (Salamon 2002). Many of the policies identified by Paul Light in his 2000 survey of scholars on the achievements of American governments in the second half of the 20th century involved just such collaborations (Light 2002).

Suzanne Mettler has recently broadened our view even further, drawing attention especially to the use of tax subsidies as policy instruments through which governments induce private and corporate actors to behave in desired ways (Mettler 2011). Such subsidies date back at least to the earliest days of the income tax. She has documented the importance of this side of this “submerged state” particularly for housing, health insurance, and retirement savings policies, showing that subsidies amount to a sizable share of the federal fiscal system. Mettler and others have observed that these relationships often further “hollow out” the capacity of governments to accomplish things without reliance on corporations (Mettler 2011; Milward 1996). Critics find particular fault with contracting and outsourcing, most recently in the troubled rollout of online marketplaces under the Affordable Care Act (Chassy and Amey 2011; Markon and Crites 2013a).

In any case, interdependence continues to grow in scope and scale. Public policy and public administration researchers, as well as scholars in sociology, economics and political science, and finally practitioners throughout the public and private sectors, recognize that governments collaborate very closely with private sector actors, and particularly with corporations.

How to summarize this research literature? First, it's essential to identify basic defining dimensions of corporations that matter in the American political economy. I have identified five such dimensions, which I label with the letter D to signify that they focus on definitions:

- D1: The grounding of a corporation in a government's grant of a charter, or governmental recognition of its legal "personhood," which enables that corporation to engage in contracts and participate in legal disputes;
- D2: Identifying which government grants a corporation its charter or personhood, which in the case of most U.S. corporations is a state government;

These characteristics have defined corporations of all types, going back well before the modern era or the development of capitalism. The next dimensions both identify contemporary specifics, and enable us to recognize important categories of corporations.

- D3: Other specific legal provisions that have been conventional for business corporations since the late 19th century, including potential immortality, limited liability for owners, division of ownership into shares, flexible purpose, geographic mobility, and legal status for managers and boards of directors largely separate from shareholders;
- D4: Recognition of non-business corporations in the private sector, especially non-profit corporations now operating under chapter 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Service code, or what are commonly identified internationally as Non-Governmental Organizations, or NGOs;
- D5: Recognition of government corporations like the Federal National Mortgage Association (the so-called "Fannie Mae"), Amtrak, and the U.S. Postal Service.

The principal focus of this paper is on business corporations, but D4 and D5 are relevant here because the distinctive activities of non-profit and governmental corporations are also important in the American political economy.

Next, I have identified five types of contemporary government activity that engage corporations and private actors in service to public purposes. I label them with the letter G to signify that they are government activities:

G1:Organizing the economy for all: defining rules of property including intellectual property, creating currency, enforcing contracts, setting market rules, providing public goods and ameliorating externalities, and educating a labor force, among other things;

G2:Legislating specifically to benefit corporations: granting corporate charters that create legal personhood, limited liability, and other protections for owners and managers, then writing tax and other laws that treat corporations differently from “natural persons” or non-corporate forms of business organizations;

These first two categories might be viewed primarily as policy done by governments for private individuals, groups, organizations, and institutions. The second is about policy for corporations, a particular set of private actors.

G3:Taxing, mandating, or regulating private behavior in order to produce or protect public goods, or to reduce negative externalities;

G4:Subsidizing corporations in various ways: providing them with land, goods, services, trained employees; and engaging in or subsidizing research and development of new technologies;

These next two categories can be thought of as policy done to private actors: sometimes viewed by those actors positively and sometimes negatively. Though they require acceptance, the interaction between governments and private actors in this category are not necessarily collaborative or mutual.

G5:Contracting for goods and services produced by corporations, and using those goods and services to implement public policies;

This last category captures the most collaborative policies, those governments do with private actors.

Finally, because scholars recognize the importance of corporations in collaborative public policies, I want to summarize the converse dimensions of these relationships as well. That is, the research literature documents corporate activities that engage governments. I have identified four types, which I will label with the letter C to signify that they are corporate activities:

- C1: General economic activity: hiring people, developing and producing goods and services in the general economy, and paying taxes;
- C2: Efforts to shape public policy by lobbying for preferred governmental action (or inaction), directly drafting legislative or regulatory language, or by litigating in courts;
- C3: Actions that influence the filling of public offices, including by offering the practical experiences and employment that many office-holders use to launch careers in all avenues of public service, by participating in or financing election campaigns, and by employing sometime public officials during periods when they are not in the public sector;
- C4: Contracting with governments to provide goods and services, the converse of category G5 above.

None of these categories is exclusively corporate, of course: private actors and organizations of all kinds may do any or all of them. Initially, the point is that, as they do these things, private actors engage the work and fortunes of governments. Nevertheless, the research literature demonstrates that the lion's share of these activities is done by corporations.

To return to the original research question that motivates this paper, to what extent is this scholarship reflected in what we teach students about public policy in the United States? Do textbooks describe and explain the complex interplay between the

public and private sectors, and in particular, the interdependence of governments and corporations?

What We Teach about American Politics and Public Policy

How does this scholarly portrait of the world compare to the public images of the public and private sectors, about public policy and political economy in the United States? Do our public conversations reflect an understanding that governments and corporations are interdependent, that each set of organizations relies heavily on the other to pursue its interests and values? One way that scholars hope to shape this public discourse is through what we teach American young people in our public schools.

Why Textbooks, and Why Civics and American Government Textbooks?

For most Americans, the one shared opportunity to learn about American politics and policy comes in high school, when most states require students to complete a course on civics or American government in order to earn a public high school diploma (Wichowski and Levine n.d.). Nine in ten adult Americans have a high school diploma or equivalent, the overwhelming majority of them from public schools (National Center for Education Statistics 2013). For most of those high school graduates, their civics and American government curriculum came to them through textbooks, supplemented by information and ideas from their teachers. These courses and textbooks provide a common basis for American knowledge about the institutions and processes of the U.S. political system that scholars investigate, and about the important individual and organizational participants in the nation's civic life.

I also focus on textbooks because they are an essential link in the chain of ideas that now organize schools and schooling in the United States (Fowler 2012). This chain of ideas is embodied in “standards-based education,” the dominant logic of education policy and school reform at all levels of the American system since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983).

Education policy makers make the first link the chain by setting broad goals for what students should be expected to know, understand, or be able to do, and then developing content standards that students will be expected to master in order to show that their achievement accomplishes those goals (EdSource n.d.; Fowler 2012). Policy makers expect that these goals and standards will, in turn, drive the content of curricula, and that educational authorities will provide schools, teachers, and instructional materials that can deliver those curricula to students. Teachers apply various pedagogies in presenting those curricula, and so on down the chain.

Policymakers view textbooks as the most important materials used in instructing students, and researchers have substantially confirmed this view (Anyon 1979). Clawson notes that textbooks are “the most visible part of the curriculum, and textbooks play a central role in almost every classroom” (Clawson 2002, 353, citing Apple 1986; Sleeter and Grant 1991). Along with the teacher, they are the embodiment of school itself. Olivo and others have found this to be particularly true in introductory courses for subjects students have not previously encountered:

The content of the textbook is central to the curriculum in introductory courses and to what the students take away from these courses as “truth.” A study of human geography textbooks points to the fundamental role of textbooks in initiating students to a discipline. The content of this most basic and accessible literature typically dictates the content of the curriculum more generally (Olivo 2012, 150, citing Mayer 1989).

Ferree and Hall make a related point in their investigation of sociology textbooks: that mass circulation textbooks embody what is considered “mainstream” in a discipline: “that is, the sociology that teachers, students, and textbooks publishers have treated as nonproblematic” (Ferree and Hall 1996, 929).

Education about politics and policy has long been a mainstream goal in the United States. Civic education is part of the fabric of American education. The United States was among the first nations in the world to develop a broadly inclusive public elementary education system, with local leaders establishing schools across the northeast in the early 1800s (Tyack and Hansot 1982). In an increasingly diverse nation of immigrants, the first organizing principal of these schools was the creation of citizens capable of self-government (Pangle and Pangle 2000). Labaree shows that this commitment to democratic equality remains among the core goals of public elementary and secondary education (Labaree 1997). Chambliss presents a typical view: “In the ideal world, all students would be reading and learning from textbooks and other text materials that are comprehensible, concerned with important civic issues, and encourage students to participate in civic activities” (Chambliss et al. 2007, 2).

Civic education is also a particular goal of political science as an organized discipline. The American Political Science Association has a standing committee on Civic Education and Citizenship, which provides curriculum, syllabi, and instructional advice for schools at all levels. The association regularly publishes research on civic education for high school and undergraduate students, including the recent book *Teaching Civic Engagement* (McCartney, Bennion, and Simpson 2013).

Data and Methods

To discover whether high school American government/civics textbooks describe or explain the real world of interdependence between governments and corporations, I surveyed the most recent edition available of fifteen widely used texts. I identified these texts in two stages. First, I included any texts chosen by more than two of the 22 state governments which select or recommend the use of specific high school civics textbooks.² Second, I included any texts chosen by large school districts outside of the 22 states already identified.³ This method is not perfect: while I am confident in identifying textbook-selecting states, I was unable to discover textbook policies for some large school districts.⁴ Table 1 lists the fifteen texts I identified and surveyed, including the edition reviewed and its year of publication.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

To enable a consistent approach to reading the fifteen texts, I created a rubric (Appendix A) that embodied the findings of the research literature outlined above. I first looked for and flagged instances in which a textbook's authors explicitly defined or explained corporations or any of their various dimensions:

- D1: Grounding a government's grant of a charter legal personhood
- D2: Identifying which government grants a corporation its charter or personhood
- D3: Other specific legal provisions, including limited liability
- D4: Recognition of non-profit corporations or NGOs
- D5: Recognition of government corporations

I followed up by seeking coverage of several related topics that might include material on business corporations: the textbooks' treatment of economic policy, "business" and "the private sector."

The remainder of the rubric focuses on the nine types of governmental and corporate activity identified above, activities that involve public-private interdependence.

Six numbered categories (G1-G6) capture governmental activities that affect corporations:

- G1: Governments organizing economies
- G2: Governments enacting corporation laws
- G3: Governments taxing, regulating, or mandating private and corporate activities
- G4: Governments directly subsidizing or otherwise assisting corporations
- G5: Governments contracting with corporations for goods and services

Four numbered categories (C1-C4) capture corporate activities that affect governments:

- C1: Corporations engaging in general economic activity
- C2: Corporations influencing public policy
- C3: Corporations influencing the filling of government offices
- C4: Corporations contracting with governments for goods and services

With the assistance of [redacted], I transcribed textbook passages captured by this rubric, and analyzed those findings using Atlas-TI software.

One challenge for my reading of these texts was to distinguish between passages in which authors simply mentioned a topic, and those in which authors included that topic in a broader explanation of politics and policy. Wallace and Allen helpfully make a distinction between these two in their study of how textbooks portray African Americans in introductory American politics textbooks (Wallace and Allen 2008). Mentioning is a necessary but not sufficient condition for exploring any topic, and a textbook may compartmentalize a mentioned topic and completely fail to contextualize or explain that topic, or include treatment of it in the broader sweep of the textbook.

Findings: What are Corporations?

I summarize my findings in Table 2, and present them in more detail below.

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

All fifteen of the textbooks mention corporations, and most of those passages focus on business corporations. There was wide diversity of treatment, however. Three of the texts – Edwards, Schmidt, and Wilson – never give any indication that a corporation is distinct from any other organization, institution, or collective action strategy. Three more – Barbour, Downey, and Janda – mention or discuss nonprofit or governmental corporations, but not business corporations as distinct from businesses in general.

D1: Corporate charters or legal personhood, and D2: Which government grants a corporation its charter or personhood? Eight of the texts define a corporation in formal, legal terms. Five of these – Fraga, Hartley, Massing, and the two Remy texts – define corporations as grounded in charters, and all in this subset note that business charters are granted by state governments. For example, Remy, in his discussion of business regulation in *United States Government*, notes that “every business corporation must have a charter issued by a state government” and then spends four sentences summarizing changing state charter practices from the 1860s to the 1890s (Remy 2010, 648). A fuller example is the Hartley text: “A business organization chartered by a state government and given power to conduct business, sell stock, and receive protection of state laws” (Hartley and Vincent 2003, R20). An overlapping subset of five texts – the two Davis texts, Fraga, McClenaghan, and Remy’s joint civic/economics text – explain that corporations are persons in a legal sense.

D3: Other specific legal provisions, including limited liability. One further text offers a partial, informal definition of business corporations: the authors of the Smith

text note that business corporations may be large or small, and that all are owned by their shareholders whose liability is limited to the money they have invested (J. W. Smith and Sullivan 2010, 558). This text does not explain business corporations any further, or identify any of their other defining characteristics.

The eight texts that offer formal, legal definitions also discuss other common corporate characteristics. All note that a business corporation can be owned by multiple people who purchase shares, and that the liability of these owners is limited to their investment. Fraga, Hartley, and McClenaghan note that a corporation can outlive its creators and initial investors. Fraga, Hartley, McClenaghan and Remy's joint civic/economics text note that the legal role of shareholders in governing a corporation are legally distinct from the legal role of officers and managers.

I should note that of these eight texts that define corporations more fully, three are joint American government/civics and economics texts, (Davis, Fernlund, and Woll 2007; Massing 2009; Remy et al. 2010) and one more is the government/civics-only texts written by a pair of authors who also produce a joint text (Davis and Fernlund 2003). These four texts tend to do more than others to draw connections between governmental and economic activity, though they also often draw sharp distinctions between forms of collective action undertaken in the public sector from those undertaken in the private sector. Two of these five take a "how to" approach to collective action in the private sector, presenting a reader with issues to consider if the reader wishes to form a business (Davis and Fernlund 2003; Remy et al. 2010). This is consistent with the way virtually all of the texts encourage readers to consider various collective action issues in the public

sector: how to pursue aspirations or solve public problems, influence public policy, or win election to public offices.

D4: Recognition of non-profit corporations or Non-Governmental Organizations. Interestingly, there is no clear match between the set of texts that define for-profit business corporations and those that mention and/or define non-profit corporations or NGOs. Eight of the texts – Barbour, the Davis civics-only text, Fraga, Hartley, Janda, Massing, McCenaghan, and the joint Remy civics/economics text – discuss these types of corporations. Davis and McClenaghan confine this discussion to international NGOs, without mentioning domestic non-profits.

D5. Recognition of government corporations. Similarly, an unmatching set of texts mention government corporations like Amtrak and Fannie Mae. Barbour, the Davis civics-only text, Downey, Janda, McClenaghan, and Remy’s civics-only text do this.

Readers of the eight texts that provide somewhat fuller definitions of corporations have at least a basis to understand corporations as actors in the political economy, and to learn about relationships among governments and corporations. The other seven texts, though they mention corporations, have only very limited grounds on which to explain such relationships.

Findings: Governments Activities that Affect Corporations

In what ways to these texts treat government activities that affect corporations?

G1. Governments organizing economies. The authors of all the texts cover governmental policies for the benefit of private actors in civil society and the economy.

All fifteen texts have at least one chapter on economic policy in which they present descriptions and explanations of American governments' roles in organizing the economy. Most focus on the special importance of the federal government, for example in the Davis texts, where the authors explain that this role dates to the founding:

To make sure that the economy of the new nation would be strong and be able to grow, Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gave Congress the power to coin money, collect taxes, borrow money, set up a postal service, build roads, and regulate commerce. In other words, Congress was to lay a foundation on which a market economy could flourish (Davis and Fernlund 2003, 346).

Virtually all of the texts also note that governments are major participants in the economy themselves, employing millions of people and producing goods and services worth billions of dollars. But few of the texts explicitly link these governmental activities to the economic fortunes of corporations.

G2. Governments enacting corporation laws. Seven of the fifteen texts – the two Davis texts, Fraga, Hartley, Massing, and the two Remy texts – mention laws enacted specifically to enable the creation of corporations or to provide specifically for their participation in the economy. Their coverage includes various combinations of the legally defined characteristics of corporations mentioned earlier, and Janda also mentions laws that license corporations to engage in specific business activities. As I also noted earlier, state governments are especially important to corporations because states issue the charters under which nearly all domestic business corporations operate. They also control most business licensing. Yet only three of the texts – Hartley, Massing, and Remy's *United States Government* – specifically mention this state role.

G3. Governments taxing, regulating or mandating corporate activities. All fifteen texts give substantial coverage of public policies done to corporations, other

businesses, and other private organizations. In their economic policy chapters, all of the textbooks offer substantial descriptions and analysis of taxation and government regulation of business activities, goods and services. Further, they all present content on government mandates that help to protect the public and public goods. All the texts explain that governmental regulations induce businesses to change their behavior for public benefit by, for example, avoiding predatory business practices, keeping workplaces safe for employees, producing food and other goods that do not harm consumers, and avoiding environmental destruction and pollution. Also, in their various discussions of federalism, all of the texts note that state governments regulate commerce within their boundaries.

These discussions of regulation raise the issue of collaboration between the public and private sectors, but only indirectly. And aside from the four that mentions that corporations are taxed differently from other businesses, none of the texts single out ways these government activities might be directed at corporations any differently from other forms of business organizations.

G4. Governments directly subsidizing or otherwise assisting corporations.

All but two – Fraga and Janda – of the fifteen texts mention one or more ways that governments use domestic and international policies to subsidize American businesses. There is no consistent focus or analysis among these passages, which cover topics including tax breaks, protection from domestic competition, the building of local special-purpose infrastructure, agricultural subsidies, direct business loans and loan guarantees, research and development, and the provision of Census data. Further, all of these

passages are about government actions in relation to businesses in general. None of the texts single out government activities focused on corporations in particular.

G5. Governments contracting with corporations for goods and services. Nine of the texts note that governments contract with businesses for goods and services: the two Davis texts, Downey, Fraga, Janda, Massing, Remy’s *United States Government*, Shmidt, and Smith. The Janda text is the only one which considers contracting with both not-for-profit organizations and businesses (Janda, Berry, and Goldman 2012, 589–592). The Edwards and Janda texts note the role of contracting for goods and services with businesses in the implementation of public policies. Janda explains that: “Recently, for-profit companies have started to compete for the grants and contracts that the government awards through competitive grants or bidding. For example, the for-profit company Maximus holds a contract from the state of Connecticut to manage the state’s program for providing child-care slots to poor families seeking such assistance” (Janda, Berry, and Goldman 2012, 442–443). Again, however, these passages all concern businesses in general, not business corporations in particular.

Findings: Corporate Activities that Affect Governments

In what ways to these texts treat corporate activities that affect governments?

C1. Corporations engaging in economic activity. Only five of the texts – Barbour, the two Davis texts, Remy’s *Civics Today*, and Schmidt – specifically mention the importance of corporate activity to the broader economy of the nation, or to the effectiveness and perceived legitimacy of governments. Davis, for example, notes that “[l]arge businesses organized as corporations dominate our economy today. They make

nearly 90 percent of the total sales in the American economy” (Davis, Fernlund, and Woll 2007, 385). Three more of the texts note the importance of business without singling out business corporations.

C2. Corporations influencing public policy. The next two categories are more conventionally recognized. Every one of the fifteen textbooks includes descriptions and explanations of the efforts of corporations and other businesses to influence public policy, especially through lobbying. This coverage is included both in chapters on governmental institutions like Congress and the presidency, and in chapters on the role of interest groups in American politics. Yet, again in these chapters, to the extent that corporations are mentioned at all, their activities are not distinguished from those of other business proprietors advocating for their interests. All participants are described as engaging in similar activities: shaping public opinion, joining in community activities visible to public officials, providing research and information, contacting public officials, and so on.

C3. Corporations influencing the filling of government offices. This latter point relates to the broader matter of corporations using various means to fill elective and appointive public offices. All the texts describe and explain efforts by American businesses to influence elections, especially by contributing money to election campaigns, but also by sponsoring advertising and other efforts to directly influence voters. The publication dates of these texts straddle the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2010 ruling in *Citizens United vs Federal Election Commission*, which outlawed most restrictions on corporate electoral activity and campaign contributions, so it would be unfair to criticize them for not yet assimilating the impact of that ruling. Aside from the

partial exceptions of Janda, McClenaghan, and especially Schmidt, the texts' campaign finance sections therefore mostly focus on activities governed by the old Federal Election Campaigns Act (FECA) and the 2002 Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA). They focus on Political Action Committees (PACs), the separate organizations that businesses, trade associations, and unions established for campaign contributions in the pre-*Citizens United* era. These passages rarely distinguish the activities of business corporations from other businesses.

Only the Wilson text discusses efforts by corporations or businesses to influence the filling of appointive public offices. It does so in a section on "The Revolving Door," a pattern in which people pass between employment in government and employment in businesses. Wilson notes that corporations may foster, and benefit from, this pattern: "If a federal official uses his or her government position to do something for a corporation in exchange for a cushy job after leaving government, or if a person who has left government uses his or her personal contacts to get favors for private parties, then the public interest may suffer" (Wilson, DiIulio, and Bose 2013, 289).

C4. Corporations contracting with governments. Only five of the texts – the Davis joint civic/economics text, Edwards, Janda, Massing, and Wilson – offer any description and explanation of business and corporate efforts to win contracts with governments to sell them goods and services. Interestingly, this roster of texts doesn't match up cleanly with the roster of five texts that mention government contracting for public policy purposes, which included Downey, Edwards, Janda, Remy's *United States Government*, and Wilson. In the case of corporations and businesses seeking government contracts, Massing offers the most passive view, simply reporting that "[b]usinesses sell

goods and services to households and the government” (Massing 2009, 558). The other two texts present a more strategic view. Janda explains that

Social services are labor intensive, and state and local governments have found it efficient to outsource programs to nongovernmental organizations, principally nonprofit organizations like community health centers and day-care centers for elderly persons. Recently, for-profit companies have started to compete for the grants and contracts that the government awards through competitive grants or bidding (Janda, Berry, and Goldman 2012, 442–443).

Wilson discusses the issue in several contexts, including firms using “revolving door” incentives to influence FDA decisions, asking their Congressional representatives to help them to gain “earmarked” project funding, and taking advantage of sole-source defense contracts to avoid cost controls (Wilson, DiIulio, and Bose 2013, 291, 356, 555). In none of these cases does Wilson describe these firms as corporations, however.

To sum up, these textbooks only partially reflect scholarly research on American politics and public policy concerning relations between the public and private sectors, and particularly between governments and corporations. All the texts mention corporations, but only a bare majority offer even a minimal definition connected to government chartering or recognition. Only five of the texts mention the level of government which grants corporations the charters without which they could not exist. The eight texts that do at least offer legal definitions do not present a consistent view of the dimensions that make corporations distinctive participants in, or components of, our political system.

When it comes to public policy, the texts cover some aspects of public-private relations reasonably well. They cover activities governments do for the development and protection of civil society and the private economy, though most of them do not mention

or explain what governments do for corporations in particular. They also cover what governments generally do to private actors, including taxation, regulations, and mandates, though again they rarely identify particular ways governments conduct these activities in relation to corporations.

Where most of these texts fall short is in describing and explaining what governments do with corporations. Nine of the texts mention the governmental side of the contractual relationships through which governments collaborate with corporations to advance public policies, and five mention the corporate side of those relationships. But only Janda's text offers any explanation that governments may engage in these relationships strategically, or that governments could be interdependent with corporations in any systematic way. Quite to the contrary, several of the texts focus on taxes, regulations, and mandates in ways that suggest that the relationships could be considered zero-sum: more governmental action implies less business success or effectiveness, and more business effectiveness implies more limitation on government. Research scholarship in politics and public policy conventionally recognizes that public-private sector interactions are not so simple as that.

The textbooks have far less to offer in describing and explaining corporate actions in relation to governments. Very often, they do not distinguish business corporations from other forms of business organization. When they do focus specifically on corporations, the texts rarely present corporations as strategic actors or arenas for strategic action in relation to governments.

With some notable exceptions, the growing collaboration between governments and corporations that has most defined policy change in recent decades is essentially absent from these textbooks. As I note in the outset of this paper, these collaborations are also among the most controversial political issues of our time. A student looking to most of these textbooks for guidance on how to understand these developments and controversies would be left empty-handed. And though we as scholars have worked to investigate, document, and explain the interdependence of governments and corporations, we have failed in our stated intentions to have our scholarship reach broader audiences, to enable democratic governance, as well as legitimate and effective policy making.

Discussion

These findings perhaps raise challenging questions. Why is there such a gap between what scholars know about and what our schools teach about American politics and public policy? And what might scholars and textbook authors do to close that gap?

Why the gap?

One possible explanation for the gap is political bias. As noted earlier, textbooks tend to present information and analysis that authors, publishers, schools, and teachers regard as settled and nonproblematic. As Foster notes in his study of history textbooks, however, what one might consider nonproblematic can itself be problematic:

Textbooks not only illustrate the historical content transmitted to the young, but they also offer a window into the dominant values and beliefs of established groups in any period. Textbooks are socially constructed cultural, political, and economic artifacts. Their contents are not pre-ordained but are conceived, designed, and authored by real people with real interests.

Essentially, textbooks appear as gatekeepers of ideas, values, and knowledge (Foster 1999, 253).

Perhaps withholding information about the growing interdependence of governments and corporations would serve political purposes that such “real people” would object to, or find dangerous. Stated more bluntly, perhaps the gap exists because high school civics and government textbooks are being used as instruments of social control by politically powerful people (Wallace and Allen 2008, 153).

But to claim that political bias causes the gap does not necessarily mean that textbook authors, publishers, schools and teachers themselves have politically biased motives. Perhaps those with authority over high school textbooks – school board members and superintendents, for example – fear public controversy over describing and explaining collaboration between governments and corporations, and prefer to avoid that potential controversy (Altbach et al. 1991).

A second possible explanation for the gap comes from recognizing the fascination with decision making and choice among scholars of politics and public policy. I would not be the first to note that scholars of politics frequently regard what happens after policy choice as an afterthought, that we more often focus on legislative enactment, executive decision making, and judicial rulings and stop there. To borrow a standard formalism, policy can be understood to happen in distinct stages: from problem identification and agenda setting, to the identification of possible alternative responses, to authoritative choice of policy, to implementation of policy, to evaluation, to policy succession (Peters 2013). The stages leading to enactment are often considered the core of politics, while implementation and evaluation are thought of as technical or

mechanical exercises rather than matters for political contestation and analysis. The textbooks considered here tend to reflect this view, and are for the most part silent on how policies are implemented or the politics of policy evaluation.

This may help us understand the gap between what we know and what we teach about politics and policy. As I noted earlier in the paper, policy implementation is the stage at which governments are most likely to lack capacities to act effectively, the stage at which they are most likely to turn to corporations for assistance. In other words, implementation is the stage at which governments are most likely to act with corporations and other private actors. If textbooks do not cover this stage of the policy process, it makes sense that they will not fully engage the interdependence of the public and private sectors, or the collaboration of governments with corporations.

A third possible explanation for the gap is simple inertia: the curriculum for an introduction to American civics and government is set, and most textbook authors and publishers, as well as school authorities and teachers, simply follow the established pattern (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, 147–160). As Stroup and Garriott have noted, “[T]he introductory American government course follows much the same format everywhere, and has changed very little since Ogg and Ray’s classic *Introduction to American Government* was published in 1922 ” (Stroup and Garriott 1997, 183, citing Ogg and Ray 1922). It turns out that there was much more variety in approaches to such introductory courses in the 1920s and 1930s than Stroup and Garriott suggest, as indicated by Russell Story’s essay in the May 1926 edition of the *American Political*

Science Review (Story 1926). But that variety seems to have dissipated in the years after World War II, and their generalization certainly holds today.

Without exception, the authors of these textbooks have organized their presentation of American government and politics in much the same way as Ogg and Ray. After some kind of introduction, each describes the founding and Constitution of the United States with particular attention to the separation of powers, federalism, civil liberties and civil rights. Each devotes chapters to the branches of government: Congress, the Presidency and the Executive, and the courts. Each has chapters on political participation and interest groups, campaigns and elections, the media, economic and social policy, and international affairs. The authors all take a formal approach to the subject, focusing on institutions and processes, as well as clearly defined types of individual and group behavior that engage those institutions and processes. This approach is familiar to almost anyone who has ever taught or taken the “intro” class.

The approach focuses, like much of political science, on *formal* institutions and their *primary* functions in systems. This structural-functionalism does not remotely capture the range and variety of political science research today, so the dominance of this approach in textbooks is puzzling. I don’t want to dismiss structural-functionalism, because clearly we as a discipline have created valuable knowledge and understanding of Congress, for example, or mass voting behavior. But we have blind spots, as Ernest Wilson observed in *PS* almost 30 years ago in his essay on “Why Political Scientists Don’t Study Black Politics, but Historians and Sociologists Do” (Wilson III 1985). By focusing on formal institutions and their primary functions, we have made it very difficult to recognize, describe, and explain the interdependence of the public and private sectors,

or of governments and corporations. We have also made it difficult for anyone who might wish to produce a textbook that closes the gap between what we know and what we teach about American politics and public policy.

How might we approach closing the gap?

One way to respond to this challenge is to build on familiar ideas. Conventional American textbooks explain the world to students by drawing clear boundaries: public power in the United States is exercised by governments, in the public sector. Their authors observe that we have many governments in the US: federal, state, and local. They also observe that most of these governments have separated powers: legislative, executive, and judicial.

This is true as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough, because it implies wrongly that the public sector is clearly separated from the private. That is, it implies that because they are private, corporations and other businesses, churches and religious congregations, and various civil society groups and organizations play no role in the exercise of public power. Scholars of politics and public policy recognize that this implication is wrong, that virtually all governments commonly collaborate with such private organizations in exercising their power, and that public/private boundaries are not as sharp as the textbooks imply.

A promising corrective may come from the observation that there is in fact a third, de facto dimension to the separation of public powers in the US: 1) among levels of government, 2) among branches of government, and 3) between public and private sector organizations. On all three dimensions, successful politics and policy requires at least

some degree of collaboration across lines of separation. In our diverse and pluralistic system, no actor or organization – public or private – can exercise power for long without collaborating in some way with others.

This formulation broadens and deepens the scope of Harold Lasswell's traditional textbook question that defines politics: who gets what, when, and how (Lasswell 1958). It enables productive questions about power and values: who is collaborating with whom in exercising power, how, and for what purposes? Readers may then more thoughtfully recognize that politics is about all kinds of actors working strategically to advance their interests and values in these collaborative relationships.

Let me only briefly suggest two further ways of closing the gap. One would accept the formalism common in political science, but switch formalisms. Instead of taking the Ogg & Ray approach and focusing on the branches of government isolated from collaboration with private actors, a text could take the policy chain approach outlined above, considering the politics of agenda-setting, identifying and developing alternatives, making authoritative policy choices, implementing those choices, evaluating the policy and its implementation and impact, and moving on to policy succession (Peters 2013). As noted above, including the implementation and evaluation of policy would necessarily broaden the scope of any textbook to include collaborations between governments and corporations.

A final possibility would be to stop organizing instruction around the comprehensive formalism of structures and functions. One could write a textbook or build a civics and American government course around a small number of important case

studies in various policy domains, or around policy networks within a particular policy domain (Agranoff 2007; O'Toole 2010; Rainey 2012), or cases that involve competing collective action strategies in the public and private sectors.

Whatever remedy we attempt must be evaluated on its effectiveness in closing the gap between what we know and what we teach about American government and public policy, in service to democratic and effective governance.

¹ See the interest group literature generally, but two ground-breaking examples of scholarship documenting this are McConnell (1966) and Heclo (1978).

² Ranked by population, the 22 states that “select” or “recommend” specific high school civics textbooks are Texas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Indiana, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, Louisiana, Kentucky, Oregon, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Utah, New Mexico, West Virginia, Idaho, Hawaii, and Rhode Island. California selects textbooks for many subjects, but not for high school civics. See also Finn, Jr. and Ravitch 2004; Stillman and Blank 2009.

³ Eleven of the 20 largest American school districts are in states with prescribed textbooks in American government/civics. Of the remaining nine, I was able to find prescribed textbooks for four. Ranked by enrollment, they are the Los Angeles Unified School District (CA), Montgomery County Public Schools (MD), San Diego Unified School District (CA), and Prince George’s County Public Schools (MD).

⁴ I was unable to find American government/civics textbook selection policies for New York City Public Schools, Chicago Public Schools, the Clark County School District (NV), and the Philadelphia City School District.

Sources Cited
(in addition to the textbooks listed in Table 1)

- Agranoff, Robert. 2007. *Managing Within Networks: Adding Value to Public Organizations*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Altbach, Philip G., Gail P. Kelly, Hugh G. Petrie, and Lois Weis, eds. 1991. *Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Anderson, Sarah, and John Cavanagh. 2000. *Top 200: The Rise of Corporate Global Power*. Washington, DC: Institute for Policy Studies. http://www.ips-dc.org/reports/top_200_the_rise_of_corporate_global_power (February 21, 2014).
- Anyon, Jean. 1979. "Ideology and United States History Textbooks." *Harvard Educational Review* 49(3): 361–86.
- Apple, Michael W. 1986. *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Atkinson, Rob. 2012. "Re-Focusing on Philanthropy: Revising and Re-Orienting the Standard Model." *William & Mary Policy Review* 4(1): 1–76.
- Balogh, Brian. 2009. *A Government Out of Sight: The Mystery of National Authority in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bó, Ernesto Dal. 2006. "Regulatory Capture: A Review." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22(2): 203–25.
- Bowman, Scott R. 1996. *The Modern Corporation and American Political Thought: Law, Power, and Ideology*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.
- Bulkley, Katrina E., Jeffrey R. Henig, and Henry M. Levin, eds. 2010. *Between Public and Private: Politics, Governance, and the New Portfolio Models for Urban School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Chambliss, Marilyn, Wendy Richardson, Judith Torney-Purta, and Britt Wilkenfeld. 2007. *Improving Textbooks as a Way to Foster Civic Understanding and Engagement*. College Park, MD: CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. <http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP54Chambliss.pdf> (August 7, 2013).
- Chassy, Paul, and Scott H. Amey. 2011. *Bad Business: Billions of Taxpayer Dollars Wasted on Hiring Contractors*. Washington, DC: Project on Government Oversight. <http://www.pogo.org/our-work/reports/2011/co-gp-20110913.html> (October 24, 2013).
- Ciepley, David. 2013. "Beyond Public and Private: Toward a Political Theory of the Corporation." *American Political Science Review* 107(01): 139–58.
- Clawson, Rosalee A. 2002. "Poor People, Black Faces: The Portrayal of Poverty in Economics Textbooks." *Journal of Black Studies* 32(3): 352–61.
- Davis, James E., and Phyllis Maxey Fernlund. 2003. *Civics: Participating in Government*. Needham, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Davis, James E., Phyllis Maxey Fernlund, and Peter Woll. 2007. *Prentice Hall Civics: Government and Economics in Action*. Boston, MA: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- DiMaggio, Paul, and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–60.
- Donahue, John D., and Richard Zeckhauser. 2011. *Collaborative Governance: Private Roles for Public Goals in Turbulent Times*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- EdSource. n.d. "Standards-Based Education." *EdSource: Highlighting Strategies for Student Success*. http://www.edsource.org/iss_sta.html (September 13, 2013).
- Fang, Lee. 2014. "Chevron's Lobbyist Now Runs the Congressional Science Committee." *The Nation*. <http://www.thenation.com/blog/178489/chevrons-lobbyist-now-runs-congressional-science-committee> (February 23, 2014).
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Elaine J. Hall. 1996. "Rethinking Stratification from a Feminist Perspective: Gender, Race, and Class in Mainstream Textbooks." *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 929–50.
- Finn, Jr., Chester E., and Diane Ravitch. 2004. *The Mad, Mad World of Textbook Adoption*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute. http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2004/200409_madworldoftextbookadoption/Mad%20World_Test2.pdf (June 23, 2012).
- Foster, Stuart J. 1999. "The Struggle for American Identity: Treatment of Ethnic Groups in United States History Textbooks." *History of Education* 28(3): 251–78.
- Fowler, Frances C. 2012. *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders: An Introduction*. 4th ed. Pearson.
- Goggin, Malcolm, Ann O'M. Bowman, James Lester, and Laurence J. O'Toole Jr. 1990. *Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown.
- Halpern, Robert. 1995. *Rebuilding the Inner City: A History of Neighborhood Initiatives to Address Poverty in the United States*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hartley, William H., and William S. Vincent. 2003. *American Civics*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston : Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Heclo, Hugh. 1978. "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment." In *The New American Political System*, ed. Anthony King. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 87–124.
- Honig, Meredith I., ed. 2006. *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation: Confronting Complexity*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ingram, Helen M., and Dean E. Mann. 1980. *Why Policies Succeed or Fail*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Janda, Kenneth, Jeffrey M. Berry, and Jerry Goldman. 2012. *The Challenge of Democracy: American Government in a Global World*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Kaplan, Thomas, and Thomas Corbett. 2003. "Three Generations of Implementation Research: Looking for Keys to Implementation 'Success.'" In *Policy Into Action: Implementation Research and Welfare Reform*, eds. Mary Claire Lennon and Thomas Corbett. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 57–71.

- Kettl, Donald F. 1988. "Performance and Accountability: The Challenge of Government by Proxy for Public Administration." *American Review of Public Administration* 18(1): 9–28.
- Kumar, Anita. 2013. "Justice Department Investigating Surveillance Leak Case." *Planet Washington*. <http://blogs.mcclatchydc.com/washington/2013/06/justice-department-investigating-surveillance-leak-case.html> (February 17, 2014).
- Labaree, David F. 1997. "Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals." *American Educational Research Journal* 34(1): 39–81.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1958. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York, NY: Meridian Books.
- Light, Paul Charles. 2002. *Government's Greatest Achievements: From Civil Rights to Homeland Defense*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 2001. "Our Millennium: Political Science Confronts the Global Corporate Economy." *International Political Science Review* 22(2): 131–50.
- Maier, Pauline. 1993. "The Revolutionary Origins of the American Corporation." *William and Mary Quarterly* 50(1): 51–84.
- Mandel, Michael. 2009. "German and French Banks Got \$36 Billion from AIG Bailout." *EconoChat -- Bloomberg BusinessWeek*. http://www.businessweek.com/the_thread/economicsunbound/archives/2009/03/german_and_fren.html#more (February 14, 2014).
- Markon, Jerry, and Alice Crites. 2013a. "Health-Care Web Site's Lead Contractor Employs Executives from Troubled IT Company." *The Washington Post*. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/health-care-web-sites-lead-contractor-employs-executives-from-troubled-it-company/2013/11/15/6e107e2e-487a-11e3-a196-3544a03c2351_print.html (November 18, 2013).
- . 2013b. "Healthcare.gov Contract: Politics Not a Factor, but Neither Were Firm's Ties to Failed Projects." *The Washington Post*. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/healthcaregov-contract-politics-not-a-factor-but-neither-were-firms-ties-to-failed-projects/2013/12/22/61728fca-6753-11e3-a0b9-249bbb34602c_story.html (February 14, 2014).
- Massing, Gregory I. 2009. *Civics in Practice: Principles of Government and Economics*. Austin, TX: Holt McDougal.
- Mayer, Tamar. 1989. "Consensus and Invisibility: The Representation of Women in Human Geography Textbooks." *Professional Geographer* 41(4).
- Mazmanian, Daniel, and Paul A. Sabatier. 1989. *Implementation and Public Policy*. Rev. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Mazzucato, Mariana. 2013. *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*. New York, NY: Anthem Press.
- McCartney, Allison Rios Millett, Elizabeth A. Bennion, and Dick Simpson. 2013. *Teaching Civic Engagement: From Student to Active Citizen*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- McConnell, Grant. 1966. *Private Power and American Democracy*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Menefee-Libey, David. 2000. *The Triumph Of Campaign-Centered Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

- . 2010. “Neoliberal School Reform in Chicago? Renaissance 2010, Portfolios of Schools, and Diverse Providers.” In *Between Public and Private: Politics, Governance, and the New Portfolio Models for Urban School Reform*, eds. Katrina E. Bulkley, Jeffrey R. Henig, and Henry M. Levin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 55–90.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 2011. *The Submerged State: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Milward, H. Brinton. 1996. “Symposium on the Hollow State: Capacity, Control, and Performance in Interorganizational Setting: Introduction.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART* 6(2): 193–95.
- Minow, Martha. 2002. *Partners, Not Rivals: Privatization and the Public Good*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Morgan, Kimberly J., and Andrea Louise Campbell. 2011. *The Delegated Welfare State: Medicare, Markets, and the Governance of Social Policy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2013. “Fast Facts: Educational Attainment.” *Fast Facts*. <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=27> (August 19, 2013).
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- O’Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 2010. “The Ties That Bind? Networks, Public Administration, and Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 7–14.
- Ogg, Frederick Austin, and P. Orman Ray. 1922. *Introduction to American Government*. New York, NY: Century. [http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.\\$b50419](http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.$b50419).
- Olivo, Christiane. 2012. “The Exclusion and Inclusion of Women in American Government Textbooks.” In *The New Politics of the Textbook, Constructing Knowledge*, eds. Heather Hickman and Brad J. Porfilio. Rotterdam: SensePublishers, 149–72. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-6091-912-1_9 (August 13, 2013).
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Pangle, Lorraine Smith, and Thomas L. Pangle. 2000. “What the American Founders Have to Teach Us About Schooling for Democratic Citizenship.” In *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*, Studies in government and public policy, eds. Lorraine McDonnell, P. Michael Timpane, and Roger W. Benjamin. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 21–46.
- Peters, B. Guy. 2013. *American Public Policy: Promise and Performance*. 9th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Pinto, Arthur R., and Douglas M. Branson. 2009. *Understanding Corporate Law*. New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Pressman, Jeffery L., and Aaron B. Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland, Or, Why It’s Amazing That Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation of Ruined Hopes*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Rainey, Hal G. 2012. "Organizations, Politics, and Public Purposes: Analyzing Public Organizations and Public Management." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45(01): 9–16.
- Remy, Richard C et al. 2010. *Civics Today: Citizenship, Economics, & You*. Columbus, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.
- Remy, Richard C. 2010. *United States Government: Democracy in Action*. New York, NY: Glencoe McGraw-Hill.
- Ripley, Randall B., and Grace A. Franklin. 1986. *Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy*. Chicago, IL: Dorsey.
- Roy, William G. 1997. *Socializing Capital: The Rise of the Large Industrial Corporation in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Salamon, Lester M., ed. 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Shklar, Judith N. 1991. "Redeeming American Political Theory." *The American Political Science Review* 85(1): 3–15.
- Sleeter, Christine E., and Carl A. Grant. 1991. "Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Current Textbooks." In *The Politics of the Textbook*, eds. Michael W. Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, Jane W., and Carol Sullivan. 2010. *United States Government*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Smith, Steven Rathgeb, and Michael Lipsky. 1993. *Nonprofits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Stanger, Allison. 2009. *One Nation Under Contract: The Outsourcing of American Power and the Future of Foreign Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stillman, Lauren, and Rolf K. Blank. 2009. *Key State Education Policies on PK-12 Education: 2008*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Key_State_Education_Policies_2008.pdf (June 23, 2012).
- Story, Russell M. 1926. "The Content of the Introductory Course in Political Science." *The American Political Science Review* 20(2): 419.
- Strange, Susan. 1996. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stroup, Daniel G., and William Garriott. 1997. "Teaching American Government: An Alternative to Ogg and Ray." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(1): 73–77.
- Supreme Court of the United States. 2010. 558 U.S. (Supreme Court of the United States) *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission*.
- Tyack, David, and Elizabeth Hansot. 1982. *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Wallace, Sherri L., and Marcus D. Allen. 2008. "Survey of African American Portrayal in Introductory Textbooks in American Government/Politics: A Report of the APSA Standing Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics*: 153–60.
- Wang, Marian. 2010. "U.S. Bore AIG Bailout Risk, but Foreign Banks Reaped the Rewards, Says Watchdog." *ProPublica*. <http://www.propublica.org/blog/item/bailout-us-bore-risk-foreign-banks-reaped-rewards> (February 14, 2014).

- Wichowski, Amber, and Peter Levine. n.d. "Civic Requirements and Guidelines."
National Alliance for Civic Education. http://www.cived.net/req_guid.html
(August 19, 2013).
- Wilson III, Ernest J. 1985. "Why Political Scientists Don't Study Black Politics, but
Historians and Sociologists Do." *PS* 18(3): 600–607.
- Wilson, James Q., John J. DiIulio, and Meenekshi Bose. 2013. *American Government:
Institutions & Policies*. 13th ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.

Table 1: High School Civics textbooks considered in this report

Barbour, Christine, and G. C Wright. <i>American Government: Citizenship and Power</i> . St. Paul, MN: EMC Publishing, 2008.
Davis, James E, Phyllis Maxey Fernlund. <i>Civics: Participating in Government</i> . Needham, MA: Prentice Hall, 2003.
Davis, James E., Phyllis Maxey Fernlund, and Peter Woll. <i>Civics: Government and Economics in Action</i> . Boston, MA: Prentice Hall, 2007.
Downey, Matthew T. <i>Contemporary's American Civics and Government</i> . Chicago, IL: Wright Group/McGraw-Hill, 2007.
Edwards, George C., Martin P. Wattenberg, and Robert L. Lineberry. <i>Government in America: People, Politics, and Policy</i> . 16th ed. New York, NY: Longman, 2014.
Fraga, Luis Ricardo. <i>United States Government: Principles in Practice</i> . Austin, TX: Holt McDougal, 2010.
Hartley, William H., William S. Vincent, and Rinehart Holt. <i>American Civics</i> . Austin, TX: Harcourt Brace & Co., 2003.
Janda, Kenneth, Jeffrey M Berry, and Jerry Goldman. <i>Challenge of Democracy: American Government in a Global World</i> . Boston, MA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning, 2012.
Massing, Gregory I. <i>Civics in Practice: Principles of Government and Economics</i> . Austin, TX: Holt McDougal, 2009.
McClenaghan, William A, and Frank Abbott Magruder. <i>Magruder's American Government</i> . Boston, MA: Pearson, 2011.
Remy, Richard C, John J Patrick, David C. Saffel, and Gary E. Clayton. <i>Civics Today: Citizenship, Economics, & You</i> . Columbus, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2010.
Remy, Richard C. <i>United States Government: Democracy in Action</i> . New York, NY: Glencoe McGraw-Hill, 2010.
Schmidt, Steffen W., Mack C. Shelley, Barbara A. Bardes, and Lynne E. Ford. <i>American Government and Politics Today</i> . Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 2014.
Smith, Jane W, and Carol Sullivan. <i>United States Government</i> . Boston, MA: Pearson, 2010.
Wilson, James Q., John J. DiIulio, and Meena Bose. <i>American Government: Institutions and Policies</i> . 13 th ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning, 2013.

Table 2. High school textbook content on the interdependence of governments and corporations
(A ● symbol indicates that the text mentions this topic.)

Text	D1: Corporate charter, personhood?	D2: Which government grants charters?	D3: Other specific characteristics?	D4: Define Not-for-Profits, NGOs?	D5: Government corporations?	G1: Organize economy?	G2: Laws for corporations?	G3: Tax/mandate/regulate?	G4: Subsidize corporations?	G5: Contract goods & services?	C1: Economic activity impact?	C2: Shaping public policy?	C3: Filling public offices?	C4: Contract goods & services?
Barbour				●	●	●		●	●		●	●	●	
Davis, Civics only	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Davis, Civics/Economics	●		●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Downey					●	●		●	●	●		●	●	
Edwards						●		●	●		●	●	●	●
Fraga	●	●	●	●		●	●	●		●		●	●	
Hartley	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●			●	●	
Janda				●	●	●		●		●		●	●	●
Massing	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
McClenaghan	●		●	●	●	●		●	●			●	●	
Remy, Civics/Economics	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●			●	●	
Remy, Civics only	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	
Schmidt						●		●	●	●		●	●	
Smith			●			●		●	●	●	●	●	●	
Wilson						●		●	●			●	●	●

Appendix A: Corporations and Governments Textbook rubric

How to use this rubric:

- *For each text reviewed, start a new MSWord file, and paste the contents of this file starting at the double line below.*
 - *Save the file using the following as the template for the file's name: LEAD AUTHOR LAST NAME, SHORT TITLE OF BOOK, EDITION, YEAR as in: Lowi.Power&Purpose.13th.2013.docx. (no spaces!)*
 - *Fill in the entire rubric, inserting content under each underlined heading below. (The D1, G5, C4, etc. notations in front of the headings are aids for my analysis of your content.)*
 - *When filling in the rubric, insert page number of quoted text before the text quoted. If a quotation continues from one page of the text to the next, place a double slash // at the break, as in: 261 This is the last line on the page that I want to quote, //262 but the quote continues on the next page.*
 - *Repetition is not a problem: if the same text content responds to more than one rubric prompt, duplicate it.*
-
-

AUTHOR of this report:

Full book citation: Author(s), title, edition (place: publisher, year)

D1: Specific definition(s) of “corporation” in glossary or anywhere in the text? (simple Y/N and, if there’s a single-passage definition, the text of that passage on lines below Y)

If Yes, does the definition mention/cover these topics (Y/N on a single line and, if Y, quotes on lines below):

D1: Corporate charter ?

D1: Legal personhood or rights?

D2: Which government grants charters to corporations?

D3: Limited liability?

D3: Sale of shares?

D3: Potentially perpetual life, or life that can outlast those who own it?

D3: Flexible purpose (that is, that the corporation can go on to engage in different activities from those it started with)?

D3: Separation of overall shareholder control from officers/management control of day-to-day operations and decisions?

D4: Does the text mention non-profit corporations or NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations)? If so, does it define them?

D5: Does the text mention government corporations? If so, does it define them?

Read the text's chapter/s on the U.S. Constitution and answer:

G1a: Does the text note the **constitutional** authority of the federal government to organize and regulate the economy and commerce? Does the text mention and/or explain patterns in how the feds do that? Does the text note impacts of these activities on private businesses or corporations?

G1b: (This may be in a separate chapter on federalism) Does the text mention and/or explain the **constitutional** authority of the states to regulate commerce and business? Does the text describe patterns in how states do that? Does the text note impacts of these activities on private businesses or corporations?

Read the book's chapter on Congress and answer:

G1: Does the text mention Congress's role in organizing and sustaining the national economy, creating rules for its operations? If so, does the text specifically mention positive or negative effects of these activities on businesses, or especially on corporations?

G2: Does the text specifically mention Congress enacting laws relating to corporations?

G5: Does the text describe efforts **by** members of Congress to win government contracts **for** businesses or corporations?

G4: Does the text describe efforts **by** members of Congress to enact tax breaks, subsidies, grants, or loans **to** businesses or corporations?

G3: Does the text describe actions **by** Congress to regulate or mandate specific behavior **by** businesses or corporations?

G1c: Does the text describe actions **by** Congress to shape foreign or international policy affecting trade or protecting American businesses or corporations abroad?

C4: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to win contracts **from** governments?

C3: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to support their preferred election outcomes by recruiting, endorsing, advertising for, or contributing money to

candidates or campaigns, or by contacting voters (directly or through PACs and other groups)?

C3a: Does the text make any mention of the “revolving door,” or other descriptions of business/corporate employees moving to or from government positions?

C2: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to influence public policy or legislation by lobbying, publishing research, advertising to the public, etc?

C2: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to gain tax breaks, subsidies, grants, or loans **from** governments?

Read the book’s chapter on the Executive Branch and/or bureaucracy and answer:

G5: Does the text say that governments contract with businesses or corporations for goods and services? (That is, that they buy things from businesses.)

G5: Does the text mention any role for private actors/organizations/non-profits/business corporations in implementing public policy?

G5a: Does the text mention “privatization”?

C2: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to influence government granting of contracts or privatization by lobbying, publishing research, advertising to the public, etc?

C3a: Does the text make any mention of the “revolving door,” or other descriptions of business/corporate employees moving to or from government positions?

C4: Does the text say that businesses or corporations seek contracts with governments to sell them goods and services?

Read the book’s chapter on interest groups and answer:

C2: Does the text include corporations in its definition of interest groups?

C2: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to influence public policy or legislation by lobbying, publishing research, advertising to the public, etc?

C2: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to gain tax breaks, subsidies, grants, or loans **from** governments?

C3: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to support their preferred election outcomes by recruiting, endorsing, advertising for, or contributing money to candidates or campaigns, or by contacting voters (directly or through PACs and other groups)?

C3a: Does the text make any mention of the “revolving door,” or other descriptions of business/corporate employees moving to or from government positions?

C4: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to win contracts **from** governments?

Does the book have a chapter on campaigns and elections? If so, read and answer:

C3: Does the text describe efforts **by** businesses or corporations to support their preferred election outcomes by recruiting, endorsing, advertising for, or contributing money to candidates or campaigns, or by contacting voters (directly or through PACs and other groups)?

Read the text’s chapter/s on Economics and/or Economic Policy and/or Social Policy and answer:

G1: Does the text say that governments help to organize the economy, create rules for its operations? If so, does the text specifically mention positive or negative effects of these activities on businesses, or especially on corporations?

G1b: Does the text distinguish between the activities of the national/federal government and state governments in organizing or regulating the economy? If so, does the text specifically mention positive or negative effects of these activities on businesses, or especially on corporations?

C1: Conversely, does the text mention positive or negative effects of businesses’ or corporation’s economic activity on the U.S. economy, on the U.S. government, or on U.S. office-holders?

G2: Does the text specifically mention laws that enable corporations to operate, or that treat corporations differently from other kinds of business organizations?

G5: Does the text say that governments contract with businesses or corporations for goods and services? (That is, that they buy things from businesses.)

G5a: Does the text mention “privatization”?

C4: Does the text say that businesses or corporations seek contracts with governments to sell them goods and services?

G4: Does the text mention ways governments assist or subsidize businesses or corporations?

G3a: Does the text mention government taxation of businesses, and especially government taxation of corporations?

G3b: Does the text mention government regulation of businesses, and especially government regulation of corporations? Does the text describe this as having generally positive or negative effects on businesses or corporations, or as having mixed effects?

G3c: Does the text describe government regulation of businesses as having gone through historical periods or stages?

Read the book's chapter/s on International or Foreign policy and answer:

G1c: Does the text describe economic dimensions of U.S. foreign policy: trade, protection of American businesses abroad, etc?

G1c: Does the text describe U.S. international economic policies as having gone through historical periods or stages?

G1c: Does the text note effects of these policies on businesses, or corporations in particular, or even multinational corporations in particular?

C2: Conversely, does the text mention efforts by businesses, corporations, or multinational corporations to influence U.S. foreign policy?

Go back and read the book's introduction, noting any instances where it might mention issues covered above