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Introduction

Most researches about industrial policies present studies about actual experiences of industrial policies implemented in specific countries (or cross-countries comparisons), focused on specific periods and/or specific industrial policies. Commonly, the analyses include also normative aspects, through the definition of best practices or how a “better” industrial policy would look like. As a general rule, industrial policies tend to be handled only by economists (SCHAPIRO, 2013, p. 50) and are usually published in economics’ journals. It would be hard to imagine that those studies would not recognize industrial policies as a kind of public policy. However, there are scarce studies about industrial policies that use the theories, approaches, and tools provided by the field of public policies to make sense and understand how those policies enter the agenda, how they are formulated, implemented and evaluated.

We would like to assess if it would make sense to take advantage of the theories, approaches, and models proposed by the field of public policies to assess industrial policies. Our methodology is based on a literature review of industrial policies and public policies, specifically in Brazil, as well as a bibliometric analysis of the research published on industrial policies.

The present study is organized in the following sections, besides this introduction. We begin by reviewing the concept of industrial policy. We then try to connect the concepts of industrial policy and public policy. In the third section, we briefly present and discuss the field of public policies and the “public field”. We then, analyze the content of the studies on industrial policies.

---

1 This study was partially financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brazil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

2 Interestingly enough, a very informative book (MARQUES; FARIA, 2013) which defends the inherent multidisciplinarity of the study of public policies covers several disciplines: Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, International Relations, Social Psychology, Law, Demography and History. Economics is an important missing discipline.
and assess in which areas they are usually published. Finally, the last section concludes the study.

**Industrial Policies**

It would be fair to say that industrial policies are subjected to scrutiny by theorists, policy-makers, bureaucracies, media and citizens alike. The controversy surrounding it is so intense that its existence and necessity is frequently called into question. It is fairly common, among its discontents and critics, the view that “no industrial policy is the best possible industrial policy”. Even when its existence and necessity are accepted, scholars and policy-makers may find it advisable to avoid this term. This is the case of a recent book published by the Interamerican Development Bank (IDB), whose title is “Rethinking Productive Development: Sound Policies and Institutions for Economic Transformation”. In its synopsis, the editors state that for the most part, they would employ the term “productive development policies“ instead of “industrial policies”. They do so to clarify that the policies go beyond industrial sectors per se (including services and agriculture as well). They also state that “the usage of the term productive development policies avoids a term [industrial policy] that has become **ideologically charged**”. (CRESPI; FERNÁNDEZ-ARIAS; STEIN, 2014, p. i, emphasis added). Along the same lines, a recent working paper by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), ironically describes industrial policy as the “policy that shall not be named”. (CHERIF; HASANOV, 2019). Finally, on one of the most well know public sector economics’ manual (STIGLITZ; ROSENGARD, 2015), the term “industrial policy” is mentioned only once in its more than 900 pages.

Yet, in the last years, we have seen a surge of interest from scholars in industrial policy. They have been noticing more interest in industrial policies in several countries. Along those lines, they mention a “return” (CHERIF; HASANOV, 2019), a “rejuvenation” (STIGLITZ; LIN; MONGA, 2013), claim that they are “back on the agenda” (BAILEY; GLASMEIER; TOMLINSON, 2019), or consider how they should look like “in the 21st century” (CHANG; ANDREONI, 2020).

In Brazil, for many authors, the 2000s have seen a return of industrial policies after approximately two decades of absence. (CANO; SILVA, 2010, p. 6), (FERRAZ, 2009, p. 241), (SCHAPIRO, 2013, p. 19), and (BRESSER-PEREIRA; NASSIF; FEIJÓ, 2016, p. 510). Between 2003 and 2014 three industrial policies were implemented in Brazil: the Industrial, Technological and Foreign Trade Policy (PITCE), from 2004 to 2007; the Productive
Development Policy (PDP), from 2008 to 2010, and the Greater Brazil Plan (PBM), from 2011 to 2014. The first two policies were carried out during the first and the second terms respectively of Lula’s administration and the latter was implemented during the first term of Roussef’s administration.

But what is industrial policy? There is no single answer to this question. The term is polysemic and full of historical and symbolic meanings. (SALERNO, 2017, p. 5). After carrying out a literature review of dozens of Brazilian and international papers about industrial policy, it was surprising to verify that most of them did not specify precisely what they meant by industrial policy.

Based on the 20 papers which explicitly defined “industrial policy”, we split the definitions into two components: “what is it?” and “what are its objectives?”.

From the perspective of “what industrial policy is”, we could cluster the definitions into three groups. An important aspect that divides the first two groups is related to the degree (or lack) of selectivity of the instruments deployed to economic sectors. The first group “broader/non-selective” is made of definitions with less emphasis on selectivity. The second one “selective” includes the definitions which stress the importance of some degree of selectivity in the instruments of industrial policy. Finally, the third group “instruments’ coordination/national project” includes the definitions which mention the need for a national government’s project or which clearly states the need for some kind of coordination between the instruments.

Table 1 –Definitions of Industrial Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Examples of Definitions</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broader/non-selective</td>
<td>“public intervention”</td>
<td>(GADELHA, 2001, p. 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“government policies”</td>
<td>(BRID, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“any type of intervention or government policy”</td>
<td>(WARWICK, 2013, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“actions and instruments”</td>
<td>(CORONEL et al., 2011, p. 337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latosensu: “measures and programs”</td>
<td></td>
<td>(VILLELA; SUZIGAN, 1996, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When it comes to the objectives of industrial policies, we categorized the definitions in 5 groups. Several definitions include a structural change from “traditional” (or low-complexity) sectors towards “modern” (or high-complexity) sectors as instrumental to industrial policy. However, some definitions do not include structural change as an objective, focusing instead on other aspects such as targeted efforts or specific interventions. The table below summarizes these definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Market intervention policies”</td>
<td>(AMADEO, 2002, p. 155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“set of instruments (essentially incentives, regulations and forms of direct participation in economic activity) through which the State (…)”</td>
<td>(PERES; PRIMI, 2009, p. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“regulatory tool/State’s economic intervention tool”</td>
<td>(SCHAPIRO, 2013, p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“policy aimed at particular industries (and firms as their components)”</td>
<td>(CHANG, 2003, p. 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricto sensu: “specific interventions”</td>
<td>(VILLELA; SUZIGAN, 1996, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“policies that stimulate specific economic activities”</td>
<td>(RODRIK, 2009, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“focused action of the State”</td>
<td>(GONÇALVES, 2016, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“targeted efforts”</td>
<td>(WADE, 2015, p. 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination of instruments/National government’s project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“coherent and coordinated set of incentives and regulations”</td>
<td>(FIESP, 2011a, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a national government’s project”</td>
<td>(QUINTANILLA, 2009, p. 122).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“implementation, coordination and strategic control of instruments”</td>
<td>(DÁVILA-FERNÁNDEZ, 2015, p. 596)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on economic growth, increase productive capacity or support to the industrial sector. Others are more general (and in a way include both the aforementioned objectives) because they mention that the objective of industrial policy is not necessarily linked to structural change nor economic growth. Its main objective should be fulfilling the goals desired by the policymakers. Finally, a few definitions mentioned the correction of market failures or the change in relative prices. Finally, there is a “mixed” definition which includes several aspects:

Industrial Policy is any type of intervention or government policy that attempts to improve the business environment or to alter the structure of economic activity toward sectors, technologies or tasks that are expected to offer better prospects for economic growth or societal welfare than would occur in the absence of such intervention. (WARWICK, 2013, p. 16)

Industrial Policies and Public Policies

Similar to industrial policy, public policy also has a myriad of definitions. We will not cover the debate surrounding the concept³ of public policy here. Instead, we try to connect the concepts of public policy and industrial policy.


Yet, the key role of public actors is only one of the constituent elements of public policy. To connect the concepts of public policy and industrial policy we take advantage of the framework suggested by Subirats et al. (2008, p. 40–43). It proposes a list of the constituent elements of public policies. We then try to identify if those elements are typically present in industrial policies⁴.

---
³ For a short review of public policy’s concepts see Subirats et al. (2008, p. 38).
⁴ In order to facilitate this process, we took as examples the aforementioned three industrial policies implemented in Brazil: PITCE, PDP and, PBM.
The first one is the "solution to a public problem". In other words, a social problem must be recognized as a public problem. Industrial policies are an "answer" to very different kinds of public problems. Policymakers can disagree among themselves of what public problem a specific industrial policy is supposed to fix. However, most industrial policies are an answer to a perceived public problem (be a lack of economic growth or absence of activity and/or investments in modern or complex economic sectors, for example). According to Subirats et al. (2008, p.40), some problems are recognized as public in a moment and then, in the future, may be seen as private, vanishing from public agenda. That may be helpful to understand why industrial policies come and go from public agendas. In the Brazilian case, for instance, as mentioned before, most studies consider that the mid-2000s marks the return of industrial policies in Brazil (with PITCE, PDP, and PBM), after several years of absence.

The second one is the "existence of target-groups in the root of a public problem". It is precisely the behavior of these target-groups which public policies try to influence or modify. In the case of industrial policies, the target-groups are private firms, in some cases from a few economic sectors (such as in PITCE) or in a wide range of sectors (such as in PDP and PBM). However, though most industrial policies focus on influencing the behavior of firms, it is arguable if they are in the root of the public problem or if it is elsewhere.

The third is "the existence of coherence or at least some intention of coherence". It means that it is needed some level of nexus between the actions intended and the results expected. Moreover, it is also required some level of cohesion among the decisions and activities planned. To assess the level of coherence of industrial policies is, in general, a difficult task. However, critics of the recent Brazilian industrial policies frequently point out their lack of coherence. Firstly, in terms of a lack of nexus between overly ambitious goals and modest resources and low capacity of management and coordination (SCHAPIRO, 2013, p. 49), (ARRUDA; VELMULM; HOLLANDA, 2006, p. 86), and (FIESP, 2011b, p. 22). Secondly, in terms of lack of cohesion between the decisions and activities foreseen by the industrial policies and the macroeconomic policies (for instance high interest rates and appreciated exchange rate) (DIEESE, 2011, p. 6).

The next two elements are related: "the existence of several decisions and activities" and a more detailed "program of interventions". Together, they mean that a public policy must be much more than a broad declaration or a unique decision and should include concrete interventions. In general, the industrial policies analyzed comply with both characteristics, since they usually
include several “instruments” (such as subsidies, public procurement, low-interest loans, tax incentives, etc.) and many interventions in different economic sectors as seen in (BRASIL, 2003), (ABDI, 2008) and (BRASIL, 2011). However, it must be noted that it may be the case that detailed and concrete decisions which may impact the productive sector are carried out, but not presented, for varied reasons, clearly as “industrial policies.\(^5\)

The sixth element is “the key role of public actors”. In other words, the aforementioned decisions and activities must be taken by the public sector, which is what happened with the Brazilian industrial policies of the 2000s.

The seventh element is “the existence of formal acts”, which means that the decisions taken must be actually implemented. The Brazilian industrial policies of the 2000s were implemented through legislation and administrative decisions by several different actors (such as the Finance Ministry, the National Bank for Economic and Social Development, etc.)

Finally, the last element is “the relatively mandatory nature of decisions and activities”. Subirats et al. (2008, p. 42–43) recognizes that the State acts not only through mandatory activities but also through incentives. This is especially important since it is fairly common that the decisions and activities in industrial policies try to influence the behavior of firms and economic sectors through incentives. There is a myriad of examples of incentives. One would be the “Good Law” (Lei do Bem), Law 11.196/06. In this case, the behavior the policy tries to change is the investments in research, development, and innovation by firms. As incentives, the law created special tax reductions and exemptions. (SALERNO; DAHER, 2006, p. 15–16).

On the whole, the industrial policies analyzed have most, if not all, constituent elements of public policy. Consequently, we could safely argue that industrial policies are a “kind” of public policy.

\(^5\) It may be even disputable if certain decisions and activities are, indeed, industrial policies. This is the case, for instance, of the activities for industrial sectors carried out in the 90s and early 2000s by the Cardoso Administration. Though recognizing the existence of those activities, some authors do not call them explicitly “industrial policies” (CANO; SILVA, 2010, p. 4–5), (ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 13). On the other hand, others consider there were industrial policies during that period (HOLLANDA FILHO, 2003, p. 774), (RESENDE, 2000) and (AMADEO, 2002, p. 184).
The “Public Field” and the Field of Public Policies in Brazil

The literature usually identifies two “subareas” of public policy: policy analysis\(^6\) and policy studies\(^7\). According to Farah (2016, p. 964–972), policy analysis was only recently recognized as a specific field of study and research in Brazil. However, despite the lack of “formal” recognition, the author shows that policy analysis started in Brazil as early as in the 1930s and has continued and evolved ever since. This new field of study, connected to policy analysis, was named the “public field”.

On the other hand, the policy studies emerged in Brazil in the 1970s and 1980s. Initially, there was a strong presence of studies on specific social sectors. However, they were focused on substantial aspects of the policies and did not concentrate on the public policy process and its common elements across sectors, both instrumental aspects of the institutionalization of the field of public policies. (FARAH, 2018, p. 69). Gradually, new sectors and issues were brought to the agenda, along with the recognition of the need to pay more attention to excluded social groups. Other concerns also made their way into the agenda, such as efficiency, effectiveness, social control, public management, etc. (FARAH, 2018, p. 68–70).

From the 2000s on there were both a boom in published papers on public policies (FARAH, 2018, p. 70–71) and a surge in the training and academic initiatives focusing on public policy, public administration, public policy management, and social management. Those initiatives usually included training in both policy process (policy studies) and more practical aspects (policy analysis) (FARAH, 2016, p. 972).

All in all, during the evolution of the field of public policies there was a fragmentation of disciplines that carry out policy studies, lack of communication among them, and prevalence of sectoral studies lacking analytical analysis. Despite this fact, several studies focused on the policy process and its effects, creating “common discourses and identities”, instrumental conditions for the institutionalization of a scientific field. (FARAH, 2018, p. 73). Therefore, it can be said that the field of public policies in consolidated in Brazil (FARAH, 2018, p. 55).

In the analysis of the evolution of policy studies in Brazil (FARAH, 2018) there is no mention of studies on economic policies (in general) or industrial policies (in particular). When it comes

---

\(^6\) We understand “policy analysis” as the “generation and mobilization of knowledge (with a scientific base) to support or influence public policy process, especially decision-making and policy formulation, but also its implementation and evaluation.” (FARAH, 2016, p. 964).

\(^7\) Which has focus on the knowledge of the public policy process. Therefore, it is not focused on supporting the practice of public policy.
to the analysis of the evolution of policy analysis in Brazil (FARAH, 2016), there is no mention to industrial policies and when economics is mentioned, it is more similar to a policy analysis “methodological style”, as put forth by (ANDREWS, 2013, p. 33–35), than a focus on the policy analysis of economic policies themselves.

Therefore, it would make sense to explore the research published on industrial policies in Brazil to understand how it is related to the public policy debate.

**Policy Studies, Policy Analysis, and Industrial Policies**

Our first step was a bibliometric study to analyze if terms related to industrial policies were more common in the area of Economics, or Public Policy and Administration. We searched the following keywords: “industrial policy”, “industrial policies”, “productive development policy” and “productive development policies” in two databases (SCIELO and JSTOR). The goal was to check the number of papers with any of those terms in the title or the abstract of papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Filter</th>
<th>Journal/Area Filter</th>
<th>JSTOR - # of Papers</th>
<th>SCIELO - # of Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Title</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Title</td>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Administration</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both databases, the number of published papers in the area of Economics with the keywords searched is considerably higher than in the area of Public Policy and Administration. This is indicative that industrial policy has been much closer to Economics than to Public Policy and Administration.

Based on the content of the papers reviewed, it can be said that most of them tend to look like more policy analysis than policy studies. In other words, they seem to concentrate more on

---

8 Includes all articles published between 1920 and 2020, filtered by journals. The terms were searched in english.

9 Includes all content published in every year available, filtered by area. The terms were searched in portuguese.
influencing the practice of public policy, especially the policy formulation, but also its implementation, than on generating knowledge about the public policy process itself.

The next step would be to check if the papers which deal with “industrial policy” published in Public Policy and Administration’s journals indeed have an approach more connected to Public Policy and Administration than to Economics. It is difficult to define if a paper on industrial policy has a public policy “approach” or not. As a tentative criteria, we are considering the following: the paper focuses on one of the “stages” of the public policy cycle (emergence of the problem, agenda setting, formulation and decision, implementation, and evaluation) and uses one or more public policies’ theory (rational-positivism, limited rationality, incrementalism/normative optimalism, garbage can, new institutionalism, cognitive approach, and contemporary theories). Third: it enunciates explicitly the public policy theory they are using to analyze the public policy, mobilizing authors and studies in the field of public policies.

Many papers published in public administration and public policies’ journals do not, at least according to the criteria stated above, have a public policy approach. In other words, although their object (industrial policy) is a public policy, they are not policy studies and are not carried out using a public policy approach. Accordingly, there are papers published in economic journals that, despite this fact, seem policy studies and use a public policy approach.

In the specific case of the literature on industrial policies in Brazil, policy studies with a public policy approach are relatively scarce. We list below the exceptions we were able to find at this moment in our research. There are some studies which focus on industrial policies, using the state capacity literature, such as (CAVALCANTE, 2017). Other studies use the multiple streams framework created by Kingdon to assess the entry of the medical-industrial complex in the agenda of industrial policies (METTEN et al., 2015) or Science and Technology and Industrial policies on the agenda of public policies (PELAEZ et al., 2017). Some studies highlight the role of ideas in the formulation of industrial policies such as (STUMM; NUNES; PERISSINOTTO, 2019). In a similar vein, De Toni (2015), bases his study on the historic institutionalism (focusing on the influence of the ideas) and on the rational choice institutionalism (focusing on the role of policy entrepreneurs). Some studies focus on the role

---

10 We based the stages on Subirats et al. (2008, p. 44–45), agreeing with the author who recognizes that thinking in terms of public policy cycle should be only an indicative framework and not a rigid scheme.

11 The public policies’ theories listed here are not exhaustive and are based on Farah (2018, p. 64–66).

12 Considering “capacity” based on both the situational perspective brought by Carlos Matus and also on historical new institutionalism.
of politicians and bureaucrats, their interaction and the private sector’s part in the process of formulation of industrial policies such as Aguiar and Rua (1995). Though more focused on Science, Technology and Innovation policies, Oliveira (2016) uses the punctuated-equilibrium theory to discuss the continuity and changes in those policies.

**Conclusions**

Most studies on industrial policies are published in economic journals, which we understood as an indication that research on this public policy tends to be closer to the discipline of Economics than of Public Policies and consequently more analyzed with approaches of the former than the latter. Probably connected to it, most studies are more concentrated on influencing the practice of public policy, than on generating knowledge about the public policy process. Consequently, they tend to look more with policy analysis than with policy studies. They also tend to focus exclusively on industrial policies and do not try to put them in comparison to other public policies, looking for similarities and a common core.

We can notice some resemblances with the observed by Farah (2018, p. 69) about the studies on the social policies in the 70s and 80s, which focused on substantial aspects of the policies but did not focus on the policy process and the common elements across sectors, which were instrumental aspects of institutionalization of the field of public policies.

Taking that into account and also noticing that there are very few studies on industrial policies that can be considered as policy studies and using a public policy approach, it is clear that industrial policies are not, at least yet, on the field of public policies.

But, one may argue, does it matter if industrial policy is in the field of public policies? In other words, what would be the advantages of bringing industrial policies into this field?

The reasons that make us believe it makes sense to move the industrial policies towards the field of public policies are twofold. Firstly, the usage of a public policy approach to study the process of industrial policies can bring important insights into the study, but also the formulation and implementation of industrial policies. Besides, being part of a broader field, it is possible to learn from the assessment of other public policies and, eventually, understand that many characteristics that are deemed specific of industrial policies are shared with other public
policies\textsuperscript{13}. It may also enlarge the “menu” of theories and tools available to assess industrial policies.

Secondly, this movement may also bring important additions and new perspectives to the field of public policies, adding to its core aspects. Some characteristics are common in industrial policies and shared by other public policies. The latter could benefit from the new knowledge brought by the analysis of industrial policies with similar methods and tools. Some examples are the strong interaction with the private sector in the formulation of industrial policies, the role of bureaucrats vis a vis elected officials in the formulation of industrial policies and the fact that, at least in Brazil, industrial policies are implemented by different actors. Therefore, it may add to the discussion of several aspects present on the field such as intergovernmental coordination, bureaucracy discretion and capture, networks, advocacy coalitions, etc. Besides, there are strong discursive and cognitive components in industrial policies. The term is frequently “silenced” through the usage of more palatable terms. Moreover, their very existence is frequently put in debate and there are clear and opposing paradigms in the understanding of industrial policies.

We believe that the role of economics as a discipline and the role of economists as an epistemic community of experts in industrial policies will probably continue to be of paramount importance. However, bringing the industrial policies to the field of public policies may strengthen the core aspects of the field of public policies and promote cross-pollination of ideas and approaches.

\textsuperscript{13} One example is the common criticism that the Brazilian industrial policies of the 2000s had short term goals linked to the electoral cycle, which is a problem because industrial policies are supposed to be “long-term policies”.
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