

PSCI 6407A

**Public Policy – Theory and Analysis**

Seminars: Thursdays, 11:35 to 2:25 pm

This course will be held remotely online.

This is a *synchronous online course*, meaning we will meet via zoom on the scheduled day and time. There may occasionally be some asynchronous elements. Participation in synchronous courses requires students to have reliable, high-speed internet access, a computer (with a webcam), and a headset with a microphone.

**I. General Information**

**Instructor**

Professor Vandna Bhatia

Email: [vandna.bhatia@carleton.ca](mailto:vandna.bhatia@carleton.ca)

**On-line office hours**

By appointment

*Please note that all email communication must be done using your official Carleton university e-mail accounts or via Brightspace, not personal emails.*

**II. Course Description**

PSCI 6407 and PSCI 6408 together constitute the core course for doctoral students in the Public Affairs and Policy Analysis field in the Department of Political Science. The aims of these courses are first to provide students with a solid grounding in all aspects of theories and concepts relating to public policy and public affairs management; and second to prepare students for their comprehensive examinations at the end of their first year of doctoral studies. PSCI 6407 focuses on theories of public policy whereas PSCI 6408 focuses on public affairs management.

In this course we will undertake an exploration of the field of public policy by surveying a range of theoretical approaches for understanding and analyzing public policy. It is designed to familiarize students with the foundations of public policy theories – their basic concepts, constructs, and contributions to the field. Each seminar in the fall term is organized around seminal works and concepts in the field of public policy, beginning with the study of actors, institutions, and ideas, and ending with an examination of some critical approaches. Readings on each subject are selected with the aim of introducing students to the key theoretical concepts and debates that make up the field of public policy.

The objective of the course is to ground students in theories and approaches in public policy, and so the reading load is substantial. Students are encouraged to work intensively in groups and are required come to each class prepared to discuss actively and in depth all assigned readings for that class. The course will be structured around weekly discussions of required readings, with one or two students responsible for facilitating discussion each week. All students are expected to come fully prepared to actively participate in discussions, regardless of whether they are presenting.

**III. Learning Outcomes**

Over the course of the term, students should develop critical analytic skills in comparing the different approaches, assessing their strengths, weaknesses, and explanatory power, and applying them to specific policy issues or situations. By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Identify the core components, concepts and assumptions of different theoretical approaches

- Synthesize and critically analyze the contributions and limitations of these approaches and the explanations or understanding of public policy they advance
- Apply these concepts to the analysis of practical policy problems, particularly in relation to your own research or area of study.

#### IV. Assessments and Evaluation

##### Seminar Participation: 15%

Seminars are premised on the principle of learning through informed discussion. For this format to be effective, each of us should come to each session prepared to actively engage with one another to question, reflect on, and discuss the concepts and ideas in the assigned readings.

| Component                  | Weight      |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| Seminar Participation      | 15%         |
| Seminar Presentation       | 10%         |
| Critical Reviews (3 @ 15%) | 45%         |
| Term Paper – Review Essay  | 30%         |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>100%</b> |

[Active reading](#) in preparation is essential. This includes considering the following questions in relation to the assigned text:

- What is the author saying – what is the main thesis or argument, what are the key concepts involved, how is the argument made?
- How effective or persuasive is the approach/theory/analysis? What makes it more/less compelling? What/how is evidence used to support the argument or conclusions?
- How does it relate to other readings from this week? From other weeks?

To facilitate discussion, students should submit two discussion questions based on the readings, prior to the upcoming class. Questions should make specific reference to the readings and should not be generic. Please post your questions to the Brightspace discussion board in advance of class, no later than Thursday at 9:00 a.m. Before coming to class, consult the questions posted by others and think about how you might address them, in addition to your own, in the discussion. The seminar participation grade will be determined based on the quality and frequency of participation.

##### Critical Reviews (Short Papers): 3 x 15% = 45%

Each paper should be between 5-7 pages, double-spaced, and take the form of critical discussion of a theme or question related to the assigned readings for a given week. These papers are meant to be *critical reviews* of the work – not summaries – and may incorporate supplementary readings but should not include material that is not in the syllabus (except as brief citations as part of the review). Papers are due by 9:00 am on the day of the class for which the readings are assigned. At least one critical review must be submitted before the fall break.

##### Seminar Presentations: 10%

Students will take a role in leading seminar discussions. Each week, one student will lead the class in a review of key concepts and ideas in the assigned readings, beginning with a brief presentation and followed by discussion. The presentation should identify the key concepts and ideas in the readings, and how they are used to understand and explain some aspect(s) of public policy. The discussion should focus on clarifying and explicating key concepts, the strengths and limitations of the ideas or approaches presented in the readings, and how they relate to other themes and topics of the course. Seminar leaders may draw upon discussion questions submitted by students as well as on their own critical review paper on the topic.

##### Review Essay: 30%

For this review essay, students should compare and contrast two or three themes/theoretical approaches from the course, with a discussion and analysis of what and how they – both individually and together – contribute to our

understanding of public policy. The review essay should develop a clear argument or question about the chosen theme and incorporate and respond to the related readings. The analysis should draw on both the assigned *and* additional supplementary literature from the syllabus and may be applied to a policy case study to illustrate or elaborate key points. Please note, this paper may not substantively duplicate work from critical reviews students have already written.

The essay will be 16-20 pages, double-spaced, excluding notes and bibliography. Additional details about and guidelines for the assignment will be distributed. The essay is due no later than **Thursday, December 9** by 5:00 pm.

## V. Course Materials and Readings

### Brightspace

All course materials, assignments, grading and communications will be accessible through Brightspace. The course website will be updated regularly, so please log in frequently for updates and news. **To access Brightspace**, go to [brightspace.carleton.ca](https://brightspace.carleton.ca) and login with your MyCarleton1 username and password. If you have technical difficulties with accessing Brightspace, please consult the [student support site](#) or contact the [ITS Service Desk](#) as soon as possible.

### Course Materials and Readings

Most required and supplementary readings are available electronically through [MacOdrum Library](#). Several texts from which we will be reading are available for purchase online (e.g., Chapters or Amazon) and on reserve at the library, including:

- Béland, D. and R.H. Cox (2011). *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Kingdon, J. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown
- Smith, K.B., and C.W. Larimer (2017). *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview. [open access] <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.4324/9780429494352>
- Weible, C.M. and Sabatier, P.A. (2018). *Theories of the Policy Process*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Westview Press.

## VI. Detailed Schedule and Assigned Readings

### 1. INTRODUCTION – STUDYING PUBLIC POLICY (SEP 9)

#### *Required Reading:*

- Smith, K.B., and C.W. Larimer (2017). *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.4324/9780429494352> [open access]
  - Chapter 1: Public Policy as a Concept and a Field (or Fields) of Study. pp. 1-20
  - Chapter 2: Does Politics Cause Policy? Does Policy Cause Politics? Pp. 23-42
- Wilder, M. (2016). Whither the funnel of causality. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 721-741.
- Daigneault, P.M and D. Béland (2015). Taking explanation seriously in political science. *Political Studies Review* 13(3):384-392.

#### *Further Reading:*

- Capano, G. (2009) Understanding policy change as an epistemological and theoretical problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 11(1): 7-31
- Hoppe, R. and Colebatch, H. (2016). The role of theories in policy studies and policy work: selective affinities between representation and performance? *European Policy Analysis*, 2: 121–149.

## 2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PUBLIC POLICY (SEP 16)

*From old to new approaches to understanding policy process: What are some of core assumptions of classical approaches to policy theory and analysis? How do contemporary theories reject, incorporate, or modify these assumptions?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Stone, D. (2012). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Chapter 1: The Market and the Polis, pp. 19-36.
- Torgerson, D. (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 19(1): 33-59.
- Clarke, J., D. Bainton, N. Lendvai and P. Stubbs. (2015). *Making Policy Move: Towards a Politics of Translation and Assemblage*. Bristol: Policy Press. Chapter 2: Translation, assemblage and beyond – towards a conceptual repertoire, pp. 33-64

### **Further Reading:**

- Allison, G. and Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Second Edition. Addison-Wesley-Longman Publishing
- Cairney, P. (2012). Complexity theory in political science and public policy. *Political Studies Review*, 10(3), 346–358.
- DeLeon, P. (2006). The Historical Roots of the Field. In M. Moran, M. Rein, R. E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 39-57.
- Marsh, D., S.A. Ercan, P. Furlong (2018). A skin not a sweater: Ontology and epistemology in political science. In In Lowndes, V., D. Marsh and G. (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan. Pp. 177-198.

## 3. RATIONAL CHOICE: THE MOTIVATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS (SEP 23)

*What are the key tenets of rational choice theories? How does rationality explain the choices of individuals and of groups (the collective action problem)? What is the utility of behavioural rationality assumptions for understanding the policy process?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Jones, B.D. (2017). Behavioral rationality as a foundation for public policy studies. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 43: 63-75.
- Hay, C. (2004). Theory, stylized heuristic, or self-fulfilling prophecy? The status of rational choice theory in public administration. *Public Administration*, 82(1): 39-62.
- Stone, D. (2012). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Chapter 10: Interests, pp. 229-247.
- Ostrom, E. (1998). A behavioral approach to the rational choice theory of collective action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997. *American Political Science Review*, 92: 1-22.

### **Further Reading:**

- Green, D.P. and I. Shapiro (1994). *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Hindmoor, A. & B. Taylor (2018). Rational Choice. In Lowndes, V., D. Marsh and G. (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 39-53
- Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Jones, B.D. (1999). Bounded rationality. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 297-321
- Lindblom, C. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review*, 19(2):79-88.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Boston: Harvard University Press. Pp. 1-65
- Pontusson, Jonas (1995). From comparative public policy to political economy: Putting political institutions in their place and taking interests seriously. *Comparative Political Studies* 28(1):117- 147.
- Shepsle K.A. (2010). *Analyzing Politics, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. New York: WW Norton. Chapter 2: Rationality: The Model of Choice (pp. 13-35)
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science* 211: 453-458.
- Wilson, R. (2011). The contribution of behavioral economics to political science. *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 201-223.

#### 4. RATIONAL INSTITUTIONALISM: RULES AND RATIONALITY IN THE POLICY PROCESS (SEP 30)

*How do institutions modify and adapt rationality assumptions to explain strategic interaction and collective action by individuals and groups? To the extent that institutions establish the 'rules of the game,' how do different types of institutions define, constrain, and enable 'rational' policy decisions?*

##### **Required Reading:**

- Immergut, E.M. (2006). Institutional constraints on policy. In M. Moran, M. Rein, R. E. Goodin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.
- Miller, G. (2000). Rational choice and dysfunctional institutions. *Governance*, 13(4): 535–547.
- Driscoll, A. and M.L. Krook, (2009). Can there be a feminist rational choice institutionalism? *Politics & Gender* 5(2):238-245.
- Meckling, J. and J. Nahm (2018). The power of process: State capacity and climate policy. *Governance*, 31:741–757.

##### **Further Reading:**

- Downs, Anthony (1960). Why the government budget is too small in a democracy. *World Politics* 12(4): 541-63.
- Levi, M. (2009). Reconsiderations of rational choice in comparative and historical analysis. In M.I. Lichbach, A.S. Zuckerman [eds.]. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure, 2nd Edition*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Mahoney J. and K. Thelen (2010). A theory of gradual institutional change. In J. Mahoney and K. Thelen, eds. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*, Cambridge University Press
- North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 to 11 (pp. 3-106)
- Pontusson, J. (1995). From comparative public policy to political economy: putting political institutions in their place and taking interests seriously. *Comparative Political Studies* 28(1):117-47.

- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1997). *Games Real Actors Play: Actor Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Boulder: Westview Press. Introduction & Chapter 1 (pp. 1-35)
- Shepsle, K. A. (1989). Studying institutions: Some lessons from the rational choice approach. *Journal of theoretical politics*, 1(2), 131-147.
- Tsebelis G. (1995). Decision making in political systems: Veto players in presidentialism, parliamentarism, multicameralism and multipartyism, *British Journal of Political Science* 25(3): 289-325.
- Weingast, B. R. (1996). Political institutions: rational choice perspectives. *A New Handbook of Political Science*, 167-190.

## 5. HISTORY AND PATH DEPENDENCE: HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALIST APPROACHES (OCT 7)

*How (and how effectively) do past decisions, entrenched rules and norms, and feedback influence and/or explain contemporary policy processes? To what extent are past policies part of the 'institutional' context that shapes policy decisions? When, or under what conditions, do policies become institutionalized?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Fioretos, O., Falleti, T.G. and Sheingate A. (2016). Historical institutionalism in political science. In Fioretos, Falleti, Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*, Oxford University Press, pp. 3-30
- Peters, G. B., Pierre, J., & King, D. (2005). The politics of path dependency: Political conflict in historical institutionalism. *Journal of Politics*, 67:1275-1300
- Levin, K., Cashore, B., Bernstein, S. *et al.* (2012). Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: Constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change. *Policy Science* 45: 123–152.

### **Further Reading:**

- Berman S. (1998). Path dependency and political action: Reexamining responses to the Depression. *Comparative Politics*, 30(4):379-400
- Capoccia G. & Kelemen R.D. (2007). The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism. *World Politics*, 59(3): 341-369.
- Fürstenberg, K. (2016). Evolutionary institutionalism: New perspectives. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 35(1), 48-60
- Hall, P.A. and R.C.R. Taylor (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44: 936-957.
- Kay, A. (2005). A critique of the use of path dependency in policy studies. *Public Administration*, 83(3): 553-571.
- Pierson, P. (2016). Power in historical institutionalism. In Fioretos, Falleti, Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*, Oxford University Press, pp.124-141
- Pierson, P. (1995). Fragmented welfare states: Federal institutions and the development of social policy. *Governance* 8(4): 449-478.
- Thelen, K. (1999). Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 369-404
- Waylen, G. (2009). What can historical institutionalism offer feminist institutionalists? *Politics & Gender* 5(2):245-53.

- Weir, M. (2006). When does politics create policy? The organizational politics of change. In Shapiro et al. (eds.) *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State*, New York University Press. Pp. 171-186

## 6. IDEAS, INSTITUTIONS AND EXPLAINING POLICY CHANGE (OCT 14)

*Institutional theories may be divided into those which explain human behaviour based on a logic of consequences or a logic of appropriateness. What is the role of ideas and norms in each of these logics? What does each contribute to our understanding of the behaviour of policy actors and policy change?*

### **Required Reading:**

- March, J. and J. Olsen (1996). Institutional perspectives on political institutions. *Governance*, 9(3): 247-64.
- Carstensen, M. B., & Röper, N. (2019). Invasion from within: Ideas, power, and the transmission of institutional logics between policy domains. *Comparative Political Studies*, 52(9), 1328–1363.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2010). Taking ideas and discourse seriously: explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fourth 'new institutionalism'. *European Political Science Review*, 2(1), 1-25.
- Fitch-Roy, O., J. Fairbrass & D. Benson (2020) Ideas, coalitions and compromise: reinterpreting EU-ETS lobbying through discursive institutionalism, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 27(1): 82-101

### **Further Reading:**

- Blyth, M. (2016). The new ideas scholarship in the mirror of historical institutionalism: a case of old whines in new bottles? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3): 464-471
- Campbell, J. (1998). Institutional analysis and the role of ideas in political economy. *Theory and Society*, 27:377-409.
- Carstensen, M. B., & Schmidt, V. A. (2016). Power through, over and in ideas: conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3), 318-337.
- Hall, P.A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state. *Comparative Politics* 25(3):275-96.
- Hay, C. (2006). Constructivist institutionalism. In R.A.W. Rhodes, S.A. Binder, B.A. Rockman (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford University Press.
- Larsson, O. (2015). Using post-structuralism to explore the full impact of ideas on politics. *Critical Review* 27(2): 174–97.
- Lieberman, R.C. (2002). Ideas, institutions, and political order: Explaining political change. *American Political Science Review* 96(4): 697-712.
- Radaelli, C. M., Dente, B., & Dossi, S. (2012). Recasting institutionalism: Institutional analysis and public policy. *European Political Science*, 11(4), 537-550.

## 7. IDEAS AS CAUSAL FORCES: DISCOURSE AND POLICY FRAMES (OCT 21)

*The role of ideas is also theorized as an independent causal factor in the policy process. What are the different ways ideas can influence policy? What do these approaches have in common and how do they differ? What are the challenges of studying ideas in political science?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Durnova, A., F. Fischer, P. Zittoun (2016). Discursive approaches to public policy: Politics, argumentation, and deliberation. In B.G. Peters & P. Zittoun [Eds.] *Contemporary Approaches to Public Policy: Theories, Controversies and Perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. Pp. 35-57

- Jacobs, A.A. (2009). How do ideas matter? Mental models and attention in German pension politics. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(2): 252-279
- Stone, D.A. (1989). Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*, 104(2): 281-300.
- Béland, D. and R.H. Cox. (2016). Ideas as coalition magnets: coalition building, policy entrepreneurs and power relations. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23(3):428-445.

### **Further Reading**

- Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse*, 21(1): 45-57.
- Beland, D. & Cox, R.H., Eds. (2011) *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Oxford University Press. Especially Part I: Theory – Chapters 1 (Mehta: The varied roles of ideas in politics ), 3 (Hay: Ideas and the construction of interests), 4 (Blyth – Ideas, uncertainty, and evolution)
- Berman, S. (2001). Review article: Ideas, norms, and culture in political analysis. *Comparative Politics*, 33(2):231-250.
- Carstensen, M.B. and V.A. Schmidt. (2016). Power through, over and in ideas: Conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23 (3):318-337.
- Fischer, F. & H. Gottweis, Eds. (2012). *The Argumentative Turn Revisited. Public Policy as Communicative Practice*. Duke University Press.
- Hajer, M. A., & Wagenaar, H. (Eds.). (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge University Press. Introduction (pp. 1-30).
- Peters, B. G., & Nagel, M. L. (2020). *Zombie Ideas: Why Failed Policy Ideas Persist*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rochefort, D.A. and R.W. Cobb (1993). Problem definition, agenda access, and policy choice. *Policy Studies Journal* 21(1): 56-71.
- Shanahan, E.A., Jones, M.D., McBeth, M., & Radaelli, C. M. (2018). The narrative policy framework. In Weible & Sabatier, *Theories of the Policy Process*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Westview Press, pp. 173-214

## **8. PEOPLE, POWER, AND PUBLIC POLICY (NOV 4)**

*How does public policy (re)shape the relationship between citizens and the state, and between individuals? What are the roles of emotion and policy discourse in the construction of agency and identity amongst target populations? (How) do the policy preferences of the public influence policy decisions?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Banting, K., & Thompson, D. (2021). The puzzling persistence of racial inequality in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1-22.
- Campbell, A. L. (2012). Policy makes mass politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15, 333-351.
- Paterson, S. (2021). Emotional labour: Exploring emotional policy discourses of pregnancy and childbirth in Ontario, Canada. *Public Policy and Administration*, 36(2), 252–272.
- Schneider, A. & H. Ingram (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review*, 87(2):334–347.

### **Further Reading**

- Bilge, S. (2013). Reading the racial subtext of the Québécois accommodation controversy: An analytics of racialized governmentality. *Politikon*, 40(1), 157-181.
- Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (1): 29-40.
- Esses, V.M., Dovidio, J.F., Jackson, L.M. and Armstrong, T.L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: the role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57: 389-412.
- Ewert, B. (2021), Citizenship as a Form of Anticipatory Obedience? Implications of Preventive Health Policy in Germany. *Politics & Policy*, 49: 891-912.
- Jacobs, L.R., & Mettler, S. (2018). When and how new policy creates new politics: Examining the feedback effects of the Affordable Care Act on public opinion. *Perspectives on Politics*, 16(2), 345-363.
- Lacroix, M. (2004). Canadian refugee policy and the social construction of the refugee claimant subjectivity: Understanding refugeeness. *Journal of refugee studies*, 17(2), 147-166.
- Laperrière, M., Orloff, A., & Pryma, J. (2019). Commodification, vulnerability, risk: Gendered social policy developments in the United States, 1980–2018. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 35(1), 41-58.
- Newman, J (2012) Beyond the deliberative subject? Problems of theory, method, and critique in the turn to emotion and affect. *Critical Policy Studies* 6: 465–479.
- Peterie, M., Ramia, G., Marston, G., & Patulny, R. (2019). Emotional compliance and emotion as resistance: Shame and anger among the long-term unemployed. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(5), 794–811.
- Verhoeven, I. & J.W. Duyvendak (2016). Enter emotions. Appealing to anxiety and anger in a process of municipal amalgamation, *Critical Policy Studies*, 10:4, 468-485
- van Oorschot, W. (2006). Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(1), 23–42

## **9. GROUPS, POWER, AND PUBLIC POLICY (NOV 11)**

*How do groups affect the policy process? What is meant by 'power,' and what are its sources and effects in the policy process? What factors make groups more (or less) influential and successful? What are the limits of understanding policy as an outcome of group interactions with the state?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Busemeyer M.R. (2020). Neo-corporatism and the responsiveness of democracy. In: Careja R., Emmenegger P., Giger N. (eds) *The European Social Model under Pressure*. Springer VS, Wiesbaden, pp. 15-30
- Dür, A., & De Bièvre, D. (2007). The question of interest group influence. *Journal of Public Policy*, 27(01), 1-12.
- Hacker, J. S., & Pierson, P. (2010). Winner-take-all politics: Public policy, political organization, and the precipitous rise of top incomes in the United States. *Politics & Society*, 38(2): 152-204.
- Orsini, M., & Smith, M. (2010). Social movements, knowledge, and public policy: the case of autism activism in Canada and the US. *Critical Policy Studies*, 4(1), 38–57.

### **Further Reading:**

- Atkinson, M.M. and W.D. Coleman (1992). Policy networks, policy communities, and the problems of governance. *Governance*, 5(2): 154-180.

- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two faces of power. *American Political Science Review*, 56(04): 947-952.
- Clapp, J. & G. Scrinis (2017). Big food, nutritionism, and corporate power. *Globalizations*, 14(4): 578-595
- Edwards, B. & Kane, M. (2014). Resource mobilization and social and political movements. In H.A. van der Heijden, ed., *Handbook of Political Citizenship and Social Movements*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(3), 564-581.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 527-553.
- Kastner, L. (2018) Business lobbying under salience – financial industry mobilization against the European financial transaction tax, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25:11, 1648-1666
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Richardson, J. (2000). Government, interest groups and policy change. *Political Studies*, 48 (5): 1006-1025.
- McFarland, A. S. (2007). Neopluralism. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 10: 45-66.
- Schwartz, N.S. (2021). Guns in the North: assessing the impact of social identity on firearms advocacy in Canada. *Politics Policy*, 49: 795-818
- Skogstad, G. (2008). Policy networks and policy communities: Conceptualizing state-societal relationships in the policy process. In L. White et al. (eds.) *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science* (pp. 205-220). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Smith, M. J. (1990). Pluralism, reformed pluralism and neopluralism: The role of pressure groups in policy-making. *Political Studies*, 38(2): 302-22.

## 10. CLASS, POWER, AND PUBLIC POLICY (NOV 18)

*How does capitalism shape the policy process and outcomes? What is the role of class and power in these approaches, and (how) do they (still) matter? What are the limits of these analytic approaches for understanding the policy process and outcomes?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Ibsen, C. L., & Thelen, K. (2017). Diverging solidarity: Labor strategies in the new knowledge economy. *World Politics*, 69(3): 409-447.
- Korpi, W. (2006). Power resources and employer-centered approaches in explanations of welfare states and varieties of capitalism: Protagonists, consenters, and antagonists. *World Politics*, 58(2), 167-206.
- Gingrich, J., & Häusermann, S. (2015). The decline of the working-class vote, the reconfiguration of the welfare support coalition and consequences for the welfare state. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 25(1), 50–75

### **Further Reading:**

- Bradley, D. et al. (2003). Distribution and redistribution in postindustrial democracies. *World Politics*, 55(2):193-228.
- Cameron, D.R. (1978). The expansion of the public economy: A comparative analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 72(4): 1243-61.
- Esping-Andersen, G (1990). *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Gindin, S. & J. Stanford (2003). Canadian labour and the political economy of transformation. In W. Clement & L. Vosko, Eds., *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Graefe, P. (2007). Political economy and Canadian public policy. In M. Orsini and M. Smith, Eds., *Critical Policy Studies*. Vancouver: UBC Press
- Hall, P.A. & K. Thelen (2009). Institutional change in varieties of capitalism, *Socio-Economic Review*, 7(1): 7–34
- Haddow, R. (2014). Power resources and the Canadian welfare state: Unions, partisanship and interprovincial differences in inequality and poverty reduction. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 47(04), 717–739.
- Mares, I. (2001). Strategic bargaining and social policy development: unemployment insurance in France and Germany. In B. Ebbinghaus & P. Manow, Eds. *Comparing Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy and Political Economy in Europe, Japan and the USA*. Routledge.
- McCarty, N. and Pontusson, H.J. (2011). The political economy of inequality and redistribution. In: B. Nolan, W. Salverda, and T.M. Smeeding (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Inequality*. London : Oxford University Press, pp. 665-692.
- Streeck, W. (2011). Taking capitalism seriously: Towards an institutionalist approach to contemporary political economy. *Socio-Economic Review*, 9(1): 137-167.

## 11. MOBILIZING IDEAS: STREAMS, PUNCTUATIONS, COALITIONS (NOV 25)

*Kingdon uses the concept of multiple streams to analyze 'an idea whose time has come'. What are the various elements or conditions in a polity that must come together for an idea to be mobilized and placed on the government agenda? What keeps new ideas from moving onto the agenda? Reflecting on readings from the past few weeks, how effectively do these approaches capture and explain the policy process?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Petridou, E. (2014). Theories of the policy process: contemporary scholarship and future directions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42, S12-S32.
- Ingram, H., P. DeLeon, A. Schneider (2016). Public Policy Theory and Democracy: The Elephant in the Corner. In B.G. Peters & P. Zittoun [Eds.] *Contemporary Approaches to Public Policy: Theories, Controversies and Perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 175-197 [open access e-book]
- And also from Peters & Zittoun (2016), one of:
  - Weible, C.M. & H.C. Jenkins-Smith, Chapter 2 – The advocacy coalition framework: An approach for the comparative analysis of contentious policy issues, pp. 15-35
  - Eissler, R., A. Russell, B.D. Jones, Chapter 4 – The transformation of ideas: The origin and evolution of punctuated equilibrium theory
  - Zahariadis, N., Chapter 9 – Bounded rationality and garbage can models of policy-making, pp. 155-169

### **Further Reading:**

- Béland, D. (2015). Kingdon reconsidered: Ideas, interests and institutions in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 6988(January): 1–15.
- Heikkila, T. & P. Cairney (2018). Comparison of Theories of the Policy Process. In C.M. Weible & P.A. Sabatier [eds.]. *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Westview Press.

- Cairney, P. & Jones, M.D. (2016). Kingdon's multiple streams approach: What is the empirical impact of this universal theory? *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1), 37-58
- Cohen, M., March J. & Olsen J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25
- Downs, A. (1972). Up and down with ecology: The issue attention cycle. *Public Interest* 36 (2): 40-50.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35.
- Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner, F. R. (2012). From there to here: Punctuated equilibrium to the general punctuation thesis to a theory of government information processing. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1): 120
- Kingdon, J. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown. Chapters 1, 5-8.
- Matti, S., & Sandström, A. (2013). The defining elements of advocacy coalitions: Continuing the search for explanations for coordination and coalition structures. *Review of Policy Research*, 30 (2), 240-257.
- Mukherjee, I., & Howlett, M. (2015). Who is a stream? Epistemic communities, instrument constituencies and advocacy coalitions in public policy-making. *Politics and Governance*, 3(2), 65-75.

## 12. CONVERGENCE, LEARNING AND DIFFUSION OF PUBLIC POLICIES (DEC 2)

*The concept of policy learning is often used to explain how and why policy change may occur. How do different authors use the concept of 'learning'? How do actors and/or different jurisdictions learn from one another? Under what conditions do policies "spread" beyond national boundaries?*

### **Required Reading:**

- Dobbin, F., B. Simmons, and G. Garrett (2007). The global diffusion of public policies: Social construction, coercion, competition or learning? *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 449-72
- Dunlop, C.A. and Radaelli, C.M. (2018). Does policy learning meet the standards of an analytical framework of the policy process? *Policy Studies Journal*, 46: S48-S68
- Gilardi, F. and F. Wasserfallen (2019), The politics of policy diffusion. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58: 1245-1256.

### **Further Reading:**

- Bennett, C. J. and M. Howlett (1992). The lessons of learning: Reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy Sciences*, 25(3): 275-294.
- Dolowitz, D. and D. Marsh (2000). Learning from abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1): 5-24.
- Drezner, D. (2005). Globalization, harmonization, and competition: The different pathways to policy convergence. *Journal of European Public Policy* 12(5): 841-859.
- Gilardi, F. (2010). Who learns from what in policy diffusion processes? *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(3): 650-666.
- Hall, P.A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning and the state. The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25: 275-96.
- Heikkilä, T., & Gerlak, A. K. (2013). Building a conceptual approach to collective learning: Lessons for public policy scholars. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3): 484-512.

- Kennett, P. & N. Lendvai (2014). Policy paradigms, gender equality and translation: scales and disjuncture. *Journal of international and Comparative Social Policy*, 30(1), 6-16.
- Marsh, David and J.C. Sharman. (2009). Policy diffusion and policy transfer. *Policy Studies* 30(3): 269-288.
- Obinger, H., Schmitt, C., & Starke, P. (2013). Policy diffusion and policy transfer in comparative welfare state research. *Social Policy & Administration*, 47(1), 111-129.
- Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy* 2(1): 3–30.
- Smith, M. P. (2013). The global diffusion of public policy: Power structures and democratic accountability. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1(2): 118-131.
- Stone, D. (2012). Transfer and translation of policy. *Policy Studies*, 33(6), 483-499.

### 13. WRAP UP AND REFLECTIONS (DEC 9)

No assigned readings.



## VII. Academic Accommodations & Regulations

### Covid-19 Information

All members of the Carleton community are required to follow COVID-19 prevention measures and all mandatory public health requirements (e.g. wearing a mask, physical distancing, hand hygiene, respiratory and cough etiquette) and [mandatory self-screening](#) prior to coming to campus daily.

If you feel ill or exhibit COVID-19 symptoms while on campus or in class, please leave campus immediately, self-isolate, and complete the mandatory [symptom reporting tool](#). For purposes of contact tracing, attendance will be recorded in all classes and labs. Participants can check in using posted QR codes through the cuScreen platform where provided. Students who do not have a smartphone will be required to complete a paper process as indicated on the [COVID-19 website](#).

All members of the Carleton community are required to follow guidelines regarding safe movement and seating on campus (e.g. directional arrows, designated entrances and exits, designated seats that maintain physical distancing). In order to avoid congestion, allow all previous occupants to fully vacate a classroom before entering. No food or drinks are permitted in any classrooms or labs.

For the most recent information about Carleton's COVID-19 response and required measures, please see the [University's COVID-19 webpage](#) and review the [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQs\)](#). Should you have additional questions after reviewing, please contact [covidinfo@carleton.ca](mailto:covidinfo@carleton.ca)

Please note that failure to comply with University policies and mandatory public health requirements, and endangering the safety of others are considered misconduct under the [Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy](#). Failure to comply with Carleton's COVID-19 procedures may lead to supplementary action involving Campus Safety and/or Student Affairs.

## Requests for Academic Accommodation

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request, the processes are as follows:

Pregnancy accommodation: Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website: [carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf](https://carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf).

Religious accommodation: Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website: [carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf](https://carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf).

Accommodations for students with disabilities: If you have a documented disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) at 613-520-6608 or [pmc@carleton.ca](mailto:pmc@carleton.ca) for a formal evaluation or contact your PMC coordinator to send your instructor your Letter of Accommodation at the beginning of the term. You must also contact the PMC no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (if applicable). After requesting accommodation from PMC, reach out to your instructor as soon as possible to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. For more information, please visit [carleton.ca/pmc](https://carleton.ca/pmc).

Accommodation for student activities: Carleton University recognizes the substantial benefits, both to the individual student and for the university, that result from a student participating in activities beyond the classroom experience. Reasonable accommodation must be provided to students who engage in student activities at the national or international level. Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist.

<https://carleton.ca/senate/wp-content/uploads/Accommodation-for-Student-Activities-1.pdf>.

For more information on academic accommodation, please contact the departmental administrator or visit: [students.carleton.ca/course-outline](https://students.carleton.ca/course-outline).

## Sexual Violence Policy

As a community, Carleton University is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment where sexual violence will not be tolerated. Survivors are supported through academic accommodations as per Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. For more information about the services available at the university and to obtain information about sexual violence and/or support, visit: [carleton.ca/sexual-violence-support](https://carleton.ca/sexual-violence-support).

## Plagiarism

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.” This includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source. Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to: books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, art works, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of

calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, material on the internet and/or conversations.

Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- any submission prepared in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, paraphrased material, algorithms, formulae, scientific or mathematical concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings without appropriate acknowledgement;
- submitting a computer program developed in whole or in part by someone else, with or without modifications, as one's own; and
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's work and/or failing to use quotations marks.

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They may include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

More information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy can be found at:

<https://carleton.ca/registrar/academic-integrity/>.

### Intellectual property

Student or professor materials created for this course (including presentations and posted notes, labs, case studies, assignments and exams) remain the intellectual property of the author(s). They are intended for personal use and may not be reproduced or redistributed without prior written consent of the author(s).

### Submission and Return of Term Work

Papers must be submitted directly to the instructor according to the instructions in the course outline. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the departmental office will not accept assignments submitted in hard copy.

### Grading

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor, subject to the approval of the faculty Dean. Final standing in courses will be shown by alphabetical grades. The system of grades used, with corresponding grade points is:

| Percentage | Letter grade | 12-point scale | Percentage | Letter grade | 12-point scale |
|------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------|----------------|
| 90-100     | A+           | 12             | 67-69      | C+           | 6              |
| 85-89      | A            | 11             | 63-66      | C            | 5              |
| 80-84      | A-           | 10             | 60-62      | C-           | 4              |
| 77-79      | B+           | 9              | 57-59      | D+           | 3              |
| 73-76      | B            | 8              | 53-56      | D            | 2              |
| 70-72      | B-           | 7              | 50-52      | D-           | 1              |

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

### **Carleton E-mail Accounts**

All email communication to students from the Department of Political Science will be via official Carleton University e-mail accounts and/or Brightspace. As important course and university information is distributed this way, it is the student's responsibility to monitor their Carleton University email accounts and Brightspace.

### **Carleton Political Science Society**

The Carleton Political Science Society (CPSS) has made its mission to provide a social environment for politically inclined students and faculty. By hosting social events, including Model Parliament, debates, professional development sessions and more, CPSS aims to involve all political science students at Carleton University. Our mandate is to arrange social and academic activities in order to instill a sense of belonging within the Department and the larger University community. Members can benefit through our networking opportunities, academic engagement initiatives and numerous events which aim to complement both academic and social life at Carleton University. To find out more, visit us on Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/CarletonPoliticalScienceSociety/>.

### **Official Course Outline**

The course outline posted to the Political Science website is the official course outline.

Updated August 23, 2021