

PSCI 6407W

Public Policy – Theory and Analysis

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

Location: Please confirm on Carleton Central

Instructor:

Dr. Vandna Bhatia

Contact:

D685 Loeb Building

520-2600, ext. 1360

vandna.bhatia@carleton.ca

Office Hours:

Thursdays, 9:30 am to 11:30 am

Or by appointment

Course Description and Learning Outcomes

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 particular 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.

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 and assumptions of different theoretical approaches;
- Synthesize and critically analyze the contributions and limitations of these approaches;
- Apply these concepts to the analysis of practical policy problems.

Evaluation and Grading

Component	Weight
Seminar Participation	15%
Critical Reviews (3 @ 15%)	45%
Review Essay (Due April 11, 2018)	40%
Total	100%

Seminar Participation: 15%

Seminars are premised on the principle of learning through informed discussion. In order for this format to be effective, students must come to each session prepared to actively engage with their peers and discuss the assigned readings. Preparation for each seminar requires that each participant complete the assigned readings in advance of the seminar, and reflect on what they have read. This includes considering the following questions in relation to the readings:

- What is the text saying – 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?
- How does it relate to other readings from this week? From other weeks?

To facilitate discussion, students are expected to submit two questions based upon the readings, prior to upcoming the class. Questions should make specific reference to the readings and should not be generic. Questions are to be posted to the CULearn discussion board in advance of class, no later than Wednesdays at 10:00 a.m. Students should consult the questions posted by others prior to class and be prepared to discuss them as well as the readings. The seminar participation grade will be determined on the basis of the quality and frequency of participation, and on in-class presentations of short papers (see below).

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 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. Students should be prepared to present their review of the readings to the class in a brief 10-minute presentation, followed by discussion. At least one critical review must be submitted before the February break. All papers are to be submitted via CULearn.

Review Essay: 40%

For this essay, students are expected to choose one from among the following assignments (please note, this paper may not substantively duplicate work from critical reviews students have already written):

- A. Compare and contrast readings from two course themes/topics, with a discussion and analysis of how these two approaches – both individually and together – contribute to our understanding of public policy;
- B. Synthesize the literature on and develop an exhaustive and detailed critique of a specific theoretical approach to policy analysis, drawing on assigned readings *and* additional supplementary literature.

Review essays must develop a clear argument or question about the chosen topic, incorporating and responding to the related readings. A brief, 2-3 page overview of the topic, including an outline of the

proposed paper and a preliminary bibliography, must be submitted no later than **Wednesday March 14, 2018**. The essay will be 16-20 pages, double-spaced, excluding notes and bibliography. Additional details about and guidelines for the assignment will be distributed in class. The essay is due no later than **Wednesday April 11, 2018** by 12:00 pm (noon). *Late papers will not be accepted without official documentation of illness or incapacity.*

Course Materials and Readings

The following text is required and available for purchase at Haven Books:

- Weible, C.M. and Sabatier, P.A. (2018). *Theories of the Policy Process*. 4th ed. Westview Press.

Most required and supplementary readings are available electronically through [MacOdrum Library](#). A number of the texts from which we will be reading are available for purchase online (e.g., Chapters or Amazon) and also 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
- Marsh, D. and G. Stoker, Eds. (2010). *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 3rd ed. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Topic Schedule and Readings

1. Introduction – Studying Public Policy (Jan 10)

Required Reading:

- Simeon, R. (1976). Studying public policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 9:548-580.
- Weible & Sabatier (2018). Introduction, pp. 1-10.
- Wilder, M. (2016). Whither the funnel of causality. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 721-741.

Further Reading:

- Atkinson, M. (2016). Richard Simeon and the Policy Sciences Project. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 49(4), 703-720.
- Skogstad, G., & White, L. (2016). Revisiting Richard Simeon's "Studying Public Policy". *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 49(4), 665-679.

2. Major Approaches to Policy Analysis (Jan 17)

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

Required 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.
- Furlong, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). A skin not a sweater: ontology and epistemology in political science. In D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 3rd Edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan. 184-211.

Further Reading:

- Allison, G. and Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Second Edition. Addison-Wesley-Longman Publishing
- DeLeon, P. (1994). Reinventing the policy sciences: Three steps back into the future. *Policy Sciences* 27(1):77-95.
- Fischer F. (1998). Beyond empiricism: Policy inquiry in post-positivist perspective. *Policy Studies Journal* 26: 129-146.
- Goodin, R.E., M. Rein. & M. Moran (2006). The public and its policies. In Moran, M., M. Rein & R.E. Goodin (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 3-35
- Lowi, T.J. (1964). American business, public policy case studies and political theory. *World Politics*, 16(4): 677-715.
- May, P.J. (1986). Politics and policy analysis. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101(1): 109-125
- Torgerson, D. (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 19(1): 33-59.

3. Rational Choice: The Motivations of Individuals and Groups (Jan 24)

What are the key tenets of rational choice theory (RCT)? How does rational choice theory explain the choices of individuals and of groups (the collective action problem)? What is the utility of RCT in understanding the policy process? Is RCT a normative theory?

Required Reading:

- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Boston: Harvard University Press. Pp. 1-65
- 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.
- 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.

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.
- 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.
- 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*, 2nd 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.
- Hindmoor, A. (2010). Rational Choice. In D. Marsh and G. (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 3rd ed. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 42-59
- 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 (Jan 31)

How does rational choice institutionalism modify some of the tenets of RCT to explain strategic interaction and collective action? 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:

- Shepsle, K. A. (1989). Studying institutions: Some lessons from the rational choice approach. *Journal of theoretical politics*, 1(2), 131-147.
- Miller, G. (2000). Rational choice and dysfunctional institutions. *Governance*, 13(4): 535-547.
- 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.

Further Reading:

- Downs, Anthony (1960). Why the government budget is too small in a democracy. *World Politics* 12(4): 541-63.
- Galvin, D., Shapiro I. & Skowronek, S. (2006). *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State*. New York: New York University Press
- Immergut, E. M. (1998). The theoretical core of the new institutionalism. *Politics & Society*, 26(1), 5-34.
- 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 [e-book available through MacOdrum Library]
- 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

- Ostrom, E. (1991) Review: Rational Choice Theory and Institutional Analysis: Toward Complementarity. *American Political Science Review* 85(1): 237-243
- North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 to 11 (pp. 3-106)
- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1997). *Games Real Actors Play: Actor Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Boulder: Westview Press. Introduction & Chapter 1 (pp. 1-35)
- Weingast, B. R. (1996). Political institutions: rational choice perspectives. *A New Handbook Of Political Science*, 167-190.

5. History and Path Dependence: Historical Institutional Approaches (Feb 7)

How (and how effectively) do past decisions, entrenched rules and norms, and feedback influence and/or explain contemporary policy processes? How and 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.
- Peters, G. B., Pierre, J., & King, D. (2005). The politics of path dependency: Political conflict in historical institutionalism. *Journal of Politics*, 67:1275-1300
- Kay, A. (2005). A critique of the use of path dependency in policy studies. *Public Administration*, 83(3): 553-571.
- Pierson, P. (2005). The study of policy development. *Journal of Policy History*, 17(1): 34-51.

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, Peter A. and Rosemary C.R. Taylor (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44: 936-957.
- Pierson, P. (2006). Public policies as institutions. In Shapiro et al. (eds.) *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State*, New York University Press. Pp. 114-131.
- 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.
- Weaver, R.K. (2010). Paths and forks or chutes and ladders? Negative feedbacks and policy regime change. *Journal of Public Policy*, 30(2): 137-162
- 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 (Feb 14)

Institutional theories may be divided into those which explain human behaviour on the basis of 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.
- 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.
- Larsson, O. (2015). Using post-structuralism to explore the full impact of ideas on politics. *Critical Review* 27(2): 174-97.
- Radaelli, C. M., Dente, B., & Dossi, S. (2012). Recasting institutionalism: Institutional analysis and public policy. *European Political Science*, 11(4), 537-550.

Further Reading:

- Béland D. & Cox R.H. (2011) *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Toronto: Oxford University Press
- Blyth, M. (2002). *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstein, J. & Keohane, R. O. (1993). Ideas and foreign policy: An analytical framework. In J. Goldstein & R. O. Keohane (Eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change* (pp. 3-30). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hall, Peter 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. [E-book available online through MacOdrum Library]
- Kangas, O.E., Niemelä M. & Varjonen S. (2014). When and why do ideas matter? The influence of framing on opinion formation and policy change. *European Political Science Review*, 6(1): 73-92
- Lieberman, R.C. (2002). Ideas, institutions, and political order: Explaining political change. *American Political Science Review* 96(4): 697-712.

7. Ideas as Causal Forces: Discourse and Policy Frames (Feb 28)

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 some of the particular challenges of studying ideas in political science?

Required Reading:

- Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse*, 21(1): 45-57.
- Jacobs, A.A. (2009). How do ideas matter? Mental models and attention in German pension politics. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(2): 252-279
- Shanahan, E.A., Jones, M.D., McBeth, M., & Radaelli, C. M. (2018). The narrative policy framework. In Weible & Sabatier, *Theories of the Policy Process*. 4th ed. Westview Press, pp. 173-214
- 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

Further Reading

- Beland, D. & Cox, R.H., Eds. (2011) *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Oxford University Press. Especially Part I: Theory – Chapters 1 (Mehta), 3 (Hay), 4 (Blyth)
- Berman, S. (2001). Review article: Ideas, norms, and culture in political analysis. *Comparative Politics*, 33(2):231-250.
- Carstensen, M. (2011). Paradigm man vs. the bricoleur: Bricolage as an alternative vision of agency in ideational change. *European Political Science Review*, 3(1):147-167
- Carstensen, M. B., & Matthijs, M. (2017). Of paradigms and power: British economic policy making since Thatcher. *Governance*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12301>
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing Public Policy*. Oxford University Press. Chapters 3-4 (pp. 48-93)
- Hajer, M. A., & Wagenaar, H. (Eds.). (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge University Press. Introduction (pp. 1-30).
- Jones, M. D. (2014). Communicating climate change: Are stories better than “Just the Facts”? *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(4), 644–673.
- Rein M. and D. Schön, (1999). Reframing policy discourse, in Frank Fischer and John Forester (eds.) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning* (pp. 145-66). Duke University Press.
- Rochefort, D.A. and R.W. Cobb (1993). Problem definition, agenda access, and policy choice. *Policy Studies Journal* 21(1): 56-71.
- Stone, D.A. (1989). Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*, 104(2): 281-300.
- Yee, A. S. (1996). The causal effects of ideas on policies. *International Organization*, 50, 69-108.

8. Mobilizing Ideas: Multiple Streams and Punctuated Equilibriums (Mar 7)

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 back on readings from the past few weeks, how effectively do these approaches explain the policy process?

Required Reading:

- Weible & Sabatier (2018). *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4th edition. Westview Press
 - Chapter 1: Herweg, N., Zahariadis, N., Zohlnhöfer, R., The Multiple Streams Framework, pp. 17-54
 - Chapter 2: Baumgartner, F., Jones B. & Mortensen P., Punctuated equilibrium theory, pp. 55-102
 - Chapter 4: Weible, C.M. & Ingold, K., The advocacy coalition framework, pp. 135-173
 - Chapter 8: Heikkila, T. & Cairney, P., Comparison of Theories of the Policy Process, pp. 301-328.

Further Reading:

- 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.
- Jones, B.D. & Baumgartner, F.R. (2004). Representation and agenda setting. *Policy Studies Journal* 32: 1-24.
- Kingdon, J. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown. Chapters 1, 5-8.

9. Power and Influence: Interest Groups and Societal Organizations (Mar 14)

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:

- Dür, A., & De Bièvre, D. (2007). The question of interest group influence. *Journal of Public Policy*, 27(01), 1-12.
- Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(3), 564-581.
- 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
- McFarland, A. S. (2007). Neopluralism. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 10: 45-66.

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.
- Börzel, T. (2011). Networks: Reified metaphor or governance panacea? *Public Administration*, 89:49-63
- 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.

- Jenkins, J. C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 527-553.
- Richardson, J. (2000). Government, interest groups and policy change. *Political Studies*, 48 (5): 1006-1025.
- Mintrom, M. and P. Norman (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 37(4): 649-667.
- 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. Political Economy and Power in Distributional Policy (Mar 21)

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:

- Graefe, P. (2007). Political economy and Canadian public policy. In M. Orsini and M. Smith, Eds., *Critical Policy Studies*. Vancouver: UBC Press
- Ibsen, C. L., & Thelen, K. (2017). Diverging solidarity: Labor strategies in the new knowledge economy. *World Politics*, 1-39, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887117000077>
- 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. <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:83334>
- Streeck, W. (2011). Taking capitalism seriously: Towards an institutionalist approach to contemporary political economy. *Socio-Economic Review*, 9(1): 137-167.

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.
- Hall, P.A. and D. Soskice (2001). An introduction to varieties of capitalism. In Hall, P.A. and D. Soskice, Eds., *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations to Comparative Advantage* (pp. 1-68). Oxford University Press. [Available electronically]
- 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.

- 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.

11. Gender and Feminist Policy Analysis (Mar 28)

What insights do feminist approaches and analyses bring to understanding how gender and the experiences of women influence and are affected by public policy?

Required Reading:

- Mazur, A.G. (2002). *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press. Chapter 1-2 (pp. 1-46)
- Orloff, A.S. (2009). Gendering the comparative analysis of welfare states: An unfinished agenda. *Sociological Theory* 27(3): 317-343.
- MacDonald, F. (2017). Knocking down walls in political science: In defence of an expansionist feminist agenda. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 411-426.
- Lombardo, E. and P. Meier (2016). Policy. In L. Disch & M. Hawkesworth (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. Oxford University Press E-Book. [e-book via MacOdrum library]
- Thompson, D. (2014). The comparative study of race: Census politics in Canada, the United States, and Great Britain. In L. Turgeon, M. Papillon, J. Wallner and S. White (eds.) *Comparing Canada: Methods and Perspectives on Canadian Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press. Ch. 4.

Further Reading

- Armstrong, P. (2013). Puzzling skills: Feminist political economy approaches. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 50(3): 256-283.
- Boris, E. (2005). On the importance of naming: Gender, race and the writing of policy history. *The Journal of Policy History*. 17(1): 72-92.
- Chappell L. (2006). Comparing political institutions: Revealing the gendered 'logic of appropriateness'. *Politics & Gender*, 2(2): 223-235.
- Daly, M. and Rake, K. (2003). *Gender and the Welfare State*. Polity Press
- Hawkesworth, M. (1994). Policy studies within a feminist frame. *Policy Sciences*, 27(1):97-118.
- Jenson, J. (2009). Lost in translation: The social investment perspective and gender equality. *Social Politics*, 16(4): 446-483.
- Kenny M. (2007). Gender, institutions and power: A critical review. *Politics*, 27(2): 91-100
- Mackay, F., M. Kenny & L. Chappell (2010). New institutionalism through a gender lens: Towards a feminist institutionalism? *International Political Science Review*, 31(5): 573-588.
- Mazy, S. (2000). Introduction: Integrating gender - intellectual and 'real world' mainstreaming. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 333-345.
- O'Connor, J.S., A.S. Orloff and S. Shaver (1999). Gendering Theories and Comparisons of Welfare States. In J.S. O'Connor et al., eds., *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States* (pp. 1-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paterson, S. (2010). What's the problem with gender-based analysis? Gender mainstreaming policy and practice in Canada. *Canadian Public Administration* 53(3): 395-416.

- Phillips, S.D. (1996). Discourse, identity, and voice: Feminist contributions to policy studies. In Laurent Dobuzinskis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, eds., *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Weldon, S.L. (2006). The structure of intersectionality: A comparative politics of gender. *Politics & Gender*, 2(2): 235-48.

12. Convergence, Learning and Diffusion of Public Policies (Apr 4)

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
- Gilardi, F. (2010). Who learns from what in policy diffusion processes? *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(3): 650-666.
- Heikkila, T., & Gerlak, A. K. (2013). Building a conceptual approach to collective learning: Lessons for public policy scholars. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3): 484-512.
- Smith, M. P. (2013). The global diffusion of public policy: Power structures and democratic accountability. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1(2): 118-131.

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.
- Dunlop, C. A., & Radaelli, C. M. (2012). Systematising policy learning: From monolith to dimensions. *Political Studies*, 61(3): 599-619.
- Hall, P.A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning and the state. The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25: 275-96.
- Kennett, P., & Lendvai, N. (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.
- Radaelli, C. (2009). Measuring policy learning: regulatory impact assessment in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy* 16(8): 1145 - 1164.
- Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy* 2(1): 3-30.
- Stone, D. (2012). Transfer and translation of policy. *Policy Studies*, 33(6), 483-499.

Academic Accommodations

The Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) provides services to students with Learning Disabilities (LD), psychiatric/mental health disabilities, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), chronic medical conditions, and impairments in mobility, hearing, and vision. If you have a disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact PMC at 613-520-6608 or pmc@carleton.ca for a formal evaluation. If you are already registered with the PMC, contact your PMC coordinator to send me your **Letter of Accommodation** at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (*if applicable*). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with me to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC website for the deadline to request accommodations for the formally scheduled exam (*if applicable*).

For Religious Observance: Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance (www.carleton.ca/equity).

For Pregnancy: Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

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 can include:

- 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;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence that 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 nontrivial. They may include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

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 and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at **4 p.m.**, stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a **stamped, self-addressed envelope** if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

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

Approval of final grades: Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor and is 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 the Dean has approved them.

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 cuLearn. As important course and University information is distributed this way, it is the student's responsibility to monitor their Carleton and cuLearn accounts.

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. Holding social events, debates, and panel discussions, 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 numerous opportunities that will complement both academic and social life at Carleton University. To find out more, visit <https://www.facebook.com/groups/politicalsciencesociety/> or come to our office in Loeb D688.

Official Course Outline: The course outline posted to the Political Science website is the official course outline.

Last modified: January 3, 2018