

PSCI 6407A

Public Policy – Theory and Analysis

Seminars: Wednesdays 0835 to 1125

Please confirm location on Carleton Central

Instructor:

Vandna Bhatia

Contact:

C640 Loeb Building
520-2600, ext. 8240

vandna_bhatia@carleton.ca

Office Hours:

Wednesdays, 12:00 to 2:00 p.m.
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.

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.

The course will be structured around weekly discussions of required readings. Each week, one or two students will facilitate discussion, beginning with a brief synthesis of the assigned readings. Guidelines for facilitating discussions will be provided in class. All students are expected to come fully prepared to actively participate in discussions, regardless of whether they are presenting.

Academic Accommodations

For Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course are encouraged to contact the Paul Menton Centre (PMC) for Students with Disabilities (500 University Centre) to complete the necessary forms. After registering with the PMC, make an appointment to meet with the instructor in order to discuss your needs **at least two weeks before the**

first in-class test or CUTV midterm exam. This will allow for sufficient time to process your request. Please note the following deadline for submitting completed forms to the PMC for formally scheduled exam accommodations: **November 7th, 2008** for December examinations, and **March 6th, 2009** for April examinations.

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 Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as: "to use and pass off as one's own idea or product, work of another without expressly giving credit to another." The Graduate Calendar states that plagiarism has occurred when a student either: (a) directly copies another's work without acknowledgment; or (b) closely paraphrases the equivalent of a short paragraph or more without acknowledgment; or (c) borrows, without acknowledgment, any ideas in a clear and recognizable form in such a way as to present them as the student's own thought, where such ideas, if they were the student's own would contribute to the merit of his or her own work. Instructors who suspect plagiarism are required to submit the paper and supporting documentation to the Departmental Chair who will refer the case to the Dean. It is not permitted to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses. The Department's Style Guide is available at:

<http://www.carleton.ca/polisci/undergrad/Essay%20Style%20Guide.html>

Oral Examination: At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

Submission and Return of Term Work: Papers must be handed directly to the instructor 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. Please note that assignments sent via fax or email will not be accepted. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Approval of final grades: 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.

Course Requirements: Students must fulfill all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade. Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a

grade of ABS. FND (Failure No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

Connect Email Accounts: The Department of Political Science strongly encourages students to sign up for a campus email account. Important course and University information will be distributed via the Connect email system. See <http://connect.carleton.ca> for instructions on how to set up your account.

Evaluation and Grading:

1) Seminar participation: 10%

Students will be evaluated on their participation in discussions of assigned readings each week. Evaluation parameters for participation will be distributed in the first seminar meeting. To facilitate discussion, each student is 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 in advance of the seminar, to the WebCT discussion list, and no later than Tuesday at 2:00 p.m.

2) Presentations: 10%

In addition, students will be assigned topics for which they will be responsible for leading class discussions. These seminar presentations are to be based on two readings from a given week. Presentations will be assigned at the beginning of the term, with each student presenting in a minimum of three seminars. Presentations should be no longer than 10 minutes, they should focus on key concepts, claims, issues etc, raised by the readings, and raise/pose questions for seminar discussions.

3) Short Papers: 4 x 10% = 40%

Each paper should take the form of critical discussion of a theme or hypothesis related to the readings from one week (excluding case studies). Papers should be handed in within one week of the class discussion of the topic. These essays are meant to be critical reviews of the work and must incorporate supplementary material. A minimum of two of these papers must be submitted no later than Wednesday October 29th.

4) Research Essay: 40%

Students are expected to submit an original analysis of a specific public policy issue, using literature drawn from the course syllabus. Specific paper topics must be discussed with the Instructor, and outlined in a written submission. Failure to submit a written outline of the proposed essay topic will result in an automatic penalty of -5/40 on the final paper. The essay will be no more than 25 pages, double-spaced. Additional details about and guidelines for the assignment will be distributed in class. The essay is due no later than **Monday December 8th, 2008 at 4 pm**. Late papers will be penalized at 5/40 per day, to a maximum of 20/40. Papers will not be accepted after Friday December 12th.

Course Schedule and Readings:

Most required and supplementary readings are available electronically through [MacOdrum Library](#). There are two required texts available through [Haven Books](#) (43 Seneca Street at Sunnyside):

- ♦ Sabatier, Paul A. (2007). *Theories of the Policy Process. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Second Edition. Boulder: Westview.
- ♦ North, Douglass C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Required readings that are not available electronically will be placed on reserve in the Political Science Resource Room, C666 Loeb. Please note that the Resource Room is open from 8:30 a.m. – 4:15 p.m., Monday to Friday.

1) Introduction: Major Approaches to Policy Analysis (September 10)

- ♦ May, P.J. (1986). Politics and policy analysis. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101(1):109-125
- ♦ Simeon, R. (1976). Studying public policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 9:548-580.
- ♦ Sabatier, Paul A. (2007). *Theories of the Policy Process. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Second Edition. Boulder: Westview. Chapter 1.

Supplementary Reading:

- ♦ DeLeon, Peter (1994). Reinventing the policy sciences: Three steps back into the future. *Policy Sciences* 27(1):77-95.
- ♦ 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.
- ♦ Schlager, E. (2007). A comparison of frameworks, theories and models of policy processes. In P.A. Sabatier, Ed., *Theories of the Policy Process. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Second Edition. Boulder: Westview
- ♦ Stone, Deborah (2002). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. Revised Edition. New York: Norton. Introduction, Chapters 1-5 (pp. 1-130)
- ♦ Torgerson, Douglas (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 19(1): 33-59.
- ♦ Weimer, D.L. & Vining, A.R. (1999). *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. Prentice Hall. Chapter 2: What is policy analysis?

2) Rational Choice Approaches (September 17)

- ♦ Green, Donald P. and Ian Shapiro (1994). *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapters 2 & 3, pp.13-46.
- ♦ 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.
- ♦ Levi, Margaret (1997). A model, a method and a map: Rational choice in comparative and historical analysis. In Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, eds., *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 174-207.
- ♦ Lindblom, Charles (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review*, 19(2):79-88.

Supplementary Reading:

- ♦ Landry, Réjean. (1996). Rational choice and Canadian policy studies. In L. Dobuzinskis et al (Eds.) *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: UT Press, 1996, 170-92.
- ♦ Olson, Mancur (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Boston: Harvard University Press. Ch. 1
- ♦ Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- ♦ 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, Kenneth A. (1989). Studying Institutions: Some lessons from the rational choice approach. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 1(2): 131-147.
- ♦ Weimer, D.L. & Vining, A.R. (1999). *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. Prentice Hall. Chapters 4-9

3) Multiple Streams: Chance and Rationality in the Policy Process (September 24)

- ♦ Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., Olsen, J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1):1-25.
- ♦ Zahariadis, N. (2007). The multiple streams framework: Structure, limitations, prospects. In Sabatier, *Theories*, Chapter 3.
- ♦ Zahariadis, N. (2008). Ambiguity and choice in European public policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(4):514-30.

Supplementary Readings

- ♦ Green-Pederson, C. & J.Wilkerson (2006). How agenda-setting attributes shape politics: basic dilemmas, problem attention and health politics developments in Denmark and the US. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(7):1039–1052
- ♦ Sabatier, Paul A. & Chris Wieble(2007). The advocacy coalition framework: Innovation and Clarification. In Sabatier, Paul A. (ed). *Theories of the Policy Process. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Boulder: Westview. Chapter 7
- ♦ Kingdon, J. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown
- ♦ True, J.L., B.D. Jones, F.R. Baumgartner (2007). Punctuated equilibrium theory: Explaining stability and change in American policy making. In Sabatier, *Theories*, Chapter 6

4) Rational Institutionalism: Rules and Rationality in the Policy Process (October 1)

- ♦ North, Douglass C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 to 11 (pp. 3-106)
- ♦ Ostrom, Elinor (2007). Institutional rational choice: An assessment of the IAD framework. In Paul Sabatier (ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Second Edition. Boulder: Westview. Chapter 2
- ♦ Scharpf, Fritz W. (1997). *Games Real Actors Play: Actor Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Boulder: Westview Press. Introduction & Chapter 1 (pp. 1-35)

Supplementary Reading:

- ♦ Downs, Anthony (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- ♦ Downs, Anthony (1960). Why the government budget is too small in a democracy. *World Politics* 12(4):541-63.

- ♦ March, James and Johan Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.
- ♦ Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge U.P, pp. 1-28.
- ♦ Pierson P. (1995). Fragmented welfare states: federal institutions and the development of social policy. *Governance* 8(4): 449-478.
- ♦ Scharpf, Fritz W. (1988). The joint decision trap: Lessons from German federalism and European integration. *Public Administration* 66(Autumn): 239-278.
- ♦ Shepsle, Kenneth A.(1989). Studying institutions: Some lessons from the rational choice approach. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1(2):131-47.

5) History and Path Dependence: Historical Institutional Approaches (October 8)

- ♦ Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C.R. Taylor (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44: 936-957.
- ♦ Peters, G. B., Pierre, J., & King, D. (2005). The politics of path dependency: Political conflict in historical institutionalism. *Journal of Politics*, 67, 1275-1300.
- ♦ Pierson, Paul (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*. 94(2):251-67.
- ♦ Thelen, K. (2004). *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 (pp. 1-38) & 6 (pp. 278-296).

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Berman S. (1998). Path dependency and political action: Reexamining responses to the Depression. *Comparative Politics*, 30(4):379-400.
- ♦ Page, Scott (2006). Path dependence. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 1(1): 87–115
- ♦ Pierson, Paul and Theda Skocpol. (2002). Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science. In Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner (eds.) *The State of the Discipline*. New York: Norton
- ♦ Pierson, Paul (2006). Public policies as institutions. In Ian Shapiro et. al. (eds.) *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State*, New York University Press:114-131.
- ♦ Pierson, Paul (1996). The path to European integration: a historical institutionalist analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*. 29(2):123-163.
- ♦ Steinmo, Sven, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth (1992). *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-32)
- ♦ Thelen, Kathleen (1999). Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2:369-404

6) Ideas, Political Institutions and Policy Change (October 15)

- ♦ Blyth, M. (2001). The transformation of the Swedish model: Economic ideas, distributional conflict, and institutional change. *World Politics*, 54(October):1-26.
- ♦ Hall, Peter A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning and the state. *Comparative Politics* 25(3):275-96.
- ♦ Lieberman, Robert C. (2002). Ideas, institutions, and political order: Explaining political change. *American Political Science Review* 96 (4):697-712.
- ♦ Hacker, Jacob S. (2004). Privatizing Risk without Privatizing the Welfare State: The Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 98(2)243-260.

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Blyth, M. M. (1997). 'Any more bright ideas?' The ideational turn of comparative political economy. *Comparative Politics*, 29, 229-250.
- ♦ Blyth, M. (2002). *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge University Press.
- ♦ Coleman, W. D., Skogstad, G., & Atkinson, M. M. (1997). Paradigm shifts and policy networks: Cumulative change in agriculture. *Journal of Public Policy*, 16, 273-301.
- ♦ 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. (1989). Conclusion: The Politics of Keynesian Ideas, in Hall, ed., *The Political Power of Economic Ideas*. Princeton University Press.
- ♦ Harrison, K. (2002). Ideas and environmental standard-setting: A comparative study of regulation of the pulp and paper industry. *Governance*, 15, 65-96.

7) Ideas As Causal Forces: Discourse, Policy Frames and Agenda Setting (October 22)

- ♦ Rein M. and D. Schön, (1999). Reframing policy discourse, in Frank Fischer and John Forester, eds. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Duke University Press. Pp. 145-166.
- ♦ Schmidt, V.A. (2001). The politics of economic adjustment in France and Britain: When does discourse matter? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8, 247-264.
- ♦ Scholten, P.W. & Van Nispen, F.K.M. (2008). Building bridges across frames? A meta-evaluation of Dutch integration policy. *Journal of Public Policy*, 28(02):181-205
- ♦ Stone, Deborah (1989). Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104(2): 281-300.

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Berman, S. (2001). Review article: Ideas, norms, and culture in political analysis. *Comparative Politics*, 33(2):231-250.
- ♦ Bhatia, V. & Coleman, W. D. (2003). Ideas and discourse: Reform and resistance in the Canadian and German health systems. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 36, 715-739.
- ♦ Braun, D. (1999). Interests or ideas? An overview of ideational concepts in public policy research. In D. Braun & A. Busch (Eds.), *Public Policy and Political Ideas* (pp. 11-29). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- ♦ Rochefort, David A. and Roger W. Cobb (1993). Problem definition, agenda access, and policy choice. *Policy Studies Journal* 21(1): 56-71.
- ♦ Fischer, Frank (2003). *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. London: Oxford University Press. Chapter 2: Constructing policy theory, pp. 21-47
- ♦ Schmidt, Vivien & Claudio Radaelli (2004). Policy change and discourse in Europe: Conceptual and methodological issues. *West European Politics*, 27(2):183-210.
- ♦ Surel, Y. (2000). The role of cognitive and normative frames in policy-making. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7(4), 495-512.
- ♦ Yee, A. S. (1996). The causal effects of ideas on policies. *International Organization*, 50, 69-108.

8) Actors and Ideas: Epistemic Communities and Policy Networks (October 29)

- ♦ Atkinson, Michael M. and William D. Coleman (1996). Policy networks, policy communities and the problems of governance. In Laurent Dobuzinkis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, eds., *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapter 11, pp. 193-218.

- ♦ Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. (1991). Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *The Journal of Politics* 53 (4): 1044–74.
- ♦ Haas, Peter (1992) Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1): 1-35.
- ♦ Thatcher, Mark (1998). The development of policy network analyses: From modest origins to overarching frameworks. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 10(4):389-416.

Supplementary Reading:

- ♦ Börzel, Tanya (1998). Organizing Babylon: On the different conceptions of policy networks. *Public Administration*. 76(2):253-73.
- ♦ Coleman, William D. and Anthony Perl (1999). Internationalized policy environments and policy network analysis. *Political Studies* 47(4): 691-709.
- ♦ Coleman, William D. and Grace Skogstad (1990). *Policy Communities and Public Policy in Canada*. Mississauga: Copp Clark Pitman.
- ♦ Dowding, Keith (1995). Model or metaphor? A critical review of the policy network approach. *Political Studies*, 43(1):136-58.
- ♦ Marsh, D. & Smith, M. (2000). Understanding policy networks: Towards a dialectical approach. *Political Studies*, 48, 4-21.

9) Feminist Policy Analysis (November 5)

- ♦ Bacchi, C. (2004). Policy and discourse: challenging the construction of affirmative action as preferential treatment. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11, 128-146.
- ♦ Hawkesworth, M. (1994). Policy studies within a feminist frame. *Policy Sciences*, 27(1):97-118.
- ♦ Kenny M. (2007). Gender, institutions and power: A critical review. *Politics*, 27(2): 91–100
- ♦ Phillips, Susan D. (1996). Discourse, identity, and voice: Feminist contributions to policy studies. In Laurent Dobuzinkis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, eds., *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Brush, L.G. (2003). *Gender and Governance*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, ch. 1.
- ♦ Boyd, Susan B. (1997). *Challenging the Public Private Divide: Feminism, Law and Public Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- ♦ Daly, M. and Rake, K. (2003). *Gender and the Welfare State*. Polity Press, pp. 1-48.
- ♦ Mazur, A. (2002). *Theorizing Feminist Politics*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- ♦ Mazy, S. (2000). Introduction: Integrating gender - intellectual and 'real world' mainstreaming. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 333-345.
- ♦ Williams, Fiona (1995). Race/ethnicity, gender, and class in welfare states: A framework for comparative analysis. *Social Politics* 2(2):127-59.

10) Power Resources Models of Distributional Policy (November 12)

- ♦ Graefe, P. (2007). Political economy and Canadian public policy. In M. Orsini and M. Smith, Eds., *Critical Policy Studies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- ♦ O'Connor, Julia and Gregg Olsen (1998). *Power Resources and the Welfare State*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Introduction and Chapter 1 (pp. 3-69).
- ♦ Bradley, D. et. al. (2003). Distribution and redistribution in postindustrial democracies. *World Politics*, 55(2):193-228.

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Boyer, Robert & Daniel Drache (1996). *States Against Markets: The Limits of Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- ♦ Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. (1985). Power and distributional regimes. *Politics and Society*, 14(2): 223-256.
- ♦ McBride, Stephan (1996). The political economy tradition in Canadian policy studies. In Laurent Dobuzinkis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, eds., *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- ♦ Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990). *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

11) Political Economy and Public Policy (November 19)

- ♦ 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*. Oxford University Press. [Available electronically through MacOdrum library]
- ♦ Thelen, K. (2001). Varieties of labor politics in developed democracies. In Hall, P.A. and D. Soskice, Eds., *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations to Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press. [Available electronically through MacOdrum library]
- ♦ Gindin, Sam & J. Stanford (2003). Canadian labour and the political economy of transformation. In W. Clement & L. Vosko, Eds., *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*. MQUP.

Supplementary Readings

- ♦ Campbell, J. L. (1998). Institutional analysis and the role of ideas in political economy. *Theory and Society*, 27, 377-409.
- ♦ Crouch, C., Streeck, W., Boyer, R. et. al. (2005). Dialogue on 'Institutional Complementarity' and Political Economy. *Socio-Economic Review* 3:359-382.
- ♦ Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, Voice & Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ Porter, M. (1990). *Competitive Advantage of Nations*. New York: Free Press, Chapters 2 (The Competitive Advantage of Firms in Global Industries) and 3 (Determinants of National Competitive Advantage).
- ♦ Vogel, S.K. (2005). Routine Adjustment and Bounded Innovation: The Changing Political Economy of Japan. In W. Streeck and K. Thelen, Eds., *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford University Press.

12) Globalization, Internationalization and Public Policy (November 26)

- ♦ Cohen, Edward S. (2000). Globalization and the boundaries of the state: A framework for analyzing the changing practice of sovereignty. *Governance*, 14(1):75-97.
- ♦ Bernstein S. and B. Cashore (2000). Globalization, four paths of internationalization and domestic policy change: The case of eco-forestry in British Columbia, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 33(2000): 67-99.
- ♦ Hoberg, G. (2001). Trade, harmonization and domestic autonomy in environmental policy. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 3(2001): 191-217.
- ♦ Skogstad, Grace (2000). Globalization and public policy: situating Canadian analyses. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 33(4): 805-828

Supplementary Reading

- ♦ Crelinsten, Ronald D. (2001). Policy making in a multi-centric world: the impact of globalization, privatization and decentralization on democratic governance. In Gordon Smith and Daniel Wolfish, eds., *Who is Afraid of the State? Canada in a World of Multiple Centres of Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapter 3, pp. 89-130.
- ♦ Gabriel, C. & Macdonald, L. (2003). Beyond the continentalist/nationalist divide: Politics in a North America 'without borders'. In W. Clement & L. Vosko, Eds., *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*. MQUP.
- ♦ Garrett, Geoffrey & Peter Lange (1995). Internationalization, institutions and political change. *International Organization*, 49, 627-655.
- ♦ Keohane, Robert O. (2001). Governance in a partially globalized world. *American Political Science Review*, 95(1):1-13.
- ♦ Knill, Christoph & Lehmkuhl, Dirk (2002). Private actors and the state: Internationalization and changing patterns of governance. *Governance*, 15(1):41-63.
- ♦ Reinicke, Wolfgang (1998). *Global Public Policy: Governing without Government*. Washington: Brookings Institute. Chapters 2-3.
- ♦ Weiss, Linda (1998). *The Myth of the Powerless State*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Last Revised: August 6, 2008