

## POLS 500: Graduate Seminar in Public Policy and Governance Dr. Alexandra Filindra

**Class meeting:** Wednesday 4:30-7:00pm

**Office Hours:** Wednesday 2-4pm and by appointment

**Email:** aleka@uic.edu

This class looks at the role of actors, institutions and processes that can influence policymaking at the federal level. Each week, we will analyze and discuss a different branch of government, guided by key research writings in the field. The types of questions we will ask are: What is agenda setting and who sets it and how? How does Congress make policy decisions? Whose preferences exactly do public laws reflect? What is the role of the President in the policymaking process? How do bureaucracies and bureaucratic politics supplement, help or hinder the policymaking process as well as policy outcomes? Do interest alone or also ideas play a role in the policy process?

The purpose of this course is two-fold: 1) to introduce you to the main theories of public policy development and formation; 2) to teach you how to “consume” these studies as a political scientist, how to analyze and evaluate these works and how to place them in the field. As part of this course, we will read upon and discuss the methodology of political science, the ontological assumptions that undergird our theories and methods, the strengths and limitations of different approaches and what makes for good and bad theory. By the end of this class, you should have the basic foundational knowledge and skills to start your own research project.

### Course Policies

Students are expected to read all assigned readings *prior* to coming to class. Attendance is required and so is participation in class discussion and in-class assignments. Students should be prepared to discuss the readings and introduce their own questions and critical comments to the topic at hand. All assignments are due on the specified day at the beginning of class. ***Late assignments will be penalized by a half-grade per day of delay.***

Students are expected to attend all classes and their grades will reflect their attendance record. Think of yourselves as training for a job and your job performance includes showing up. Should you need to be absent for a valid reason, please contact me *before* class to let me know that you will be absent and the reason for your absence. For multi-day absences I will need documentation.

Use of laptops in class is permitted as long as the computer is used for taking notes or for in-class exercises. Anyone discovered using the laptop for personal or other purposes (e.g. chatting, IMing, Facebook) will get a zero for a participation grade for the class. The first infraction will also lead me to ban computers from the classroom, so you will be responsible for your classmates’ loss of this privilege. I would strongly encourage you to take notes by hand on paper for several reasons: 1) research shows that taking notes on the computer tends to shift your brain to transcription mode: you do not cognitively engage with what is being said, rather you focus on getting it written down as accurately as possible. On the other hand, use of paper and pen requires you to engage cognitively because when writing, we tend to summarize speech rather than transcribe; 2) absence of a computer equals absence of temptation to check email, IM, Facebook and everything else.

### Code of Conduct

Plagiarism is a serious violation of the students’ code of conduct and will be treated with equal severity. Students are required to use proper citation and sourcing for all written work. No exceptions. You can select to use either APA or Chicago as long as you use it consistently throughout your work. (For Chicago: [http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools\\_citationguide.html](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html); For APA: <http://www.apastyle.org/>).

Wikipedia and other similar sources of information should NEVER be used as a direct source! The information provided in Wikipedia is not always trustworthy since it is anonymously produced and not checked. If you use something you found on Wikipedia, go to the original source to check it out.

According to school policy which can be found at <http://www.uic.edu/depts/dos/studentconduct.html>, there are several types of violations of academic integrity. Below, I have copied and pasted the definitions of all types of violations as presented in the school handbook.

Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will include, but not be limited to the following examples:

1. **Cheating** during examinations includes any attempt to (1) look at another student's examination with the intention of using another's answers for attempted personal benefit; (2) communicate in any manner, information concerning the content of the examination during the testing period or after the examination to someone who has not yet taken the examination; (3) use any materials, such as notebooks, notes, textbooks or other sources, not specifically designated by the professor of the course for student use during the examination period or (4) engage in any other activity for the purpose of seeking aid not authorized by the professor.
2. **Plagiarism** is the copying from a book, article, notebook, video or other source, material whether published or unpublished, without proper credit through the use of quotation marks, footnotes and other customary means of identifying sources, or passing off as one's own, the ideas, words, writings, programs and experiments of another, whether or not such actions are intentional or unintentional. Plagiarism also includes submitting, without the consent of the professor, an assignment already tendered for academic credit in another course.
3. **Collusion** is working together in preparing separate course assignments in ways not authorized by the instructor. Academic work produced through a cooperative (collaborative effort) of two or more students is permissible only upon the explicit consent of the professor. The collaboration must also be acknowledged in stating the authorship of the report.
4. **Lying** is knowingly furnishing false information, distorting data or omitting to provide all necessary, required information to the University's advisor, registrar, admissions counselor, professor, etc. for any academically related purpose.

### Citations Guide

You can select either Chicago or APA but for those of you who are not familiar with any specific citation style, please read through the following site which provides information on the Chicago style. It is commonly used in social sciences and easy to follow.

[http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools\\_citationguide.html](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html)

For your papers, I strongly encourage you to use **EndNote** (<http://endnote.com/>), a citation software which is available to you from the UIC online bookstore. EndNote allows you to build a digital library of the books and articles that you plan to use for your research and it automatically formats the bibliography and the inline citations in the appropriate style. It will save you a lot of time and will get you in the habit of adding citations while writing and editing not at the end of the process.

### When and How to Use Citations

According to the guidelines provided by the Library at American University, here are some instances when you need to use citations (<http://www.library.american.edu/tutorial/citation3.html>):

Citations not only locate a piece of writing within the **context** of a particular scholarly debate, they also allow writers to make claims based on the **authority of another expert**.

**For example:** a scientist researching the possibility of AIDS vaccines may rely on some data gathered by the Center for Disease Control. Using a citation, the scientist tells the reader **where the data was collected** and that the **authority** of the CDC **attests to its accuracy**.

Similarly in the Humanities, a scholar analyzing Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* may cite a philosopher or literary critic, like Michel Foucault. The scholar therefore identifies the **type of interpretive lens /**

**theoretical framework** being brought to the analysis. Critics may or may not accept the validity of the interpretive lens, but the scholar **won't have to re-create** the entire philosophy.

#### When do you need to use citations?

- When **quoting**
- When **paraphrasing** someone else's ideas
- When using a **statistic or direct fact**
- When you are using someone else's work as a **theoretical framework / interpretive lens**
- When you are relying upon **data collected by someone else**
- When you are relying upon **opinions or interpretations** articulated by someone else
- It will strengthen your case if you support any **key assertions** with citations to show support amongst experts for accepting the validity of those assertions

#### When do you not need to use citations?

- When stating **common knowledge** (knowledge that can be found in many sources OTHER than those in the bibliography). If you aren't sure that something is common knowledge, it probably isn't.
- When the ideas, opinions, interpretations **are your own**, (although it strengthens your case if you are able to cite others who would agree with you or whose work leads to similar conclusions).

**REMEMBER:** Citations and giving credit to others strengths your work because you bring to bear the authority of an “expert” to your findings and conclusions. The more people you cite, the more weight does your work have because you show that you have strong familiarity with the literature.

#### Class Requirements

1. **Papers (60% of grade):** You will write three papers (1,200-1,500 words). One paper will be a critical review of one of the books that we will be discussing each week. Two papers will be research designs, one on a week of your choice; the second will be on Tichenor's *Dividing Lines*. You will provide copies of your *research design* papers to everybody in the class- make copies!
2. **Leading class discussion (15% of grade):** Each of you will be class discussion leader for two weeks of your choosing. During that week, you will be responsible for the class and you should have read not only the required but also the suggested readings in order to bring additional material into the classroom. Remember: everyone is supposed to have read the required readings so you should provide value added to the students and to me. Presenters will distribute a 1-2 page summary brief for the week's readings. The summary should focus on the substantive and theoretical relationship between the readings and the rest of the literature. It is also your responsibility to come to my office and let me know of your plans on how to organize the class and what you plan to do, at least a few days before the class meets.
3. **Response papers (5% of grade):** On an alternate basis (one week the one and the next week the other), students who are not assigned to write a critical review or a research design paper should prepare 1) a short (no more than 500 words) critical summary of the readings; 2) a “reversed-engineered” research design for the week's assigned reading (also short, 500 words).
4. **Response to class-mates research designs and critical reviews (5% of grade):** Every class will begin with a half-hour discussion of the previous week's research designs. Everyone except for the authors will submit one-two paragraph critiques of the previous week's research designs. Bring copies for me and for the authors. This is a mini-peer review process, so be critical but also thoughtful, nice and helpful. The same goes for the critical reviews. Go through the person's paper, make comments, ask questions, and provide thoughtful editing. We will not be discussing your edits in class, but I will get a copy for my records.
5. **Class participation and department talk attendance (15% of the grade):** You are required to talk in class, respond to questions and have an informed and critical view of the literature. Furthermore, you are required to attend the department lecture series which will take place once or twice a month. You will be expected to have read the presenter's paper if made available, and ask

questions about it during the presentation. Also, we will discuss these presentations in class both for content and for form.

### **Required Books**

All books should be in the bookstore. You should also be able to find cheap used copies at Amazon.com, alibris.com and other sites that sell used books. You can order older editions if they are cheaper.

- King, G., R. Keohane, S. Verba (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Jacob Hacker (1999) *The Road to Nowhere*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- R. Douglass Arnold (1990) *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press (older editions are fine)
- Amy Zegart (2007) *Spying Blind: The CIA, the FBI and the Origins of 9/11*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Van Evera S. (1997) *to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Stone, D. (2011) *The Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision-making*. New York: W.W. Norton (older editions are fine)
- Pierson, Paul (2011) *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Weyland, Kurt (2007) *Bounded Rationality and Policy Diffusion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Olson, Mancur. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971 (older editions are fine)
- Daniel Tichenor (2002) *Dividing Lines*. Princeton University Press

## **The Four Questions** **(adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Analyzing and critiquing political science works requires you to think about four key questions. Each week, in your papers you should address these questions. For those of you writing critical reviews, these questions should be the focus of your entire paper. For those of you writing response papers, these questions should be answered in 1-2 cogent paragraphs.

A critical review paper should include the following information:

- 1. What is the book's main argument or causal mechanism?**
- 2. How does the book fit in the literature, how does it mesh with what came before it?**
  - a. What literature does this book speak to?
  - b. How well does it fit in this literature?
  - c. How does the literature fit in with the broader literature in political science?
- 3. What is the author's research design and how well is it conceived?**
  - a. Dependent variable (s): what is it? How well is it specified? How are they operationalized?
  - b. Independent variables: What are they? How well are they specified? How are they operationalized?
  - c. What is the nature of the causal connection? Does the author infer correlation? Causation?
  - d. What is the method used? Is it appropriate given the question being asked? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology?
- 4. If the author was presenting this work at a conference what probing/devastating/reputation-making question would you pose to him/her?**
  - a. Evidence used? Evidence validity?
  - b. Alternative explanations unaccounted for?
  - c. Implications

## **Guidelines for Writing Papers (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Good arguments and good writing are both essential to a good paper. Even if the argument is excellent, chances are that it will not be treated as such if the presentation is terrible. As a rule, bad writing is a sign of muddled thinking.

The purpose of these papers is to force you to think critically about how to understand and analyze public policy and theories of American politics. There are many different ways you can tackle a critical review assignment. For example, you may compare and contrast the ways two different authors approach the same problem. If you do that, you need to carefully specify the basis for your comparison (methodology, empirical evidence, etc) and show that you have apples-to-apples. You will also need to justify your selection of works to compare. Another option is to analyze an author's argument in light of the methodology used, seeking to illuminate us on whether given this methodology are the conclusions supported (i.e., does the author really connect dependent and independent variables? Are they specified in useful, meaningful ways? Is the connection plausible? Do you buy it?).

**Do not forget:** You only have 1,200-1,500 words which means no room for fluff. The introductory paragraphs should: 1) state the big question; 2) define the contending perspectives on it; 3) identify the critical grounds on which they differ; 4) explain how you are going to test them; 5) summarize your conclusions and the basis for these conclusions.

**One final piece of advice:** When you are finished with your draft, read the introduction and the topic sentences of the rest of the paragraphs in the paper. If doing so does not give you an absolutely clear picture/outline of your argument, something is wrong. Fix it.

## **Guidelines for Reverse Engineered Research Designs (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Books do not fall from heaven. In fact, the better the book, the less likely it is to have been immaculately conceived (though authors would love for you to think so!). The purpose of this assignment, therefore, is to get you to “reverse-engineer” the books we read, to figure out how they were made, and why they were made the way they were. Think of it as taking apart the machine and putting it back together piece-by-piece. As a budding political scientist, you need to be able to do this for two reasons: first, figuring out how books are written is an essential part of figuring out their strengths and weaknesses. Only if you understand what stuff they are made of, can you fully assess an empirical investigation's power. Second, understanding the mechanics of political science book-writing is part of the learning process. After all, your goal is to write one of these books, too.

Much like your answers to the “Four Questions,” your reverse engineered research designs should be short, tight sketches. They should, however, answer the following questions:

1. What is the author's big question? What's the conundrum (empirical/theoretical) that so intrigued the author that s/he *had to* write this book?
2. Given this conundrum, what hypotheses did the author develop to get at the big question (dependent variable; independent variables; intervening variables; asserted causal connections; etc)?
3. Given the author's conundrum, what were the alternative methods by which s/he could have puzzled out the answer?
4. Why did the author choose the method that s/he used?
5. How did the author define confirming/disconfirming data (i.e., how did s/he specify how s/he would KNOW if s/he was right?)

## **Guidelines for Research Designs (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

The purpose of this course is not only to make you informed consumers of the American politics and public policy literature, but to get you ready to produce it. Thus, two of the papers that you have to prepare for this course will not be mere critiques of the work of others. They will be research proposals that a political scientist may actually undertake. And to make this as realistic as possible, you will distribute copies of your research designs to everybody else and have to defend it for the first half hour of the next class. Furthermore, to keep everybody honest, all the other students in the class will give you (and me) a page of comments on your research design. Their comments will stress the following which are, by extension, the essential elements of a good research design. This is what you must keep in mind when preparing yours for them (and me) to critique.

1. A statement of the “big question” including reference to the relevant, competing analytic approaches;
2. A statement of the method and its applicability to the question at hand;
3. A definition of the dependent variable (including for example the expected range of variance, the time period of variance, or whatever is relevant and appropriate, sources for data);
4. Specification of the independent variable(s) and their characteristics and sources;
5. A statement of the hypothesized causal connection, the process that links the dependent and independent variables;
6. A statement about the unit of analysis and a good justification for it (i.e., how and why is it appropriate to the type of analysis you are proposing)
7. A statement of the type of evidence you intend to study. How is it applicable to the question at hand? What will constitute confirming/disconfirming evidence?

## **Guidelines for Presenters** **(adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE syllabus)**

Presenters have a lot of responsibility in this class. Collectively, we all depend on them to make the class work. You also have an individual incentive to make a great class presentation: part of your grade depends on it! Presentations should offer a very brief introduction and overview of the week's readings. *The main function of the presentations, however, is to raise the critical questions (substantive and methodological) that arise from the readings.* Presentations are not meant to be universally critical, but should be balanced assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the type of argument made in the readings, the variables used, the suggested causal mechanism, etc. Your presentation should consider the following questions, among others:

1. What is the literature that this week's readings talk to? How do they fit into this literature and more generally, how does this literature fit into the broader sweep of the literature we've covered so far?
2. What is the dependent variable? How (and how well) is it defined/specified? (I.e., what is this book about?)
3. What are the independent variables? How (and how well) are they defined/specified?
4. What is the nature of the causal connection that is hypothesized/asserted between independent and dependent variables and how, exactly, is it operationalized? (E.g., is this a correlational argument or is there a clear assertion of causation with the actual process of influence detailed?)
5. What is the method (game-theory, aggregate data, case study, etc)? How appropriate is it to the argument? What are the gains from its use-and what are the limitations it imposes?

REMEMBER: The purpose of your presentations is NOT to answer all these questions. It is to raise them. Nothing kills discussion quicker than the presentation of an open-and-shut case! And, to reemphasize the professional socialization theme, I will bore you with all semester, learning how to identify the core questions- and then pose them provocatively- is an essential skill if you are to succeed in the classroom and in political science more generally.

## **The Academic Whodunit, or How to Write the Perfect Formula Paper (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE syllabus)**

Many students, including the former student teaching this course, have benefited greatly from Dr. Shafer's "formula. This is the official "whodunit" approach to writing academic papers. Follow it closely and it will save you much grief in the future.

What is the first thing that happens in your average or not so average whodunit? You find a body- sometimes in the first sentence, but almost inevitably within the first couple of paragraphs. This in turn, occasions a series of thoughts and questions on the part of the reader like: oh, look, a body; and "who is it?" and "what did she die of?" and "why where they killed?," and "whodunit?" And, of course, the rest of the book then provides the reader with a logical deductive process by which all these questions are slowly answered and the beastly murderer unmasked.

Now, as in all good whodunits, the first, most essential thing in writing a good paper is the body. Like Agatha Christie, you may want to take a sentence or two to "set the scene"- but no more. Remember, your readers, unlike hers, want to get to the meat (sorry) immediately. What's the "moral equivalent" of a body? Your "problem," your "issue," your "big question." From the very first sentence or two, you've got to make your reader sit up and think, "well, hello, what have we here?" Then in rapid succession, you have to raise all the other appropriate questions: what happened? Why? With what consequences? Having done so, you can now take the reader in hand and lead them gently through the unmasking process. And remember, it is a logical process (no surprises here!) that ought to proceed in precisely the order suggested by the first paragraphs which were skillfully conceived to aim your unsuspecting reader unerringly in the murderer's direction. (I've always detested whodunits that achieve their effect only by leaving the reader ignorant of the one essential clue and so unable to sleuth along with the sleuth.)

Finally, let us recall the all-so-important differences between a whodunit and your perfect paper. First, unlike the author of a whodunit, you've got to give the reader the answer (YOUR answer), your murderer, up front with no pussy-footing around. From the very beginning, your reader ought to know what the question is, why it is important, what is the debate about it, how you intend to analyze it, and what your conclusion is. Second, unlike the author of a whodunit, your job is not to baffle and amuse by dragging in a clutter of interesting people, issues, data and other red herrings. This is why the hardest part of writing a good paper is writing the first, tight, perfect introductory paragraph or two- because they define rigorously what can and what cannot be included in what follows. The introduction should serve as a complete and easy to follow roadmap to your paper's argument and its architecture. If a given fact, issue, citation, etc. is not absolutely essential to unmasking the murderer, kill it! Remember, what impresses is not a tedious catalogue of all that you have read on the general subject of whatever, but a neat, efficient, no-frills presentation of just that which is essential to your case at hand.

## Week 1 (8/26/2015): Introduction to the class, requirements, expectations

### Required readings

- Weber, Max (1922) "Science as a vocation," <http://anthropos-lab.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Weber-Science-as-a-Vocation.pdf>
- Weber, Max (1922) "Politics as a vocation," <http://anthropos-lab.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Weber-Politics-as-a-Vocation.pdf>
- George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," [http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/politics/english/e\\_polit](http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/politics/english/e_polit)
- Gunnell, John (2006) "The Founding of the American Political Science Association: Discipline, Profession, Political Theory, and Politics." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 100, No. 4, Thematic Issue on the Evolution of Political Science, in Recognition of the Centennial of the Review (Nov., 2006), pp. 479-486
- Jackie Stevens, "Political Scientists are lousy forecasters," [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/opinion/sunday/political-scientists-are-lousy-forecasters.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/opinion/sunday/political-scientists-are-lousy-forecasters.html?_r=1)

### \*\*\*\*WEEK 2 (9/2/2015) CLASS IS CANCELLED DUE TO APSA CONFERENCE\*\*\*\*

- **HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT:** Go to <https://www.citiprogram.org/Default.asp?>. Register on the site and take the human subjects exam. This will familiarize you with the ethics of doing research involving human subjects. It will also be helpful later on when you begin on your own research and you will need IRB approval. Once you have completed the test, print out the confirmation page and bring it to class with you. Also keep a copy for your records because you will need it if you do an IRB.
- **Also:** Short summary of the following articles.
- VanEvera S. (1997) "How to Write a Paper," <http://web.mit.edu/17.423/www/writingtips.html>
- Farr, et.al. (2006) "The Policy Scientist of Democracy", APSR, Vol 100, Issue 4
- Dryzek, John (2006) "Revolutions without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science," APSR Vol. 100, Issue 4

## Week 3 (9/9/2015): Political science methodology: positivist approaches

### Required readings

- King, G., R. Keohane, S. Verba (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Part 1 and Part 3)
- Hempel, Carl (1945) "Criteria of Confirmation and Acceptability"

**TIP:** Although you are not required to buy these three books below, I strongly recommend that you do. They will be extremely useful for writing research papers and building your dissertation proposal and the thesis itself. You should take the time and read them cover-to-cover and probably multiple times throughout your career in graduate school.

### Optional:

- Little, Daniel (1991) *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- Ragin, Charles (1987) *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Studies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- Kuhn, Thomas (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- *The Chicago Manual of Style*, <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html> (Most political science journals use the Chicago style, so take the time to learn it now! It will come in handy when you write papers for class or for publication)
- *Endnote* (<http://www.endnote.com/>) is a software that allows you to build a bibliography and then it does the proper styling and citation by itself for every item that you choose to

incorporate. Other similar programs exist and the new version of Microsoft Word has a built-in citation system. Learn how to use them, they save time and aggravation.

#### **Week 4 (9/16/2015): Rational Choice and Public Policy**

##### **Required readings**

- DeLeon, Peter, "The Stages Approach to the Policy Process: What has it Done? Where is it Going?" in Sabatier, *Theories of the Policy Process* (1999)
- Ostrom, Elinor "Institutional Rational Choice: An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework" (same)
- Zachariadis, Nikos "Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams" (same)

##### **Optional readings**

- Green, D. and I. Shapiro (1996) *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Hirschmann, A.O. (1961) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy*.
- Axelrod, R. (1981) "The Emergence of Cooperation among Egoists," *APSR*, 75(2):306-318

#### **Week 5 (9/23/2015): Policy analysis methodology: constructivist approaches**

##### **Required readings**

- Stone, D. (2011) *The Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision-making*. New York: W.W. Norton

##### **Optional readings**

- Gibbons, M. (2006) "Hermeneutics, Political Inquiry, and Practical Reason: An Evolving Challenge to Political Science." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 100, No. 4, Thematic Issue on the Evolution of Political Science, in Recognition of the Centennial of the Review (Nov., 2006)
- Schneider and Ingram (1997) "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy," *The American Political Science Review*, 87(2):334-347
- Fischer, Frank "Beyond Empiricism: Policy Analysis as a Deliberative Practice," *Policy Studies Journal* (26)1:129-146
- Edelman, Murray (1988) *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Edelman, Murray (1985) *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press
- Geertz, Clifford (1973) "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books

#### **Week 6 (9/30/2015): Institutionalism and Public Policy**

##### **Required readings**

- Pierson, Paul (2011) *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

##### **Optional readings**

- Thelen, K. (1990) "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics," *Annual Reviews in Political Science*, 291) 369-384
- Lichbach, M. and A. Zuckerman (1997) *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Steinmo, Sven.1989. "Political Institutions and Tax Policy in US, Sweden, and Britain." *World Politics*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Jul., 1989), pp. 500-535

#### **Week 7 (10/7/2015): Psychological Perspectives on Policy**

- Weyland, Kurt (2007) *Bounded Rationality and Policy Diffusion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

##### **Optional readings**

- Jones, Bryan (2003) "Bounded Rationality and Political Science: Lessons from Public Administration and Public Policy," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 395-412. <http://www.esf.edu/es/felleman/696AM%20Bounded%20Rationality.pdf>

- Kuklinski, James and P. Quirk (2009) "Reconsidering the Rational Public: Cognition, Heuristics and Mass Opinion," <http://igpa.uillinois.edu/system/files/WP71-RationalPublic.pdf>
- Berejikian, Jeffrey D. 2002. *Model Building with Prospect Theory: A Cognitive Approach to International Relations*. *Political Psychology* 23:4 (December 2002): 759-786

## THE POLICY CYCLE

### Week 8 (10/14/2015): Issue Definition and Agenda Setting

#### Required readings

- Baumgartner, F. R. and B.D. Jones (1991) "Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems," *Journal of Politics*, 53(4): 1044-1074
- Hacker, Jacob (1999) *The Road to Nowhere*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

#### Optional readings

- Rochefort David and Roger Cobb (1994) "Problem Definition: An Emerging Perspective," in *The Politics of Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, pp. 1-31
- Kingdon, John W. (2003) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Longman (earlier editions are fine too; this is a MUST read)
- Burstein, Paul and Marie Bricher (1997) Problem Definition and Public Policy: Congressional Committees Confront Work, Family and Gender, 1945-1990," *Social Forces*, 75(4): 135-169
- Lakoff, George "Simple Framing" (<http://www.cognitivepolicyworks.com/resource-center/frame-analysis-framing-tutorials/simple-framing/>)
- Frameworks, "Framing Public Issues" (<http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/assets/files/PDF/FramingPublicIssuesfinal.pdf>)
- Eshbaugh-Soha, M. (2005) "The Politics of Presidential Agendas," *Political Research Quarterly*, 58(2):257-268
- Wood, D. B. and A. Vdlitz (2007) "Issue Definition, Information processing and the Politics of Global Warming," *AJPS*, 51(3): 552-568

### Week 9 (10/21/2015): Congress and policy-making

- R. Douglass Arnold (1990) *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

#### Optional readings:

- McCubbins, Matthew and Thomas Schwartz (1984) "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols vs. Fire Alarms," *American Journal of Political Science*, 28:165-179
- Binder, Sarah, "Can Congress Legislate for the Future?," <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2006/12/15governance-binder>
- Polsby, N. (1968) "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives." *APSR*, 62(March):144-68
- Fenno, Richard F. "[The House Appropriations Committee as a Political System: The Problem of Integration](#)." *American Political Science Review* 56, no. 2 (1962): 310-324.
- Mayhew, David R. (2004) *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

### Week 10 (10/28/2015): The Role of Interest Groups in Policymaking

#### Required readings

- Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57 (March): 45-56.
- Olson, Mancur. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971, chapters 1, 2, 5, and 6.
- Schattschneider, Elmer E. *The Semi-Sovereign People*. Florence, KY: Wadsworth Publishing, 1975, chapters 1-2.
- Ticehnor article

### Optional readings

- Walker, Jack L. "[The Origin and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America.](#)" *American Political Science Review* 77, no. 2 (1983): 390-406.
- Campbell, Andrea L. "[Self-Interest, Social Security, and the Distinctive Participation Patterns of Senior Citizens.](#)" *American Political Science Review* 96, no 3 (2002): 565-74.
- Riker, W. and P. Ordeshook (1968) "A Theory of the Calculus of Voting," *APSR*, 62(March): 25-42
- Dahl, R. (1961) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lowi, T. (1969) *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy and the Crisis of Public Authority*. New York: W.W. Norton (esp. Ch. 1-2)

### Week 11 (11/4/2015): Public Opinion and Policymaking

#### Required readings

- Bullock, J. (2011) "Elite Influence on Public Opinion in an Informed Electorate," *APSR*, 105(3)
- Wlezien, Christopher (1995) "The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol 39, pp. 981-1000
- Bartels, Larry (2005) "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in American Mind," *Perspectives on Politics*, (March 2005), pp. 15-31
- Lupia, et.al. response to "Homer" in the same issue of *Perspectives*
- Hacker Jacob and Paul Pierson (2005) "Abandoning the Middle: The Bush Tax Cuts and the Limits of Democratic Control," *Perspectives on Politics* (March 2005), 33-53

#### Optional readings

- Gerber, Elisabeth R. "[Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives.](#)" *American Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 1 (1996): 99-128.
- Page, B. I., and R. Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McKelvey, R.D., and P. Ordeshook. 1990. "Information and Elections: Retrospective Voting and Rational Expectations." In J. A. Ferejohn and J. H. Kuklinski, eds., *Information and Democratic Processes*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lupia, A., and M. D. McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Delli Carpini, M., and S. Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

### Week 12 (11/11/2015): Bureaucracy

#### Required

- Amy Zegart (2007) *Spying Blind: The CIA, the FBI and the Origins of 9/11*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

#### Optional readings

- Wilson, James Q. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1991, chapters 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9.
- Moe, Terry M. "[Control and Feedback in Economic Regulation: The Case of the NLRB.](#)" *American Political Science Review* 79, no 4 (1985): 1094-1116.
- Allison, Graham T. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *American Political Science Review* 63, no 4 (1969): 689-718.
- Cornelius Kerwin (2003) *Rulemaking: How Government Agencies Write Law and Make Public Policy*. Washington, DC: CQ Press

### Week 13 (11/18/2015): Political Participation & the Bureaucracy

- Moffit, Susan (2014) *Making Policy Public: Participatory Bureaucracy in American Democracy*. Cambridge University Press

#### Optional Readings

- Carpenter, Daniel. "The Evolution of National Bureaucracy in the United States." In *Institutions of American Democracy: The Executive Branch*. Edited by Joel D. Aberbach and Mark A. Peterson. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006, chapter 2
- Mc Cubbins, Mathew, Roger Noll, and Barry Weingast. "[Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control](#)." *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 3, no. 2 (1987): 243-77.

**Week 14 (11/25/2015): THANKSGIVING-NO CLASS**

**Week 15 (12/2/2015) The Politics of American Immigration Policy**

**Required:**

- Tichenor, Daniel (2002) *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

**Optional:**

- Smith, Rogers (1997) *Civil Ideals*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Ellermann, Antjie (2009) *States against Migrants: Deportation in the United States and Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gimpel James, and James Edwards (1998) *Congressional Politics of Immigration Reform*. New York: Longman
- Andreas, Peter (2009) *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Bosniak, Linda (2006) *The Citizen and the Alien*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.