

McMaster University
Winter 2017
Tuesdays, 8.30-11.20 am
KTH-732

Dr. Katherine Boothe
Office hours: Tuesdays 11.30am-1.30pm
or by appointment, KTH-525
boothek@mcmaster.ca

POLSCI 783 Comparative Public Policy

Focusing on policy encourages a focus on substance. After all, the main reason politics matters is because those who exercise political authority make decisions that have profound effects on their societies. To understand patterns in public policy is to understand a great deal about the content of politics, of what people are fighting for and why, and of why and how some are more successful than others.

-Paul Pierson, in *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 40, no. 2 (2007), p. 156.

Overview and course objectives

This course surveys a range of approaches to comparative public policy. It has two objectives. First, it seeks to impart an understanding of approaches used in comparative public policy in terms of their basic concepts, their conception of what studying policy entails, and the sorts of explanation they seek to provide. Second, it aims to encourage course participants to situate the different approaches in relation to one another along a number of axes (e.g., assumptions, levels of analysis, ability to explain different phenomena). At the end of the course, participants should be capable of critically discussing the merits of the different approaches, and of situating their own research within this field of competing theories.

Any week's required readings may include pieces devoted primarily to describing a particular approach to public policy, critiques of that approach, and illustrative applications of that approach, particularly when used in a comparative research design. For every reading before class, students should try to answer the following three basic questions in one sentence each: a) what is the reading's main research question; b) what is the answer to the research question; and c) what evidence is used to support that answer? Being able to identify the answers to each of these questions is the first step in preparing for class discussion. The course will proceed through in-class discussion of each week's readings, with discussions led by students on a rotating basis. Students will be evaluated on their comprehension and ability to apply the approaches analyzed over the course of the semester, as well as on their contribution to class discussions.

Course requirements & evaluation

The course mark will be based on the following components:

I.	Participation	20%
II.	Discussion leadership	10%
III.	Critical review paper	15%
IV.	Literature review	55%

1. Participation (20%, ongoing):

A central feature of a seminar is that students learn from each other through discussion. As

such, it is essential that all students do the readings in advance of the seminar and come prepared to participate actively in the class discussion. I strongly encourage you to think about what insights you can gain from the readings, not just what's "wrong" with them, which can be one's first inclination. Think about how the readings fit together (or don't), how they relate to readings in previous weeks, and especially how they relate to the topic of your literature review or policy debates with which you are familiar. I recognize that speaking in seminar can be intimidating at times, but it is a crucial skill in academia (and life!), and my goal is for our seminar to be an open-minded and considerate place to practice.

To help you prepare for class, I will post a reading guide and some discussion questions on Avenue by Tuesday at 4pm. You are required to **post a brief (350-500 word) response by Friday at midnight**. The response should include a preliminary answer to at least one question from my guide, at least one additional discussion question, and indicate familiarity with all the assigned readings. The best type of questions will be those that bridge, juxtapose, or somehow address multiple readings, highlighting theoretical or methodological similarities and differences. You should read your colleagues' responses before class, and **post at least one substantive response** (e.g. respond to their question or comment on additional questions it might raise, rather than saying "good point!"). You can skip one week's response without notice or penalty.

Students are expected to regularly read a newspaper with Canadian and international coverage and to contribute to class discussion on current events related to public policy. Each week, PhD students are expected to read at least one of the items included under additional readings as part of their PhD comprehensive preparation and reference the reading in their reflections, comments, and class discussion.

2. Discussion facilitation (10%, determined first week of class):

You will take on the role of discussion leader for one week, in some cases in collaboration with a fellow student. It will be the discussion leader(s)' responsibility to review their colleagues' responses on Avenue and **compile a discussion guide, submitted to me by email no later than Monday at 2pm**. The guide should include my questions and a synthesis of student questions (so you will have to merge, edit, and organize according to the themes you identify). During class, the discussion leader(s) will introduce the questions and key themes, explain why they are interesting or important, and initiate the discussion by proposing some answers, and facilitate throughout the seminar. The discussion guide should be prepared jointly when there is more than one student assigned to the week. The guide and facilitation are worth 10% of the final grade.

3. Critical review essay (15%, due beginning of class, date selected by student):

There are eleven weeks of readings in the class (after the first week and excluding the graduate conference). You must submit one critical review essay, for any week except the week you are acting as discussion leader – they are separate assignments and need to be done on distinct topics. I don't need to know in advance when you plan to submit your review essay. Essays are due every week at the start of class (not later than that, and late submissions will not be accepted and do not count as submissions...since you choose when you submit and when you don't, there really isn't any valid excuse for handing in something late).

Essays must be 1500 words in length, single-spaced and typed in a 12-point font (this is approximately three single-spaced pages). Review essays are NOT summaries of the readings. You are required to make links between readings, as well as providing a critical assessment of those readings. The essay should situate the readings and their research

question(s) in the literature and discuss strengths and weaknesses. How do these readings contribute to our understanding of why and how policies develop, vary, change, or remain the same?

4. Literature review (55% Research question due February 27, final paper due April 11):

This paper will constitute your assessment of some element of the literature on comparative public policy. It will be patterned after review articles that you can find in journals such as Comparative Politics, World Politics, and Annual Review of Political Science. You choose the topic, whether it is a key debate, conceptual definition, or the “state of the field” in some substantive area. The paper should survey the literature in this area and forward an argument about gaps, puzzles, shortcomings, progress in theoretical understanding or lack thereof in the literature. The paper should include empirical examples, whether from multiple countries or focusing on just one, to ground the analysis. Ideally, try to choose a paper topic that will help you with your own longer-term research agenda.

Choosing a good research question is the first step of a successful paper. **Research questions must be emailed to me by midnight, February 27.** You are encouraged to meet with me before this to discuss your ideas. Your question should be relatively well-developed at this point, which will require preliminary review of the literature you propose to address in your paper. Your research question may be developed from one of our weekly topics, but I expect you to consider links and debates across the weekly readings and draw on literature from more than one week. The only restriction on the topic is that it must be different from your short critical review essay.

Reviews should be 4500-6000 words (14-19 pages 1.5 spaced, standard 12-pt font and margins, excluding bibliography). MA students are expected to submit papers closer to the lower word limit and use at least 10 scholarly sources. PhD students are expected submit papers close to the maximum word limit and use at least 20 scholarly sources. Both source minimums include course readings.

Course policies

Contacting your instructor

I am very happy to meet to discuss any issues or concerns that arise over the course of the term. This includes further discussion of substantive topics in the course, feedback on your work, or problems you may be having completing assignments. If you cannot make my office hours, please e-mail me or talk to me in class to arrange another time to meet. **PLEASE DIRECT EMAIL TO MY MCMASTER.CA ACCOUNT, AS I DO NOT CHECK AVENUE EMAIL.** I aim to respond to email within 48 hours, but suggest that questions of a substantive nature are usually better handled in person.

Attendance

Regular attendance is expected of all students. Students who are unavoidably absent should report to me on return to classes.

Late assignments

There will be a penalty of 5% per day (including weekends) for late final papers. If you become seriously ill in advance of this assignment, it is important that you take steps to notify the instructor (me) about your situation so we can work something out.

McMaster Statement on Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty consists of misrepresentation by deception or by other fraudulent means and can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty"), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university. It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various kinds of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, specifically Appendix 3, located at: <http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies>

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

- Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one's own or for which other credit has been obtained.
- Improper collaboration in group work.
- Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Students who require academic accommodation must contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. Academic accommodations must be arranged for each term of study. Student Accessibility Services can be contacted by phone 905-525-9140, ext. 2865 or e-mail sas@mcmaster.ca. For further information, consult McMaster University's Policy for Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.

Course Modifications

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check his/her McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

Statement on Electronic Resources

In this course we will be using AvenueToLearn. Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

Faculty of Social Sciences E-Mail Communication Policy

Effective September 1, 2010, it is the policy of the Faculty of Social Sciences that all e-mail communication sent from students to instructors (including TAs), and from students to staff, must originate from the student's own McMaster University e-mail account. This policy protects confidentiality and confirms the identity of the student. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that communication is sent to the university from a McMaster account. If an instructor becomes aware that a communication has come from an alternate address, the instructor may not reply at his or her discretion.

Course Schedule

Week 1, Jan 10	Introductions, Course Overview
Week 2, Jan 17	Introduction to theory and methods
Week 3, Jan 24	Power Resource Theories
Week 4, Jan 31	Pluralism and Neo-Pluralism
Week 5, Feb 7	Graduate Conference – CIBC Hall
Week 6, Feb 14	Rational choice institutionalism

READING WEEK – NO CLASS FEB 21

Week 7, Feb 28	Historical institutionalism	QUESTION DUE
Week 8, Mar 7	Institutional change and policy change	
Week 9, Mar 14	Ideas: framing and mental models	
Week 10, Mar 21	Learning	
Week 11, Mar 28	Cross-jurisdictional influences	
Week 12, April 4	Public opinion	

FINAL PAPERS DUE APRIL 11 by 4pm

Course Readings

Articles marked [*] are available on Avenue. All other readings should be accessed online through the McMaster library or at the web address indicated.

In addition to the articles and book chapters, there is one required text: **Parsons, C. (2007). How to map arguments in political science. Oxford: Oxford University Press.** There are a limited number of copies available from the Campus Store. The book is on two-hour reserve at Mills Library, or may be purchased as an e-book from major online retailers. Please note that if you intend to order a hardcopy from an online retailer there is likely to be a shipping delay. **Please let me know if you have any difficulties accessing a copy, and note that reading the assigned chapters is essential.** We don't read one every week, but they provide a crucial framework to our discussion of different types of explanations.

Bold in recommended list: reading highly recommended and/or on PhD comp list

1. Introduction to course (Jan 10)

No assigned readings – however the readings for week 2 are heavy, so I advise you to get a head start.

2. Introduction to theory and methods (Jan 17): What sort of knowledge can we develop about why we get the policies that we do? How might comparison aid us in developing that knowledge? How can we distinguish between different approaches to explaining political action?

Each week per Parsons, ask if readings aim to explain action (are they successful/convincing? what else might they try to do?) and ask about the underlying logic of that explanation

Parsons, Craig. 2007. How to Map Arguments in Political Science, introduction and chapter 1.

*Hall, Peter. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research." In Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences, eds. James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. New York: Cambridge University Press.

*George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. Chapter 10: Process Tracing and Historical Explanation. In *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

* Taylor, Mark Zachary. 2007. "Bivariate & Multivariate Regressions: A Primer." Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, Georgia Institute of Technology, unpublished paper.

Additional Reading:

Lieberson, Stanley. 1992. "Small N's and big conclusions: an examination of the reasoning in comparative studies based on a small number of cases." In *What is a case?*, Ragin and Becker, eds. New York: Cambridge

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 99, 3 (August): 435-452.

Mahoney, James. "Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics," *Comparative Political Studies* 40:2 (2007), 122-144.

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball and Kendra L. Koivu. 2009. "The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences," *Comparative Political Studies*, 42:1 114-146.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14: 227-249.

Phillips, S. D. (1996). Discourse, identity, and voice: Feminist contributions to policy studies. In L. Dobuzinkis, M. Howlett, & D. Laycock (Eds.), *Policy studies in Canada: The state of the art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Symposia on qualitative vs quantitative methods in *Political Analysis* 14 (2006) and 18 (2010), including papers by Schrodt; Beck; Brady, Collier, and Seawright.

American Political Science Association's Organized Section on Qualitative and Multi-Method Research semi-annual newsletter. Copies available at:

<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletters/>

Ragin, Charles. 1986. *The Comparative Method*. Berkeley: UC Press.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Seawright, Jason and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly* 61, 2 (June): 294-308.

Shapiro, Ian. "Problems, methods, and theories in the study of politics, or: what's wrong with political science and what to do about it," and Frances Fox Piven, "The politics of policy science" in Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud (eds.) *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics* (Cambridge U.P., 2004), 19-41, 83-105.

Steinberg, Paul F., "Causal Assessment in Small-N Policy Studies," *Policy Studies Journal* 35:2 (2007), 181-204.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1995. "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide in Political Science." *American Political Science Review*, 89, 2 (June): 471-474.

Walby, Sylvia. 2005. "Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice." *Social Politics* 12, 3: 321-343.

Wolf, Frieder. 2010. "Enlightened Eclecticism or Hazardous Hotchpotch? Mixed Methods and Triangulation Strategies in Comparative Public Policy Research." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 4, 2: 144-167.

3. Power Resources Theories (Jan 24): Does capitalism shape policy outcomes, and if so, how do concepts of class help illustrate that shaping? What are the limits to this sort of analysis?

Parsons, chapter 2: Structural explanation

*Korpi, Walter. "The Power Resources Model," in Christopher Pierson and Francis G. Castles (eds) *The Welfare State Reader* (Polity Press, 2000), 77-88.

*Esping-Andersen, Gosta. "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism," in Christopher Pierson and Francis G. Castles (eds) *The Welfare State Reader* (Polity Press, 2000), 154-169.

Orloff, Ann Shola. "Gendering the Comparative Analysis of Welfare States: An Unfinished Agenda," *Sociological Theory* 27:3 (2009) 317-343. **(also highly recommend her 1993 piece below)**

Dion, Michelle. 2005. "The Political Origins of Social Security in Mexico during the Cárdenas and Ávila Camacho Administrations." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 21, 1 (Winter): 59–95.

Additional Reading:

Annesley, Claire, Francesca Gains and Kirstein Rummery, "Engendering politics and policy: the legacy of New Labour," *Policy & Politics* 38:3 (2010) 389-406.

Banaszak, Lee Ann *The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Banaszak, Lee Ann Karen Beckwith and Dieter Rucht, "When Power Relocates. Interactive Changes in Women's Movements and States," in Lee Ann Banaszak, Karen Beckwith and Dieter Rucht (eds) *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Blakely, Georgina and Valerie Bryson (eds.) *Marx and Other Four Letter Words* (Pluto Press, 2005), esp. ch. 1-4.

Finkel, Alvin, "The State of Writing on the Canadian Welfare State: What's Class Got to Do with It?" *Labour/Le Travail* 54 (2005) 151-74.

Graefe, Peter "Political Economy and Canadian Public Policy," in Miriam Smith and Michael Orsini (eds.) *Critical Policy Studies* (UBC Press, 2007).

Huber, Evelyne and John D. Stephens. 2000. "Partisan Governance, Women's Employment, and the Social Democratic Service State." *American Sociological Review*, 65, 3 (June): 323-342.

Huber, Ragin, and Stephens. 1993. "Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure and the Welfare State" *American Journal of Sociology*, 99 (3): 711-749.

Korpi, Walter, and Joakim Palme. "New Politics and Class Politics in the Context of Austerity and Globalization: Welfare State Regress in 18 Countries, 1975-95." *American Political Science Review* 97:3 (2003) 425-446.

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. *key comparison of PRA and VoC arguments about origins of welfare state

Mahon, Rianne, "From 'Bringing' to 'Putting': The State in late Twentieth-Century Social Theory," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 16:2 (1991) 119-144.

Mahon, Rianne, "Swedish Social Democracy: Death of a Model?" *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (2000) 27-59.

Manow, Philip. 2009. Electoral rules, class coalitions and welfare state regimes, or how to explain Esping-Andersen with Stein Rokkan. *Socioecon Rev* (2009) 7 (1): 101-121.

O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Shola Orloff and Sheila Shaver, *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada and Great Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), ch. 1.

Orloff, Ann. 1993 "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship." *American Sociological Review*, 58: 303-328.

Panitch, Leo. "The Impoverishment of State Theory," *Socialism and Democracy* 13:2 (1999) 19-35.

Swenson, P. 1991. "Bringing Capital Back In, or Social Democracy Reconsidered: Employer Power, Cross-Class Alliances, and Centralization of Industrial Relations in Denmark and Sweden." *World Politics*, 43(4):513-544.

Winders, Bill, "Maintaining the Coalition: Class Coalitions and Policy Trajectories," *Politics & Society* 33:3 (2005), 387-423.

4. Pluralism and Neo-Pluralism (Jan 31): How do groups affect the policy process? What reflects their relative success? What are the limits of understanding policy as the outcome of group conflict and cooperation?

Smith, Martin J. "Pluralism, Reformed Pluralism and Neopluralism: The role of pressure groups in policy-making," *Political Studies* 38:2 (1990) 302-22. **(Example of review article)**

*Olson, Mancur. 1984. *The Rise and Decline of Nations*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, Chapter 2: The Logic.

Mares, Isabella. 2000. Strategic Alliances and Social Policy Reform: Unemployment Insurance in Comparative Perspective. *Politics and Society*, 28(2), 223–244.

Banack, C. (2016). Understanding the Influence of Faith-Based Organizations on Education Policy in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 48(04), 933–959.

Additional Reading:

Dye, Thomas R. and L. Harmon Zeigler, *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*, 3rd Ed. (Duxbury Press, 1975), p. 3-6 ("Meaning of Elitism") and p. 9-13 ("Meaning of Pluralism").

Eising, Rainer "The access of business interests to EU institutions: towards élite pluralism?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 14:3 (2007) 384-403.

Farnsworth, Kevin and Chris Holden. 2006. "The Business-Social Policy Nexus: Corporate Power and Corporate Inputs into Social Policy." *Journal of Social Policy* 35, 3: 473-494.

Hacker, Jacob and Paul Pierson. 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 (skim 152-167, focus on 168-204).

Jordan, Grant "The Pluralism of Pluralism: An Anti-Theory?" in Jeremy Richardson (ed.) *Pressure Groups* (Oxford University Press, 1993), 49-68.

Lindblom, Charles E. "The Market as Prison," *Journal of Politics*, vol. 44, no. 2 (1982), 324-336.

Macdonald, Douglas. *Business and Environmental Politics in Canada* (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2007), ch. 4.

Mares, Isabela. 2003. "The Sources of Business Interest in Social Insurance: Sectoral versus National Differences." *World Politics*, 55, 2 (Jan.): 229-258.

McFarland, Andrew S. *Neopluralism: the evolution of political process theory* (University Press of Kansas, 2004).

Michalowitz, Irina "What determines influence? Assessing conditions for decision-making influence of interest groups in the EU," *Journal of European Public Policy* 14:1 (2007) 132-152.

Polsby, Nelson W. How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative. *The Journal of Politics* 22, 3 (Aug., 1960), 474-484.

Polsby, Nelson W. *Community Power and Political Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), chapter 7 (“Notes for a Theory of Community Power”)

Swank, Duane and C. Martin, “Employers and the Welfare State,” *Comparative Political Studies* 34:8 (2001), 899-923.

Thelen, Kathleen. 2003. “The Political Economy of Business and Labour in Developed Democracies.” In I. Katznelson and H. Milner, eds., *Political Science: the State of the Discipline*. New York: Norton, 371-397.

Additional reading on varieties of capitalism:

Hall, Peter A. and Soskice, David. 2001. “An Introduction to varieties of capitalism.” In Peter A. Hall and David Soskice, eds, *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1-68.

Hall, Peter A. and Daniel W. Gingerich. 2009. “Varieties of Capitalism and Institutional Complementarities in the Political Economy: An Empirical Analysis.” *British Journal of Political Science*, 39:449-482.

Iverson, Torben and John D. Stephens. 2008. “Partisan politics, the welfare state, and three worlds of human capital formation.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (4/5): 600-37.

Thelen, Kathleen. 2012. “Varieties of Capitalism: Trajectories of Liberalization and the New Politics of Social Solidarity.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15: 137-159.

Thatcher, Mark. “Varieties of Capitalism in an Internationalized World: Domestic Institutional Change in European Telecommunications.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 37, 7 (September 2004): 751-780.

Estevez-Abe, Margarita. 2006. “Gendering the Varieties of Capitalism: A Study of Occupational Segregation by Sex in Advanced Industrial Societies. *World Politics*, 59, 1 (October) 142-175.

5. Graduate conference (Feb 7)

We will be attending *Mapping the Global Dimensions of Public Policy*, a graduate student conference, in CIBC Hall. Attendance will be taken; participation in a Q&A session is worth a bonus participation point.

6. Rational Choice Institutionalism (Feb 14): Institutions are often described as “the rules of the game”, and this is particularly relevant for approaches that understand policy to be driven by strategic actors working within institutional constraints. If we accept certain assumptions about actors’ rationality, what do these works tell us about the types of constraints posed by different institutions? How do they help us explain cross-jurisdictional policy variation?

Parsons, chapter 3: Institutional explanation

Tsebelis, George. 1995. “Decision making in political systems: Veto players in presidentialism, parliamentarism, multicameralism and multipartyism.” *British Journal of Political Science*, 25(3): 289-325.

*Immergut, Ellen M. 1992. The rules of the game: The logic of health policy-making in France, Switzerland, and Sweden. In *Structuring politics: Historical institutionalism in comparative analysis*. Eds. Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ganghof, S. (2011). Promises and Pitfalls of Veto Player Analysis. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 9(2), 1–25.

Also read “Mothers and others” post by Bittner and Thomas on St. John’s Status of Women Council blog: see reading guide for questions about gender and vetoes.

<http://sjwomenscentre.ca/2016/02/01/mothers-and-others-understanding-the-relationship-between-parenthood-and-politics/>

Additional Reading:

Campbell, John L. and Ove K. Pedersen. 2007. “The Varieties of Capitalism and Hybrid Success: Denmark in the Global Economy.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 40, 3: 307-332.

Campbell, John L. *Institutional Change and Globalization* (Princeton University Press, 2004), ch. 1.

Chappell, Louise. 2006. “Comparing Political Institutions: Revealing the Gendered “Logic of Appropriateness”, *Politics & Gender* 2(2): 223-235. (PhD students: read alongside March and Olsen, below)

Crepaz, Markus and Ann W. Moser. 2004. “The Impact of Collective and Competitive Veto Points on Public Expenditures in the Global Age.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 37, 3: 259-285.

Driscoll, Amanda and Mona Lena Krook, “Can there be a feminist rational choice institutionalism?” *Politics & Gender* 5:2 (2009), 238-245.

Haggard, Stephan, and Matthew D. McCubbins, eds. *Presidents, Parliaments, and Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001, Chapters 1-3 [veto players and economic policy].

Harrison, Kathryn. 1996. “The Regulator’s Dilemma: Regulation of Pulp Mill Effluents in the Canadian Federation.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 29(3): 469-496.

Iversen, Torben and Soskice, David. 2001. “An asset theory of social policy preferences.” *American Political Science Review*, 95, 4:875-893.

March and Olsen. 1984. *The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life. American Political Science Review* 78:734-749

Mahler, Vincent. 2004. “Economic Globalization, Domestic Politics, and Income Inequality in the Developed Countries: A Cross-National Study.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 37, 9 (November):

Moe, Terry M. “Power and Political Institutions,” *Perspectives on Politics*, 3:2 (2005) 215-231.

Ostrom, Elinor. 2007. “Institutional Rational Choice: An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework.” in Paul Sabatier, (ed) *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder: Westview.

Peters, B. Guy. 1999. “Institutionalisms Old and New,” in *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The ‘New Institutionalism’* Pinter.

Scharpf, Fritz W. 2000. “Institutions in Comparative Policy Research.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 33: 6:7.

Scarpf, Fritz W. 1997. *Games Real Actors Play: Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research, Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Introduction, Chapter 2

Steinmo, Sven. 1989. “Political Institutions and Tax Policy in the United States, Sweden, and Britain.” *World Politics* 41 (July): 500-535.

Tsebelis, George and Eric C. C. Chang. 2004. “Veto players and the structure of budgets in advanced industrialized countries.” *European Journal of Political Research*, 43: 449-476.

READING WEEK, NO CLASS FEBRUARY 21

DRAFT RESEARCH QUESTION DUE VIA EMAIL, FEB 27 BY MIDNIGHT

7. Historical Institutionalism (Feb 28): It is common to say that past policies – policy legacies – have important impacts on current and future policymaking. How and why do they have these effects?

Pierson, P., (1993). When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change. *World Politics*, 45(4), 595–628. **(Example of review article)**

Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 369-404.

*Grace, J. (2011). Gender and Institutions of Multi-level Governance: Child Care and Social Policy Debates in Canada. In M. L. Krook & F. Mackay (Eds.), *Gender, Politics and Institutions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Brady, D., Marquardt, S., Gauchat, G., & Reynolds, M. M. (2016). Path Dependency and the Politics of Socialized Health Care. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 41(3), 355–392.

Additional Reading:

Capoccia, G., & Kelemen, R. D. (2007). The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism. *World Politics*, 59(03), 341–369.

Hacker, Jacob. 1998. The Historical Logic of National Health Insurance: Structure and Sequence in the Development of British, Canadian, and U.S. Medical Policy. *Studies in American Political Development* 12 (1998): 57-130.

Hall, Peter A. and Kathleen Thelen. 2009. "Institutional change in varieties of capitalism." *Socio-Economic Review* 7(1):7-34.

Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies*, 44(5), 936-57.

Howlett, Michael and Jeremy Rayner, 2006. "Understanding the historical turn in the policy sciences: A critique of stochastic, narrative, path dependency and process-sequencing models of policy-making over time," *Policy Sciences* 39(1):1-18.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics." *American Political Science Review*, 94, 2: 251-267.

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): 117-47.

Thatcher, Mark. 2004. "Varieties of Capitalism in an Internationalized World: Domestic Institutional Change in European Telecommunications," *Comparative Political Studies* 37(7): 751-80.

Waylen, Georgina. 2009. "What can historical institutionalism offer feminist institutionalists?" *Politics & Gender* 5(2):245-53.

Williams, Russell Alan. 2009. "Exogenous Shocks in Subsystem Adjustment and Policy Change: The Credit Crunch and Canadian Banking Regulation," *Journal of Public Policy*, 29(1): 29-53.

8. Institutional change and policy change (Mar 7): Theories of gradual institutional change seek to address a longstanding criticism of historical institutional approaches: that they only have room for exogenous change. This week's readings ask, can we theorize endogenous change in institutions and public policy?

- *Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen. 2010. A Theory of Gradual Institutional Change. In Mahoney and Thelen, eds. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010, 1-37.
- *Onoma, Ato Kwamena. 2010. The contradictory potential of institutions: the rise and decline of land documentation in Kenya. in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (eds) *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hacker, J. S. (2004). Privatizing Risk without Privatizing the Welfare State: The Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States. *The American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 243–260.
- *Costa, A. P. G. (2013). Long-Term Care Italian Policies: A Case of Inertial Institutional Change. In *Reforms in Long-Term Care Policies in Europe* (pp. 221–241). New York, NY: Springer New York.

Additional Reading:

- Capano, Gliberto (2009) "Understanding Policy Change as an Epistemological and Theoretical Problem," *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 11(1):33-46.
- Howlett, Michael and Benjamin Cashore, (2009) "The Dependent Variable Problem in the Study of Policy Change: Understanding Policy Change as a Methodological Problem," *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 11(1):7-31
- Patashnik, Eric. 2003. After the Public Interest Prevails: The Political Sustainability of Policy Reform. *Governance* 16(2): 203-234.
- Streeck, W., & Thelen, K. A. (2005). *Beyond Continuity*. New York: Oxford University Press, see especially chapter 1.**

9. Ideas - framing and mental models (Mar 14): During the week on rational choice, we took actors' preferences as a given. This week, we take preferences as something that needs to be explained by *ideas*. What do you see as the main points of conflict or congruence between these approaches to the role of ideas? What are some of the particular challenges of studying ideas, and do you think the authors address them appropriately?

Parsons chapter 4: Ideational explanation

- Berman, S. 1998. *The Social Democratic Moment: Ideas and Politics in the Making of Interwar Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Chapter 2.
- Jacobs, A. M. 2009. How Do Ideas Matter?: Mental Models and Attention in German Pension Politics. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(2), 252–279.
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334–347.
- Bleich, Erik. 2002. Integrating Ideas into Policy-Making Analysis: Frames and Race Politics in Britain and France. *Comparative Political Studies* 35(9):1054-1076.

Additional Reading:

- Béland, D., & Cox, R. H. (Eds.). 2011. *Ideas and politics in social science research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. See especially chapter 1 and 3.**
- Bell, S. 2011. Do We Really Need a New "Constructivist Institutionalism" to Explain Institutional Change? *British Journal of Political Science*, 41(04), 883–906.
- Bell, S. 2012. Where Are the Institutions? The Limits of Vivien Schmidt's Constructivism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42, 714–719.
- Blyth, M. 1997. "Any more bright ideas?" The ideational turn of comparative political economy.

Comparative Politics, 29(2), 229–250.

Blyth, M. 2002. *Great transformations: Economic ideas and institutional change in the twentieth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blyth, M. 2003. Structures Do Not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science. *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(04), 695–706.

Jerit, J. (2009). How Predictive Appeals Affect Policy Opinions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 411–426

Korteweg, A. C. (2006). The Construction of Gendered Citizenship at the Welfare Office: An Ethnographic Comparison of Welfare-to-Work Workshops in the United States and the Netherlands. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 13(3), 314–340.

Lewis, Jane. “Work/Family Reconciliation, Equal Opportunities and Social Policies: The Interpretation of Policy Trajectories at the EU level and the Meaning of Gender Equality,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 13:3 (2006) 420-437.

Schmidt, V. A. 2008. Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1), 303–326.

Schmidt, V. A. 2012. A curious constructivism: a response to Professor Bell. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42, 705–713.

Schmidt, Vivien A. 2002. “Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment?” *Comparative Political Studies* 35: 168-93.

Stone, Deborah. 1989. Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104:289-300

Williams, Fiona “Race/ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Welfare States: A Framework for Comparative Analysis,” *Social Politics* 2:2 (1995) 127-59.

Yee, Albert S. 1996. The causal effects of ideas on policies. *International Organization*, 50, 1.

Yves Surel. 2000. “The Role of Cognitive and Normative Frames in Policy-Making,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 7:4: 495-512.

10. Learning (Mar 21): Some of the earlier uses of ideas as an explanatory factor (see Hecló 1974) discuss the way policymakers learn about a policy and how this leads to policy change. How do different authors use the concept of learning?

Hall, Peter A. 1993. “Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain.” *Comparative Politics*, 25, 3 (April): 275-296.

Oliver, Michael J. and Hugh Pemberton, 2004. “Learning and Change in 20th-Century British Economic Policy,” *Governance* 17(3): 415-441.

Béland, Daniel. 2006. “The Politics of Social Learning: Finance, Institutions, and Pension Reform in the United States and Canada,” *Governance*, 19, 4: 559-583.

Mahon, R. (2005). Rescaling Social Reproduction: Childcare in Toronto/Canada and Stockholm/Sweden. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(2), 341–357.

Additional Reading:

Bennett, Colin J. and Michael Howlett. 1992. “The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change.” *Policy Sciences*, 25, 3: 275-94.

Hecló, Hugh. 1974. *Modern Social Policies in Britain and Sweden: From Relief to Income Maintenance*. Yale: Yale University Press. Chapter 6.

11. Cross-jurisdictional influences (Mar 28): This week we take a broader view of learning to ask how jurisdictions learn from one another – or emulate others’ policies, or draw

negative lessons from others' mistakes. Under what conditions do policies "spread" beyond national boundaries?

Dolowitz, David P. and David Marsh. 2000. "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making," *Governance* 13(1): 5-24.

James, Oliver and Martin Lodge. 2003. "The Limitations of 'Policy Transfer' and 'Lesson Drawing' for Public Policy Research." *Political Studies Review*, 1, 2: 179-193.

Illic, Mary and Kathryn Harrison. 2007. "Protecting Endangered Species in the US and Canada: The Role of Negative Lesson Drawing," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 40(2): 367-394.

*Kollman, Kelly. 2011. Same-Sex Unions Legislation and Policy Paradigms: Something Borrowed, Yet Something New. In G. Skogstad, *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism, and Domestic Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Additional Reading:

Bernstein, Steven and Benjamin Cashore. 2000. Globalization, Four Paths of Internationalization, and Domestic Policy Change: The Case of EcoForestry in British Columbia, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 33:67-99.

Dolowitz, David and David Marsh, "Who Learns What from Whom? A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature," *Political Studies* 44 (1996) 343-57.

Lodge, Martin. 2003. "Institutional Choice and Policy Transfer: Reforming British and German Railway Regulation." *Governance*, 16, 2: 159-178.

MacRae, Heather. 2006. "Rescaling Gender Relations: The Influence of European Directives on the German Gender Regime," *Social Politics* 13(4): 522-50.

Stone, Diane "Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks," *Policy Studies Journal* 36:1 (2008), 19-38.

Skogstad, Grace (ed). 2011. *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism, and Domestic Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weyland, K. 2005. "Theories of Policy Diffusion: Lessons from Latin American Pension Reform." *World Politics*, 57, 2: 262-295.

12. Public opinion (April 4): The ability of public opinion to influence policy is a key assumption of democratic governance. Is it also problematic? Under what conditions do we expect public opinion to have a significant influence – or not?

Parsons chapter 5: Psychological explanation p.133-136, 143-144, 156-160 (you are welcome to read the whole chapter, but this week we mainly focus on how public opinion relates to psychological explanation, and how it differs from/is similar to ideational and institutional explanation)

Burstein, P. 2006. Why Estimate of the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy are Too High: Empirical and Theoretical Implications. *Social Forces* 84(4): 2273-2289.

Cook, Fay Lomax, Jason Barabas and Benjamin I. Page. 2002. Invoking Public Opinion: Policy Elites and Social Security. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66(2): 235-264.

Eichenberg, R. C. (2003). Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Use of Force by the United States, 1990-2003. *International Security*, 28(1), 110–141.

Gidengil, E. (2007). Beyond the Gender Gap: Presidential Address to the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, 2007. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 40(04)

Additional Reading:

Bartels, Larry M. (2005). Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American

- Mind. Perspectives on Politics, , pp 15-31. doi:10.1017/S1537592705050036.
- Brooks, C., & Manza, J. (2007). *Why Welfare States Persist: The Importance of Public Opinion in Democracies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burstein, P. 2003. The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 29–40.**
- Cutler, F. (2004). Government responsibility and electoral accountability in federations. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 34(2), 19–38.**
- Cutler, F. (2008). Whodunnit? Voters and Responsibility in Canadian Federalism. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 41(03), 627.
- Cutler, F. (2010). The Space between Worlds: Federalism, Public Issues and Election Issues. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(4-5), 487–514.
- Downs, A. 1972. Up and down with ecology: The issue attention cycle. *Public Interest*, 28 (Summer), 38–50.**
- Dion, Michelle. L. and Birchfield, Vicki. (2010), Economic Development, Income Inequality, and Preferences for Redistribution. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54: 315–334.
- Druckman, James D., Jordan Fein and Thomas J. Leeper. 2012. A Source of Bias in Public Opinion Stability. *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 430-454. [opinion, framing, health policy, a useful bibliography]
- Eichenberg, R. C. (2003). Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Use of Force by the United States, 1990-2003. *International Security*, 28(1), 110–141.
- Gidengil, E., Blais, A., Nadeau, R., & Nevitte, N. (2003). Women to the Left? Gender Differences in Political Beliefs and Policy Preferences. In M. Tremblay & L. J. Trimble (Eds.), *Women and electoral politics in Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.**
- Jacobs, A. M., & Matthews, J. S. (2012). Why Do Citizens Discount the Future? Public Opinion and the Timing of Policy Consequences. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(04), 903–935.**
- Jacobs, L. R. (1993). *The Health of Nations: Public Opinion and the Making of American and British Health Policy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Lax, Jeffrey R. and Justin H. Phillips. (2009) Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness. *American Political Science Review* 103 (3), pg. 367-386.
- Page, B. and R. Shapiro. 1983. Effects of Public Opinion on Policy. *American Political Science Review* 77(1): 175-190.**
- Soroka, S. N., & Wlezien, C. 2004. Opinion Representation and Policy Feedback: Canada in Comparative Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 37(03).
- Winter, Nicholas J. G. 2005. Framing Gender: Political Rhetoric, Gender Schemas, and Public Opinion on U.S. Health Care Reform. *Politics & Gender* 1(3): 453-480.
- Wlezien, C., & Soroka, S. N. (2010). Federalism and Public Responsiveness to Policy. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 41(1), 31–52.**

PAPERS DUE APRIL 11 BY 4 PM