



# JOHN GLENN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

## Seminar in Public Policy Public Affairs 8030

### Syllabus

Spring, 2015

|                                   |                                |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Professor: Jos C.N. Raadschelders | Time: Thursday, 9 -12          |
| Office: 350d Page Hall            | Location: 240 Page Hall        |
| Phone: 688-4325                   | Office Hours: & By Appointment |

### Introduction

This seminar is designed to heighten the graduate student's ability to think critically about public policy research. It builds upon the ideas and discussions in "The History of Public Administration Thought and Current Directions". It is one of the two policy courses offered in the Ph.D. program in Public Policy.

The Ph. D. degree requires the mastery of a body of research concepts and techniques and the ability to apply them to extend knowledge in the candidate's area of expertise. It further requires the ability to analyze critically a body of literature as a prerequisite for advancing that literature. Mere familiarity is not sufficient. This course will emphasize the critical assessment of public policy research on policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation.

There are three primary crosscutting perspectives. There is, first, an historical perspective that is concerned with the chronology and currency of ideas. A second perspective is cultural, which illuminates how concepts are reflections of a distinctive set of values, ideology, and customs as well as preferred modes of reasoning. In this vein, understanding the epistemology and ontology of the field is key. The third perspective is analytical with an emphasis on the authority, justification, value, and "workability" of ideas; i.e., how they shape our thinking, normatively, empirically, intellectually and pragmatically.

### Seminar Objectives

The purpose of this course is to introduce doctoral students to the historical, intellectual conversations about the nature and scope of American public policy. More specifically, the objectives are to:

- a. enable students to develop a "cognitive map" of the major contributors and their intellectual relationships;
- b. identify the major theoretical and practical questions and issues in the field and some of the conceptualizations and answers that have already been given;
- c. develop the ability to think critically, synthetically, and to probe and – possibly - develop theory;
- d. hone the craft of writing academic papers; and
- e. hone the craft of writing a critical book review.

### Grading

| Course Requirement                  | Percentage of Grade |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Weekly Critical Essays              | 20%                 |
| Lead Weekly Discussion              | 10%                 |
| Seminar Participation               | 10%                 |
| Literature or “Classic” Book Review | 20%                 |
| Reflection Paper                    | 20%                 |
| Final Exam                          | 20%                 |

### Course Readings

The following books are required:

1. Paul A. Sabatier, Christopher M. Weible (eds.) (2014, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. ISBN: 978-0-8133-49268 (SW)
2. Frank Fischer (2005, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *Evaluating Public Policy*. Wadsworth Publishing Company. ISBN 978-0-4952-06873(F)
3. John Kingdon (2011, updated 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Longman: Boston. ISBN 978-0-205-00086-9
4. Jeffrey L. Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky (1984). *Implementation*. Berkeley: University of California Press. ISBN 0-520-05331-1 (P)

Students can access textbook information via the Barnes & Noble bookstore website: [www.shopOhioState.co](http://www.shopOhioState.co), as well as from their BuckeyeLink Student Center. This information is disseminated by B&N to all area bookstores. You may buy from a store of your choice and/or shop for

books (always use ISBN# for searches) on line.

## Seminar Requirements

There are five seminar requirements.

### 1. *Weekly Critical Essays* (20% of your grade)

It is expected that everyone will read the assigned readings and write a brief critical essay every week (maximum of three pages in length, line spacing 2, 1" margins). These critical essays, together with the course readings and discussions, will provide the foundation upon which the student can expand her/his study in preparation for the candidacy examination in the policy area. Since many of the readings are cumulative, it would be expected that many of the ideas and issues in the early weeks are relevant for the essay questions in the latter weeks.

Each of the students will have the responsibility to lead the discussion of the readings several times throughout the semester, and assignments for that will be made at the start of the semester.

Your grade will be based on the quality of the written review as well as how well you present your review.

Most of the essay questions are drawn from the candidate list of essay questions for the policy specialization of the doctoral candidacy examination. Hence, writing good essays in this class is an excellent way to begin preparing for the candidacy examination. The advantage of spending the time now is that you have just read the important readings and can benefit from class discussion in better understanding the intellectual issues at stake and the significance of the readings. Later, you will need to supplement your readings from the syllabus and revisit your essays but it will be a far easier task later if you put in the effort now.

Many of the questions require you to make an assessment of the literature in terms of theory and/or practice. You are only starting your advanced reading of the policy literature so you will certainly be limited in how much you can say. Still, it is important to begin thinking about these questions and you should be able to say something intelligent. More will become clear as we continue through the course and as you continue through your doctoral student career.

If there is more than one essay question assigned for that class, pick just one essay. Please limit your essays to make sure that your persuasive essay has (a) clear thesis(es) and that your conclusions are supported by clear arguments. Essays require that you critique the existing literature.

### *Critiques*

Critiques should consist of two parts. I have uploaded some examples to the Carmen website ([Knoke.rtf](#), [Lindblom.rtf](#), [Powell.rtf](#), [Taylor.rtf](#)). The first part should be a brief factual description of the main points of the reading. This does not involve any critique and ideally your description of what the author(s) is saying would be agreeable to both the author and critics of the work. This will allow the reader to quickly identify the main contribution of the work. Please limit your use of direct quotes, except where necessary. The second part of the written review should be a critique of the work. Review **Appendix 1**, for directions on how to write up a critique of your assigned readings.

Please do not read your critiques! You should understand the reading and your critique of the work sufficiently that you need only refer to your notes, not read from them. Points will be deducted if you read from your essay. Hence, the grade for your weekly essay encompasses both the written text as

well as how you present your critique in class AND how well you listen to the comments of your peers (using the same criteria in **Appendix 1**).

### *How to Exchange Files*

The written critiques should be made available to the class by Tuesday night (12 a.m.) so that we have enough time to read, think about, and formulate our questions before the seminar on Thursday morning.

To make the copies available to your colleagues, email a copy of your review to everyone in the class. Our email addresses can be found on the Carmen website.

Students will receive feedback from their peers during the class discussion and, if necessary, additional comments from the instructor.

## **2. Lead Weekly Discussion** (10% of your grade)

Every week one of you will start and lead the discussion of that week's readings. How often you will do so depends upon the number of students enrolled in the class. The student leading the discussion will determine the order that the other students present their critique of the week's readings. The grade for this element depends upon how well you lead the discussion(s) which includes raising questions, managing multiple speakers, etc..

## **3. Class Participation** (10% of your grade)

The second requirement in this class is class participation. Class discussion will bring out the subtleties, connections to other works, and the relevance and power of these ideas for modern theory and practice.

Your class participation grade (10%) is dependent upon how well you listen and react to the presentation made by your peers of their assigned articles (using the same criteria in Appendix 1).

Your assignment includes reading others' critiques before the class, listening to their presentation, and making sure that it makes sense to you and the class.

## **4. Literature Review OR Review of "Classic" Book in Policy Sciences / Policy Analysis** (20% of your grade)

Please "drop" your assignment in the "Dropbox" on the course website.

### **Option A: Literature Review Relevant to Your Dissertation / Research Interests**

The final assignment is to write a manuscript that traces the intellectual development of an important issue or field of specialization within public policy that is relevant to your interests. The primary requirement is that this topic be of interest to you (which usually means that it may have some relationship to your future dissertation topic). For example, one could trace the development of research on public participation and public policy, the role of street-level bureaucrats in implementing policy, or what the critical factors in policy innovation are. As a very rough guide, your review should include, as a minimum, five articles.

The purpose of this assignment is for you to begin gaining mastery over a particular subject area in public policy. This is a first and important step in beginning your dissertation work and ultimately, your professional development as an academic. **Appendix 2** gives some suggestions on how you might proceed with this assignment. Look at **Appendix 3** for a listing of important journals where you can

find articles relevant to your interest. I strongly encourage you to talk to me or to your classmates frequently about your ideas or doubts.

**Option B:** *Review of a “Classic” Book in Policy Analysis or Policy Science*

As an alternative, you can review a “classic” book. **Appendix 4** lists some suggested books (and articles). If you would like to read something else, please discuss with the instructor.

**5. Reflection Paper** (20% of your grade)

Each of you will write a reflection paper that focuses on (an element of) the nature of policy studies. You can use your weekly written memos as “feeders” into this assignment. Keep asking yourself - as the weeks go by - what it is that strikes you about policy studies, what is it achieving, what it is missing, what trends do you see, how are theory and practice balanced, etc., etc.

**6. Final Exam** (20% of your grade)

This final exam will be on the nature of policy studies and is comparable to the field question in the qualifying exam. Obviously, it builds upon the other course assignments.

**Due dates:**

1. February 3 - One paragraph description of your topic including an explanation of the issue, why it is important to study, how it fits in within your longer career goals. It is important that when you write, you begin writing with a target journal in mind. Please also identify a target journal (and secondary and tertiary journals should your article be rejected at the primary target journal).
2. March 10 - Rough draft of literature review
3. April 14 - Final Paper

Appendix 3 provides a listing of some of the important journals in public policy.

### **Academic Misconduct**

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-5-487, all instances of alleged academic misconduct will be reported to the department chairperson and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (<http://oaa.osu.edu/coam/home.html>). Academic misconduct is grounds for failing the course and may be grounds for further sanctions. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, giving or receiving information during an examination and submitting plagiarized work for academic requirements.

For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct:

[http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource\\_csc.asp](http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp)

If you have any questions or concerns, please discuss them with me.

## Schedule

### **January 12:** *Policy Analysis and Policy Science: A First Statement*

- Lasswell, H.D. (1951). The Policy Orientation. In H.D. Lasswell and D. Lerner, *The Policy Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 3-15.
- Dror, Y. (1967). Policy Analysts - New Professional Role in Government Service. *Public Administration Review*, 27: 197-203.

#### *Optional Readings*

- Farr, J., J.S. Hacker and N. Kazee (2006). The policy scientist of democracy: The discipline of Harold D. Lasswell. *American Political Science Review*, 100: 579-587.
- Brunner, R.D. (2008). The policy scientist of democracy revisited. *Policy Sciences*, 41: 3-19.
- Farr, J., J.S. Hacker and N. Kazee (2008). Revisiting Lasswell. *Policy Sciences*, 41: 21-32.

#### *Essay Questions*

The early proponents of policy analysis had great hopes for how it could improve policy. Identify the early hopes for this new profession and whether these promises have been fulfilled. The early proponents were also cognizant of potential obstacles to how well policy analysts could accomplish their work and the degree to which policy analysis could have an impact on policy. Have these concerns proved correct? Have there been contributions or obstacles that were not anticipated by the early proponents of policy analysis?

OR

Consider the early contributors to the field of public policy, e.g., Lasswell, Lindblom, and Wildavsky. Describe in detail the framework that each advocated for developing the field of public policy. Discuss the ways in which the field of public policy has advanced beyond these frameworks. In what ways are these frameworks still relevant to the field? Be sure to include as evidence for your characterizations recent policy scholarship. (nota bene: see on Lindblom, Fry/Raadschelders 2014; on Wildavsky, PSJ 2010, 38(3); on Lasswell, check website for article by Nick Turnbull in *Critical Policy Studies*, 2008, 2(1)).

**January 19:** Martin Luther King Day (no class)

### **January 26:** *Policy Analysis and Policy Science: A First Example*

- Pressman, J. L., A. Wildavsky (1984). *Implementation*. Entire Book. (P)
- Hummel, R.P. (1991). Stories Managers Tell: Why They Are as Valid as Science. *Public Administration Review*, 51(1): 31-41.
- Sabatier, P.A. The Need for Better Theories. 3-17 (S)
- Schlager, E., C.M. Weible (2013). New Theories of the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 389-396. (download from PSJ website).

#### *Essay Question*

What are the factors that are important to good policy design and practice? What are the factors that are important to good theory about policy? What are the relationships among policy formulation, implementation and evaluation?

**February 2:** *Democracy and Policy Science*

- Barber, B.R. (1998). Foundationalism and Democracy. In B. Barber (ed.), *A Passion for Democracy: American Essays*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1954). *The Public and its Problems*. Chicago: Swallow Press. (Excerpts)
- Habermas, J. (1996). Three Normative Models of Democracy. In S. Benhabib (ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper. (Excerpts)

#### *Essay Question*

The norms and processes in science and democracy are, in some ways, similar and compatible. At the same time, some can see too much science as a threat to democracy and too much democracy in science as problematical as well. Since policy analysis adapts the social sciences to public policy problems, and integrates social knowledge from many disciplines, the positive and negative tensions between democracy and science are also present within the policy analysis. Identify these tensions as they relate policy analysis and assess their implications for conducting useful policy analysis.

#### **February 9:** *Science, Social Science, Policy Science and Democracy*

- Bozeman, B. and D. Landsbergen (1989). Truth and Credibility in Sincere Policy Analysis: Alternative Approaches for the Production of Policy-Relevant Knowledge. *Evaluation Review*, 13: 355-379.
- Brunner, R.D. (2010). Adaptive governance as a reform strategy. *Policy Sciences*, 43: 301-341.
- Dahl, R. (1947). The Science of Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review*, 7: 1-11.
- Lindblom, C.E. (1959). The Science of "Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review*, 19: 79-88.
- Mitroff, I.I. (1974). Norms and Counter-Norms in a Select Group of Apollo Moon Scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 39(4): 579-595.

#### *Essay Question*

The norms and processes in science and democracy are, in some ways, similar and compatible. At the same time, some can see too much science as a threat to democracy and too much democracy in science as problematical as well. Since policy analysis adapts the social sciences to public policy problems, and integrates social knowledge from many disciplines, the positive and negative tensions between democracy and science are also present within the policy analysis. Identify these tensions as they relate policy analysis and assess their implications for conducting useful policy analysis.

#### **February 16:** *Typologies and Stages*

##### *Policy Typologies*

- Lowi, T.J. (1972, July-August). Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice. *Public Administration Review*, 32(4), 298-310.
- Spitzer, R. (1987, June). Promoting Policy Theory: Revising the Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 15(4): 675-689.
- Kellow, A. (1988, Summer). Promoting Elegance in Policy Theory: Simplifying Lowi's Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 16(4): 713-724.
- Lowi, T. (1988, Summer). An Assessment of Kellow's Promoting Elegance in Policy Theory. *Policy Studies Journal*, 16(4): 725-728.

- Spitzer, R.J. (1989, Spring). From Complexity to Simplicity: More on Policy Theory and the Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(3): 529-536.
- Kellow, A. (1989, Spring). Taking the Long Way Home? A Reply to Spitzer on the Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(3): 537-546.
- Spitzer R.J. (1989, Spring). Complexity and Inductions: A Rejoinder to Kellow. *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(3): 547-549.

*Stages Description of the Policy Process*

- deLeon, P. (1999). The Stages Approach to the Policy Process. 19-34 (S).

*Optional Reading*

- Grindle, M. (ed.) (1980). *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*Essay Question*

In attempting to develop concepts and a vocabulary to talk about policy analysis, scholars have developed several intellectual tools including typologies, models, or frameworks to characterize, explain, or understand the policy process. Pick one of these tools and briefly describe that tool and what it sought to accomplish. Then identify the criticisms of that tool. Finally, decide and support your arguments on whether that tool has made a contribution to academics or practitioners in advancing knowledge in the field.

**February 23:** *Policy Rationality: Alternative Views*

- Ostrom, E. Institutional Rational Choice. 21-64 (S)
- Ingram, H., Schneider, A.L. and P. deLeon. Social Construction and Policy Design, 93-126 (S)

*Optional Reading*

- Stone, D. (2002). *Policy Paradox. The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641-672.

*Essay Question*

Compare and contrast the social constructionist, (institutional), and logical positivist contributions to Policy Analysis. Can we synthesize these approaches? Do they make differential contributions to different subfields or different components of the policy process (policy cycle)?

**March 3:** *Rationality: Multiple Streams Framework*

- Kingdon, J. (2010). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. (2d. ed., updated) (K), entire book.
- Zahariadis, N. The Multiple Streams Framework: Structure, Limitations, Prospects. 65-92 (S)

*Essay Questions*

How useful is the Multiple Streams Framework? Is this framework applicable to all policy arenas? What dimensions or variables should be added? Should this framework be simplified? What are the next steps in its development?

Or, the more general question about policy:



How is policy made? How does it change? There have been several frameworks, theories, and models, each characterizing the change process differently and offering a different explanation for the change dynamic. Compare and contrast some of the important frameworks (or we could identify which ones we want them to discuss). Then, identify which of these frameworks does a better job at explaining the policy process? Does the ability of the framework depend on the particular policy context?

**March 10: Policy Adoption and Change – Advocacy Coalition Framework**

- Sabatier, P.A. and C.M. Weible. The Advocacy-Coalition Framework: An Assessment. 189-220 (S)  
*Optional Reading*

- Weible, C.M. (2007). An Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to Stakeholder Analysis: Understanding the Political Context of California Marine Protected Area Policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(1): 95–117.

- Sobek, J. (2003). Comparing Policy Process Frameworks: What Do They Tell Us About Group Membership and Participation for Policy Development? *Administration & Society*, 35(3): 350-374.

- Weible, C.M., P.A. Sabatier, H.C. Jenkins-Smith, D. Nohrstedt, A.D. Henry, P. de Leon (2011). A Quarter Century of the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Introduction to a Special Issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(3), 349-393. (download from PSJ website).

*Essay Question 1:*

How is policy made? How does it change? There have been several frameworks, theories, and models, each characterizing the change process differently and offering a different explanation for the change dynamic. Compare and contrast some of the important frameworks (or we could identify which ones we want them to discuss). Then, identify which of these frameworks does a better job at explaining the policy process? Does the ability of the framework depend on the particular policy context?

*Public Participation*

- Thomas, J.C. (1995). *Public Participation in Public Decisions : New Skills and Strategies for Public Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, pp. 15-35.

- Webler, T. and S. Tuler (2002). Unlocking the Puzzle of Public Participation. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society*, 22: 179-189.

*Essay Question 2:*

A great deal has been written on the appropriate role that the policy analyst can serve in supporting policy makers. Less discussed and articulated is the appropriate role that the policy analyst has in supporting citizen participation. Identify why this oversight has occurred. What are the difficulties in involving citizens in the policy process? Did certain theories of democracy provide insight as to how one would successfully involve citizens? Considering the realities of how policy analysts' work and the institutions that they operate in, what are the prospects that policy analysts can play an important role in citizen participation?

*Expertise*

-Fischer, F., (2009). *Democracy and Expertise* [electronic resource available online through OSU library search]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Essay Question 3:*

Policy analysis brings expertise in service to democracy. Yet, the earliest writings in public administration demonstrate that there are fundamental tensions between expertise and democracy. Trace the broad contours of this discussion and identify the major tensions. Have we adequately reconciled how expertise can truly be of service in a democracy? How is this manifest in practices and institutions?

**March 16:** Spring Break

**March 23:** *Policy Adoption and Change – Networks / Punctuated Equilibrium*

*Networks*

- Adam, S. and H. Kriesi. The Network Approach. 129-154 (S)
- Robinson, S.E. (2006). A Decade of Treating Networks Seriously. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(4): 589-598.
- Rethemeyer. R.K. and D.M. Hatmaker (2008). Network Management Reconsidered: An Inquiry into Management of Network Structures in Public Sector Service Provision. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4): 617–646.

*Essay Question 1:*

Although commentators like Hecl and Coleman have talked about iron triangles, issue networks and interorganizational coordination, policy networks are a relatively recent approach to understanding policy. There is currently much intellectual energy behind networks, in both the policy and management literatures but does this enthusiasm have any basis? What has the research contributed so far to our understanding of how networks operate? What future?

*Punctuated Equilibrium*

- True, J.L., B.D. Jones, F.R. Baumgartner. Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in American Policymaking. 155-187 (S)
- John, P. (2003). Is there Life after Policy Streams, Advocacy Coalitions, and Punctuations: Using Evolutionary Theory to Explain Policy Change. *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(4): 481-498.
- Jones, B. (2005). A Model for Policy Choice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(3): 325-351.

*Essay Question 2:*

Policy decision-makers and the public can focus on only a finite number of problems. Discuss the various theoretical approaches that explain how problems (or issues) appear on the agenda. As important, what explains how long issues stay on the agenda before they are either disposed of or attention is lost? [What are the limitations of this approach? Is the focus on attention useful in explaining all of the policy decisions made? What future elaborations are necessary to improve the theory or its application?]

**March 30:** *Implementation*

- Cline, K.D. (2000). Defining the Implementation Problem: Organizational Management versus Cooperation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(3): 551-571.
- deLeon, P., L. deLeon (2002). What Ever Happened to Policy Implementation? An Alternative Approach. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4): 467-492.

- Goggin, M.L. (1986). The Too Few Cases/Too Many Variables' Problem in Implementation Research. *Western Political Quarterly*, 39(2): 328-347.
- Hill, H.C. (2003). Understanding Implementation: Street-Level Bureaucrats' Resources for Reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13: 265-282.
- O'Toole, L.J. (2004). The Theory-Practice Issue in Policy Implementation Research. *Public Administration*, 82(2): 309-329.

*Essay Question*

Can there be a general theory or model of implementation? Explain what a general theory of implementation would look like? What would it include and what would it exclude?

**April 6: Evaluation**

- F. Fischer, *Evaluating Public Policy* (F)

*Essay Question*

Compare and contrast the various approaches to evaluation: policy as design, the rational approaches, and naturalistic approaches. In particular, identify what epistemological and ontological assumptions underlay these approaches and what methodologies and methods derive from these approaches (and their assumptions).

**April 13: Comparative Policy: Large N and Diffusion**

- Blomquist, W. The Policy Process and Large-N-Comparative Studies. 261-289 (S)
- Berry F.S. and W.D. Berry. Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research. 223-260 (S)
- Volden, C. (2006). States as Policy Laboratories: Emulating Success in the Children's Health Insurance Program. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2): 294-312.
- Mintrom, M. (1997). Policy Entrepreneurs and the Diffusion of Innovation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3): 738-770.
- De Jong G.F., et al. (2006). Measuring State TANF Policy Variations and Change after Reform. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(4): 755-781.
- Jensen, J.L. (2003). Policy Diffusion through Institutional Legitimation: State Lotteries. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(4): 521-541.
- Gupta, K. (2012). Comparative Public Policy: Using the Comparative Method to Advance Our Understanding of the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40 (S1), 11-26. (download from PSJ website)

*Essay Question:*

One attempt to understanding the determinants of policy is the use of comparative studies among nations, states, or local governments. Why have some researchers pursued this approach? What, in the main, have been the contributions of this approach? What are the critiques of this approach?

**April 20: Interdisciplinarity: Psychology, Sociology, Economics (Political Economy), and Law**

- Coleman, J. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement): 95-120.
- Hill, C.J., L.E. Lynn (2004). Governance and Public Management: An Introduction. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 23(1): 3-12.
- Hodgson, G. (1998). Institutional Economic Theory: The Old Versus the New. In D.L. Prychitko (ed.)

*Why Economists Disagree: An Introduction to the Alternative Schools of Thought.* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

- Tversky, A., D. Kahneman (1974). Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(27): 1124-1131.

- Kreis, A.M., R.K. Christensen (2013). Law and Public Policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(S1), S38-51. (download from PSJ)

- Cairney, P. 2013). Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: How Do We Combine the Insights of Multiple Theories in Public Policy Studies? *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(1), 1-21. (download from PSJ website).

### *Optional*

- Faust, D. (1982). A Needed Component in Prescriptions for Science: Empirical Knowledge of Human Cognitive Limitations. *Knowledge*, 3(4): 555-570.

- Alt, J.E., M. Levi, E. Ostrom (eds.). *Competition and Cooperation: Conversations with Nobelists about Economics and Political Science.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

### *Essay Question*

Historically public affairs schools have separated the study of public policy from the study of public management. What do you think of this separation? Is there theoretical and/or practical overlap across these subject matters? How do policy studies inform management and vice versa? Be sure to include as evidence both historic and recent policy and management scholarship. Are these subject matters becoming one? If so, is this a good or a bad idea?

### **April 27:** *The Complex Problem of Theory / Summary of Policy Theories*

#### *Systems Thinking and Systems Dynamics Tools*

- Meadows, D.H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems.* White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing. (Introduction and Chapters 1 and 2)

#### *Complexity*

- Morçöl, G. (2008). A Complexity Theory for Policy Analysis. In L.F. Dennard, K.A. Richardson, G. Morçöl (eds.), *Complexity and Policy Analysis: Tools and Methods for Designing Robust Policies in a Complex World.* Goodyear, Arizona: ISCE Publishing.

#### *Complexity and Policy Analysis*

- Rittel, H., M. Webber (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences* 4(1) (1973) 155-169.

- Dennard, L.F. (2008). Legitimacy, Accountability and Policy Analysis. In L.F. Dennard, K.A. Richardson, G. Morçöl (eds.), *Complexity and Policy Analysis: Tools and Methods for Designing Robust Policies in a Complex World.* Goodyear, Arizona: ISCE Publishing.

#### *Agent-Based Modeling Tools and Policy Analysis*

- Bankes, Steven C. (2002). Tools and Techniques for Developing Policies for Complex and Uncertainty. *Systems Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(1): 7263-7266.

*Essay Question 1:*

The behavioral revolution in the social sciences swept aside previous political science and sociological concerns about, among other things, social elites and power. While the behavioralists certainly had legitimate concerns about the kind of research was done, one consequence, is that concerns like "power" are less explicitly dealt with, and are really absorbed into concepts like information asymmetry or frameworks like systems theory of politics. Should policy analysts and academics deal with "power"? What is the appropriate way to understand power from a policy analysis perspective?

*Course Summary*

- Schlager, E. A Comparison of Frameworks, Theories, and Models of Policy Process. 293-319 (S)
- Sabatier, P. Fostering the Development of Policy Theory. 321-336 (S)
- Trouset, S., H.C. Jenkins-Smith, C. Weible (2014). 2014 Public Policy Yearbook: Recent Developments in Public Policy Research. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1), S1-S11. (download from PSJ website).
- Petridou, E. (2014). Theories of the Policy Process: Contemporary Scholarship and Future Directions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1), S12-S32. (download from PSJ website).
- Blume, G., T. Scott, M. Pirog (2014). Empirical Innovations in Policy Analysis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1), S33-S50. (download from PSJ website).
- Adams, W.C., D.L. Infeld, L.F. Miniichelli, M.W. Russell (2014). Policy Journal Trends and Tensions: JPAM and PSJ. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42 (S1), S118-S137. (download from PSJ website).

*Essay Question 2:*

How is policy made? How does it change? There have been several frameworks, theories, and frameworks, each characterizing the change process differently and offering a different explanation for the change dynamic. Compare and contrast some of the important frameworks (or we could identify which ones we want them to discuss). Then, identify which of these frameworks does a better job at explaining the policy process? Does the ability of the framework depend on the particular policy context?

## **Appendix 1: Some tips on reading and critiquing the literature**

Reading the literature in a doctoral seminar is somewhat different than in a Master's course. While becoming knowledgeable is surely a primary goal, so too, is learning to think critically and to locate a work within the larger context of the field is a skill to be developed within the PhD seminar.

I would like you to address the following questions for each of your readings where it is relevant:

1. What is the essential thesis or argument? What is the implicit normative theory of governing? of democracy? of policy? What are the behavioral assumptions about people including elected and appointed officials, public servants, and citizens?
2. What is the underlying structure of the thesis or question? Is it based upon deductive, logical argument? Intuition? Common sense? Is it empirical? Is it ideological?
3. How persuasive is the development of the case? Is it defensible? Is there evidence? Is it plausible?
4. What is the pragmatic meaning of the work, i.e., if we believed what the author is saying what difference would it make to our existing stock of ideas, our working hypotheses, and to practice? Or, is the meaning unclear or undetermined, so that is not possible to connect it, or draw any implications for action from the work?
5. What literature or theory is cited? How is the preexisting theory utilized?
6. Where do you locate it in the larger context of the field?

Each time you read an article or book reflect on these questions to ferret out the basic intellectual elements of the scholarship.

## **Appendix 2: Some tips on writing a manuscript**

1. Identify areas of interest and the core theoretical issues in those areas of interest, while simultaneously....
2. ...scanning public administration and/or policy journals to get a feel for the kind of issues discussed, the methodologies employed, and the literatures cited. Also identify who the authors are and where they come from.
3. From steps one and two, identify a core issue that you find interesting and/or relevant to your dissertation and that could be published in a journal in which you think you could have a fairly good chance of being published. Also, identify second and third target journals for a fallback position.
4. Then pick out one article that either is really interesting to you, looks like an article that you might want to publish someday, is a literature review, or lays out a theoretical or research agenda.
5. Read that article and critique just as we are doing in our class. Then find a second article and either using the references in that first article (to look back), online citation databases (to look forward and see what articles have referenced the article you just critiqued) or by looking across the journal from which you retrieved your first article (or one of the other journals found in Steps 1 and 2), pick your second article.
6. Repeat Steps 1-5 until you have about five - seven articles. Now give an overall summary to the summaries you have written and write an introduction that tells the reader why this is an interesting subject.

(This is not how you will eventually complete the literature review for your dissertation but the above approach is very efficient in finding articles of central importance to your interest.)

### **Appendix 3: Important Journals in the Field of Public Policy**

*American Political Science Review*  
*American Review of Public Administration*  
*Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*  
*Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*  
*Journal of Economic Perspectives*  
*Journal of Public Economics*  
*Public Administration Review*  
*Policy Sciences*  
*Policy Studies Journal*  
*Policy Studies Review*

### **Appendix 4: Classic Works in the Field of Public Policy**

(Articles from the “2008 Policy Shootout!” *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 37(1), Feb., 2009 (Pick six articles)

(Articles from “Special Session on Useful Evaluation”, *American Journal of Evaluation* Vol. 24(4), Dec. 2003, pp. 483-535.)

Alejandro, Roberto, *Hermeneutics, Citizenship, and the Public Sphere*  
Bardach, Eugene, *The Implementation Game*  
Bobrow, Davis, John Dryzek, *Policy Analysis by Design*  
Braaten, Jane, *Habermas’s Critical Theory of Society*  
deLeon, Peter, *Advice and Consent*  
deLeon, Peter, *Democracy and the Policy Sciences*  
Diesing, Paul, *Science and Ideology in the Policy Sciences*  
Dryzek, John S., *Discursive Democracy*  
Dunn, William, *Policy Analysis*  
Fischer, Frank, *Democracy and Expertise*  
Fischer, Frank, *Reframing Public Policy*  
Fischer, Frank, J. Forester, *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis*  
Forester, John, *Critical Thinking in the Public Policy and Planning Process*  
Hawksworth, Mary, *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*  
Hajer, Martin, Hendrik Wagenaar (eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis*  
Jenkins-Smith, Hank, *Democratic Politics and Policy Analysis*  
Jones, Bryan D., Frank Baumgartner, *The Politics of Attention*  
Lasswell, Harold, *A Pre-View of Policy Sciences*  
Yehezkel Dror, *Design for the Policy Sciences*  
Lindblom, Charles E., *Strategy of Design: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process*

Lindblom, Charles E., *Inquiry and Change*  
 Lindblom, Charles E., David Cohen, *Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving*  
 Lipsky, Michael, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*  
 Majone, Giandomenico, *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*  
 Mazmanian, Daniel A., Sabatier, Paul A., *Implementation and Public Policy*  
 Ostrom, Elinor, *Governing the Commons*  
 Paris, David, J. Reynolds, *The Logic of Policy Inquiry*  
 Putnam, Robert D., *Making Democracy Work*  
 Radin, Beryl, *Beyond Machiavelli*  
 Ripley, Randall, *Policy Analysis in Political Science*  
 Roe, Emory, *Narrative Policy Analysis or Taking Complexity Seriously*  
 Sabatier, Paul, Hank Jenkins-Smith, *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*  
 Salamon, Lester, *Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action*  
 Schattschneider, E.E., *The SemiSovereign People*  
 Schneider, Anne, Helen Ingram, *Policy Design for Democracy*  
 Schön, Donald, *The Reflective Practitioner*  
 Schön, Donald, Martin Rein, *Frame Reflection*  
 Simon, Herbert, *Sciences of the Artificial*  
 Thompson, Dennis, *Political Ethics and Public Office*  
 Weimer, David, Aidan Vining, *Policy Analysis*  
 Wilson, James Q., *The Moral Sense*

### **REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION POLICY**

Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated, and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office for Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil Avenue; telephone 292-3307; TDD 292-0901; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>.