



# THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

## Seminar in Public Policy

PA 8030

Spring 2017

Mondays, 9:00-12:00

---

**Professor:** Dr. Stephanie Moulton

**E-mail:** [moulton.23@osu.edu](mailto:moulton.23@osu.edu)

**Phone:** 614.247.8161

**Office:** 310 U Page Hall

**Office Hours: Mondays, 3-5 pm\*\***

*\*\*Additional office hours by appointment*

---

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

This seminar is designed to provide students with an overview of the scholarly study of public policy. Public policy research is broadly defined in this course to include studies of the public policy process, policy implementation and policy analysis. The course is intentionally interdisciplinary, combining insights from political science, public economics, psychology, organizational theory and public affairs to enhance students' understanding of public policy. This course is the required course in the public policy stream for the Ph.D. in Public Policy and Management. It is designed to complement the materials covered in the public management and public economics streams of the doctoral curriculum. These streams are necessarily intertwined, and therefore some of the content covered in this course may build from and contribute to the materials covered in the other streams of the curriculum. Students are encouraged to build connections between courses.

The course is divided into three sections: (1) the historical foundations of public policy research; (2) theoretical frameworks commonly used to analyze the policy system and policy processes; and (3) policy institutions and actors that are often central to policy related research. Within each section, the content is divided into four to five topical areas representing core areas of knowledge that students of public policy should be expected to obtain mastery of by the time that they take their candidacy exams. The readings each week consist of a combination of classic manuscripts and books, as well as contemporary applications and extensions. Students should come to class prepared to discuss and engage the assigned readings. Additional readings are provided for deeper exploration of particular topics and to assist students as they prepare for their candidacy exams.

### LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After completing the course, students should be able to do the following:

- (1) Describe the foundations and frameworks that have motivated the study of public policy;
- (2) Synthesize and critique different theoretical perspectives employed to analyze policy processes;
- (3) Analyze the roles that different institutions and actors play in the policy system; and
- (4) Articulate how your own research agenda will build from and extend public policy scholarship.

## GRADED COMPONENTS

The graded components in this course include: (1) class participation; (2) two oral manuscript critiques; (3) three written critical essays; and (4) a term paper. Each of the course components, and their contribution to the final grade, is discussed in detail below.

### Grade Distribution:

Class Participation	10%
Oral Manuscript Critiques (2 @ 10% each)	20%
Critical Essays (3 @ 15% each)	45%
Term Paper	25%

Transformation of numerical grade to a letter grade will be according to the schedule below:

A	93-100	B+	87-89.9	C+	77-79.9	D+	67-69.9
A-	90-92.9	B	83-86.9	C	73-76.9	D	60-66.9
		B-	80-82.9	C-	70-72.9	E	< 60

### Participation (10% of Final Grade)

Informed participation is necessary for the success of this seminar. Students are required to complete and contemplate the readings before class, and they are required to demonstrate this preparation by contributing meaningfully to seminar discussions. Every week, I will document each student's contribution as having been good, adequate, or inadequate. To get full participation credit, students will need to have received a rating of "good" more often than not, and they cannot have received a rating of "inadequate." Your contribution will be evaluated based on your preparation and engagement with class discussion, not on your demonstrated mastery of the material. Some of the materials will be quite dense, and it may be difficult to see the connections between the readings. The critical essay prompts for each week should provide guidance for the main points to identify in the readings. I expect that you will read the materials prior to class and document any questions, confusion or concerns that you have with the readings.

### Oral Manuscript Critiques (20% of Final Grade, 2 @ 10% each)

The readings for each week consist of a combination of classic manuscripts and contemporary applications. The contemporary applications are provided as examples of attempts to build from or extend the topic under study on a given week, and are indicated with an \*\*. All students are expected to read the application manuscripts each week. In addition, you will be assigned to lead a critique of an application manuscript two times during the semester. Your oral critique should demonstrate your ability to think critically about the content of the manuscript and to locate the manuscript within the larger context of the field. Your oral critique should include the following components: (1) a concise summary of the essential purpose of the manuscript, the methodological approach and key findings; (2) your analysis of the primary contributions of the manuscript to the study of public policy, including how it builds from or extends prior research; and (3) unanswered questions raised by the manuscript and/or areas for future inquiry that could extend the manuscript. You will be evaluated based on the presentation of your critique in class; you will not be expected to turn in a written critique. However, you may bring written notes with you to class to help guide your presentation.

### **Critical Essays (45% of Final Grade, 3 @ 15% each)**

Each week, critical essay questions are posed that draw from the themes of the readings for a given week (see Appendix A), often building cumulatively on course materials from prior weeks. These questions simulate the types of questions that are asked on the candidacy exam. You will want to refer to these questions each week as you prepare for class, as they will help you focus your readings. In addition, you will select three questions throughout the semester for which you will submit a written response, one from each of the three sections of the course (Defining and Analyzing Public Policy, Policy Processes, and Policy Actors). You are required to submit a draft of your response to the question to Carmen prior to the class session (Monday at 9:00 am) for which the question is provided. You may then revise your response after the class session, with a new response to be submitted by Friday (5:00 pm) of the week for which the question was assigned. Do not delete your original response, but include your new response as a new document (with the suffix “revised” in the file name, in addition to the question number). Each essay response should be no longer than 2,000 words (about 4 pages, 12 point font, single spaced).

### **Term Paper (25% of Final Grade)**

Learning how to write scholarly manuscripts is arguably the most important skill to obtain during your time as a doctoral student. Your term paper in this course thus provides you with the opportunity to practice (and receive feedback) on this important skill. For this paper, you should formulate a research question that builds from and extends some aspect of public policy that is covered in the course. Your research question formulation should demonstrate your ability to identify a gap in the current literature that is both important and feasible to study. Your formulation should include motivation as to why this is an important question to study and a plan for informing the question. Second, you should include a review of prior literature related to your question and discussion of your theoretical expectations. You do not need to propose a research design, collect data or conduct an analysis. Essentially, I am looking for a draft of the first part of a scholarly manuscript, including an introduction, literature review and theoretical expectations. You should start on your paper early in the semester, as we will discuss your progress on your paper (as a class) at various points throughout the semester. Your final term paper should be no longer than 5,000 words (about 10 pages, 12 point font, single spaced).

### **TEXTS**

The following texts are required. Additional texts are optional (as noted under “Further Reading”). All other readings are available on Carmen.

Students can access textbook information via the Barnes & Noble bookstore website: [www.shopOhioState.com](http://www.shopOhioState.com) 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) online.

1. Paul A. Sabatier, Christopher M. Weible (eds.) (2014, 3rd ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. ISBN: 978-0-8133-49268

2. Deborah Stone. (2002). *Policy Paradox. The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company

3. John Kingdon (2011, updated 2nd ed.). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Longman: Boston. ISBN 978-0-205-00086-9

***Recommended Texts:***

4. Jeffrey L. Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky (1984). *Implementation*. Berkeley: University of California Press. ISBN 0-520-05331-1

5. Michael Lipsky. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy, 30th ann. Ed.: dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation.

5. Aaron Wildavsky (1987). *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, 2nd ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)**

The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the University's Code of Student Conduct, and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the University's Code of Student Conduct may constitute "Academic Misconduct." Sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University.

In the Ohio State University's Code of Student Conduct, Section 3335-23-04 defines academic misconduct as: "Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process." Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's Code of Student Conduct is never considered an "excuse" for academic misconduct.

**STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH**

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student's ability to participate in daily activities. The Ohio State University offers services to assist you with addressing these and other concerns you may be experiencing. If you or someone you know is suffering from any of the aforementioned conditions, you can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the Office of Student Life Counseling and Consultation Services (CCS) by visiting [www.ccs.osu.edu](http://www.ccs.osu.edu) or calling 614-292- 5766. CCS is located on the 4th Floor of the Younkin Success Center and the **10<sup>th</sup> Floor of Lincoln Tower**. 24 hour emergency help is also available through the National 24/7 Prevention Hotline at 1-800-273-TALK or at [www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org](http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org)

**ADA Statement**

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/>.

SAMPLE

## SCHEDULE

**\*\*Indicates "Current application manuscript"**

### Part 1: Defining and Analyzing Public Policy (Policy as Unit of Analysis)

#### Week 1 (1/9) Course Introduction & Public Policy Orientation

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Weimer, David L. (2008). Theories of and in the Policy Process. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 36(4): 489-495.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Dewey, J. (1954). *The Public and its Problems*. Chicago: Swallow Press. (Excerpts)
- ❖ Brewer, G. D., & DeLeon, P. (1983). *The foundations of policy analysis*. Dorsey Pr.
- ❖ Lasswell, Harold D. (1970). "The emerging conception of the policy sciences." *Policy sciences* 1.1: 3-14.
- ❖ Bobrow, Davis B., et al. (1977). "The place of policy analysis in political science: five perspectives." *American Journal of Political Science* 21.2: 415-433.

#### Week 2 (1/16) MLK Day NO CLASS

#### Week 3 (1/23) Policy Design I: Economic & Behavioral Foundations

- ❖ Weimer, D. and A. Vining (2005). *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. Chapters 4-5 required (Chapters 6-8 recommended).
- ❖ Madrian, B. C. (2014). Applying Insights from Behavioral Economics to Policy Design. *Annual Review of Economics*, 6(1), 663-688.
- ❖ \*\* Colman, Gregory J., and Dahlia K. Remler. (2008). "Vertical equity consequences of very high cigarette tax increases: If the poor are the ones smoking, how could cigarette tax increases be progressive?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 376-400.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ Dahl, R. A., & Lindblom, C. E. (1953). *Politics, Economics and Welfare: Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Process*. Harper.
- ❖ Lindblom, C. E. (1977) *Politics and Markets*. New York: Basic.
- ❖ Shafir, E. ed., 2013. *The behavioral foundations of public policy*. Princeton University Press.
- ❖ Wilson, R. K. (2011). The contribution of behavioral economics to political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 201-223.
- ❖ Tversky, A., D. Kahneman (1974). Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(27): 1124-1131.
- ❖ 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.

- ❖ Amir, O., Ariely, D., Cooke, A., Dunning, D., Epley, N., Gneezy, U., ... & Prelec, D. (2005). Psychology, behavioral economics, and public policy. *Marketing Letters*, 16(3-4), 443-454.

#### **Week 4 (1/30) Policy Design II: Democratic Foundations**

- ❖ Stone, D. (2002). *Policy Paradox. The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company (Read Chapter 1, skim other chapters)
- ❖ Schneider, Anne, Helen Ingram, and Peter de Leon. (2014). "Democratic policy design: Social construction of target populations," Chapter 4 in Sabatier and Weible, 105-150.
- ❖ \*\*Jill Nicholson-Crotty and Sean Nicholson-Crotty (2004). "Social Construction and Policy Implementation: Inmate Health as a Public Health Issue," *Social Science Quarterly* 85: 240-256.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ Sen, Amartya. 1970. *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*.
- ❖ Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American political science review* 87.02 (1993): 334-347.
- ❖ Bozeman, B. (2002). Public-value failure: When efficient markets may not do. *Public administration review*, 62(2), 145-161.
- ❖ Bozeman, B. (2007). *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism*. Georgetown University Press.

#### **Week 5 (2/6) Public Policy Taxonomies**

- ❖ Lowi, Theodore J. (1972). "Four systems of policy, politics, and choice." *Public administration review* 32.4: 298-310.
- ❖ Gormley Jr, W. T. (1986). Regulatory issue networks in a federal system. *Polity*, 595-620.
- ❖ Salamon, Lester M. (2000). New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction, *The. Fordham Urb. LJ* 28: 1611.
- ❖ \*\*Yi, Hongtao and Richard C. Feiock (2014). Renewable Energy Politics: Policy Typologies, Policy Tools and State Deployment of Renewables. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42 (3): 391-415.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. (1990). Behavioral assumptions of policy tools. *The Journal of Politics* 52.02: 510-529.
- ❖ Salamon, Lester M., and Odus V. Elliott. (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*. Oxford University Press.
- ❖ Spitzer, R. (1987). Promoting Policy Theory: Revising the Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 15(4): 675-689.
- ❖ Kellow, A. (1988). Promoting Elegance in Policy Theory: Simplifying Lowi's Arenas of Power. *Policy Studies Journal*, 16(4): 713-724.
- ❖ Lowi, T. (1988). An Assessment of Kellow's Promoting Elegance in Policy Theory. *Policy Studies Journal*, 16(4): 725-728.
- ❖ Spitzer, R.J. (1989). 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.

## Part 2: Policy Processes & Implementation (Policy System as Unit of Analysis)

### Week 6 (2/13) From Policy Stages to Complex Systems

- ❖ Weible (2014). Introducing the Scope and Focus of Policy Process Research and Theory, Chapter 1, in Sabatier & Weible
- ❖ deLeon, Peter. (1999). The Stages Approach to the Policy Process. 19-34, in Sabatier, First Edition.
- ❖ Meadows, D.H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing. (Introduction, Chapters 1 and 7)
- ❖ Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdams. (2011). "Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields." *Sociological Theory* 29, no. 1: 1–26.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ Lasswell, H. D. (1956). *The decision process: seven categories of functional analysis*. Bureau of Governmental Research, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Maryland.
- ❖ Brewer, G.D. (1974). The policy sciences emerge: to nurture and structure a discipline. *Policy Sciences*, 5(3), pp.239-244.
- ❖ Laumann, E.O. and Knoke, D. (1987). *The organizational state: Social choice in national policy domains*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.
- ❖ Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. (2012). *A Theory of Fields*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.

### Week 7 (2/20) Agenda Setting: Multiple Streams, Punctuated Equilibrium

- ❖ Kingdon, J. (2010). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. (2d. ed., updated), Chapter 1, skim entire book.
- ❖ F.R. Baumgartner, B.D. Jones, and P. Mortensen. (2014). Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in American Policymaking, Chapter 3 in Sabatier & Weible, 59-104.
- ❖ Zahariadis, N. (2014). Ambiguity and Multiple Streams, Chapter 2 in Sabatier & Weible, 25-58
- ❖ \*\*Liu, X., Lindquist, E., Vedlitz, A., & Vincent, K. (2010). Understanding local policymaking: Policy elites' perceptions of local agenda setting and alternative policy selection. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(1), 69-91.

#### Further Reading:



- ❖ Lindblom, Charles (1959). 'The Science of 'Muddling Through''. *Public Administration Review*, 19:79–88.
- ❖ Bendor, J. (1995). A Model of Muddling Through. *American Political Science Review*, 89:819–840.
- ❖ Baumgartner, F. and Bryan Jones. (1994). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University Press.
- ❖ 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.

### **Week 8 (2/27) Policy Conflict, Cooperation and Networks**

- ❖ Jenkins-Smith, H., D. Nohrstedt, C.M. Weible and P.A. Sabatier. (2014). The Advocacy-Coalition Framework: Foundations, Evolution and Ongoing Research, Chapter 6 in Sabatier & Weible, 183-224.
- ❖ Ostrom, E. with M. Coz and E. Schlager. (2014). An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework and Introduction of the Social-Ecological Systems Framework, Chapter 8 in Sabatier & Weible, 267-306.
- ❖ Feiock, R. C. (2013). The institutional collective action framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 397-425
- ❖ \*\*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.

#### **Further Reading:**

- ❖ Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641-672.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Lubell, M. (2013). Governing institutional complexity: The ecology of games framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 537-559.

### **Week 9 (3/6) Policy Diffusion & Comparative Public Policy**

- ❖ Berry F.S. and W.D. Berry. (2014). Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research, Chapter 9 in Sabatier & Weible, 307-362.
- ❖ Shipan, Charles R. and Craig Volden. (2008). The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion. *American Journal of Political Science* 52, 4: 840–57.
- ❖ Blomquist, W. The Policy Process and Large-N-Comparative Studies. 261-289, in Sabatier & Weible
- ❖ \*\*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.
- ❖ \*\*De Jong G.F., et al. (2006). Measuring State TANF Policy Variations and Change after Reform. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(4): 755-781.

Further Reading:

- ❖ Mintrom, M. (1997). Policy Entrepreneurs and the Diffusion of Innovation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3): 738-770.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Schlager, E., C.M. Weible (2013). New Theories of the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 389-396.
- ❖ Jensen, J.L. (2003). Policy Diffusion through Institutional Legitimation: State Lotteries. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(4): 521-541.

**Week 10 (3/13) OSU SPRING BREAK**

**Week 11 (3/20) Policy Implementation**

- ❖ Pressman, J. and Aaron Wildavsky. (1984). *Implementation*, 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 1 (Appearances), Chapter 5 (The Complexity of Joint Action), and Chapter 7 (Economic Theory and Program Implementation).
- ❖ Sandfort, Jodi and S. Moulton. (2015). *Effective Implementation in Practice: Integrating Public Policy and Management*. (Chapter 2). Wiley/ Jossey-Bass.
- ❖ Weiss, M.J., Bloom, H.S., & Brock, T. (2014). A conceptual framework for studying the sources of variation in program effects. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 33(3), 778-808.
- ❖ \*\* Heinrich, C. J., Burch, P., Good, A., Acosta, R., Cheng, H., Dillender, M., ... & Stewart, M. (2014). Improving the implementation and effectiveness of out-of-school-time tutoring. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), 471-494.

Further Reading

- ❖ Elmore, Richard F. (1979). "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." *Political Science Quarterly* 94, no. 4: 601-616.
- ❖ Sabatier, Paul A. (1986). Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis." *Journal of Public Policy* 6, no. 1: 21-48.
- ❖ Ingram, Helen, and Anne Schneider. (1990) "Improving implementation through framing smarter statutes." *Journal of Public Policy* 10.01: 67-88.
- ❖ Goggin, M.L. (1986). The Too Few Cases/Too Many Variables' Problem in Implementation Research. *Western Political Quarterly*, 39(2): 328-347.
- ❖ Michael Hill and Peter Hupe. 2008. *Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and in Practice*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- ❖ Benny Hjern and David Porter. 1981. "Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis." *Organizational Studies* 2(3): 211-27.
- ❖ Matland, Richard E. (1995). Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 5(2): 145-174.
- ❖ Robichau, Robbie W. and Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. (2009) "The Implementation of Public Policy: Still the Missing Link." *Policy Studies Journal* 37, no. 1: 21-36.
- ❖ Nilsen, Per, Christian Ståhl, Kerstin Roback, and Paul Cairney. (2013). Never the Twain Shall Meet?—A Comparison of Implementation Science and Policy Implementation Research. *Implementation Science* 8, no. 63.

- ❖ May, Carl. Towards a General Theory of Implementation. (2013). *Implementation Science* 8.
- ❖ Moulton, S. & Jodi Sandfort. (2017). "The Strategic Action Field Framework for Policy Implementation Research," *Policy Studies Journal*, forthcoming

### Part 3: Policy Actors (Policy Agents and Institutions as Unit of Analysis)

#### Week 12 (3/27) Formal Political Authority

- ❖ Kreis, A.M., R.K. Christensen (2013). Law and Public Policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(S1), S38-51.
- ❖ McCubbins, M. D., Noll, R. G., & Weingast, B. R. (1987). Administrative procedures as instruments of political control. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 3(2), 243-277.
- ❖ Moffitt, S. L. (2010). Promoting agency reputation through public advice: Advisory committee use in the FDA. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(03), 880-893.
- ❖ Lavertu, S. (2013). Issue-specific political uncertainty and policy insulation in US federal agencies. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 29(1), 145-177.
- ❖ Acs, A. (2015). Which Statute to Implement? Strategic Timing by Regulatory Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, muv018.
- ❖ \*\*Lavertu, S., & Weimer, D. L. (2011). Federal advisory committees, policy expertise, and the approval of drugs and medical devices at the FDA. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(2), 211-237.

#### Further Reading:

- ❖ Peterson, Paul E. (2012). *The price of federalism*. Brookings Institution Press.
- ❖ McCarty, Nolan (2004). The Appointments Dilemma. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(3):413-428.
- ❖ Whitford, Andrew B. (2002). "Decentralization and political control of the bureaucracy." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 14.2: 167-193.
- ❖ Berry, C. Barry C. Burden, and William G. Howell. (2010). After Enactment: The Lives and Deaths of Federal Programs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(1):1-17.
- ❖ Lavertu, S. (2015). For fear of popular politics? Public attention and the delegation of authority to the United States executive branch. *Regulation & Governance*, 9(2), 160-177.
- ❖ Joshua D. Clinton, David E. Lewis, and Jennifer L. Selin. Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(2):387-401, 2014
- ❖ \*\*Nicholson-Crotty, Jill, and Susan M. Miller. (2012). "Bureaucratic effectiveness and influence in the legislature." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22.2: 347-371.
- ❖ \*\*Kogan, V., Lavertu, S., & Peskowitz, Z. (2015). Performance federalism and local democracy: Theory and evidence from school tax referenda. *American Journal of Political Science*.

#### Week 13 (4/3) Informal Political Authority: Bureaucratic Discretion

- ❖ Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy*, 30th ann. Ed.: dilemmas of the individual in public service. Russell Sage Foundation. Preface, Chapter 1, Introduction to Parts II & III, and Chapter 14.
- ❖ May, Peter J. and Soren C. Winter. (2007). "Politicians, Managers, and Street-Level Bureaucrats: Influences on Policy Implementation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19, no. 3: 453-476

- ❖ \*\*Hill, H.C. (2003). Understanding Implementation: Street-Level Bureaucrats' Resources for Reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13: 265-282.
- ❖ \*\*Garrow, Eve E. and Oscar Grusky. (2012). Institutional Logic and Street-Level Discretion: The Case of HIV Test Counseling. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(1): 103–131.

Further Reading:

- ❖ Maynard-Moody, Steven Williams, and Michael Craig Musheno. (2003). *Cops, teachers, counselors: Stories from the front lines of public service*. University of Michigan Press.
- ❖ Schön, Donald A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: BasicBooks.
- ❖ Hill, Carolyn J. (2005). "Casework Job Design and Client Outcomes in Welfare-to-Work Offices." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16, no. 2: 263–288.
- ❖ Sandfort, Jodi R. (2000). Moving Beyond Discretion and Outcomes: Examining Public Management from the Front-Lines of the Welfare System. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 729–756.
- ❖ Yackee, S. W. (2013). Assessing regulatory participation by health professionals: A study of state health rulemaking. *Public Administration Review*, 73(s1), S105-S114.

**Week 14 (4/10) WORK ON TERM PAPERS**

**Week 15 (4/17) Interest Groups, Citizens, Nonprofits & Policy**

- ❖ Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on politics*, 12(03), 564-581.
- ❖ Webb Yackee, Susan. (2006) Sweet-talking the Fourth Branch: The Influence of Interest Group Comments on Federal Agency Rulemaking. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1):103–124.
- ❖ Bovaird, Tony. (2007). Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review* 67(5): 846–860.
- ❖ \*\*Haeder, Simon and Susan Webb Yackee. "Influence and the Administrative Process: Lobbying the U.S. President's Office of Management and Budget." *American Political Science Review*, forthcoming.

Further Reading:

- ❖ Schattschneider, E.E. (1975). *The Semisovereign People*.
- ❖ Lowi, T. (1979). *The End of Liberalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Chapters 1; . Boston: Norton.
- ❖ Weisbrod, Burton A. (1997). The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Its Entwining with Private Enterprise and Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16, no. 4: 541-555.
- ❖ Golden, M. M. (1998). Interest groups in the rule-making process: Who participates? Whose voices get heard?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(2), 245-270.
- ❖ Bingham, Lisa B., Tina Nabatchi and Rosemary O'Leary. (2005). The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government. (2005). *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 547–558.
- ❖ Nabatchi, Tina. (2012). Putting the 'Public' Back in Public Values Research: Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Value. *Public Administration Review* 72, no. 5: 699–708.
- ❖ Sandfort, Jodi R. (2010). Nonprofits within Policy Fields. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management* 29: 637–644.

## Week 16 (4/24) Policy Analysts and Public Policy

- ❖ Wildavsky, Aaron. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, 2nd ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1987. (Select chapters uploaded to Carmen).
- ❖ Blume, G., T. Scott, M. Pirog (2014). Empirical Innovations in Policy Analysis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1), S33-S50.
- ❖ 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.

### Further Reading:

- ❖ Lavertu, S., Walters, D. E., & Weimer, D. L. (2012). Scientific expertise and the balance of political interests: MEDCAC and Medicare coverage decisions. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 22(1), 55-81.
- ❖ Petridou, E. (2014). Theories of the Policy Process: Contemporary Scholarship and Future Directions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1), S12-S32.
- ❖ Bobrow, Davis B. and John S. Dryzek. (1987). *Policy Analysis by Design*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- ❖ Braybrooke, David and Charles Lindblom. (1963). *A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process*. New York: The Free Press.
- ❖ Blank, Rebecca M. (2002). What do Economists Have to Contribute to Policy Decision? *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 42: 817–824.
- ❖ Rivlin, Alice. (1971). *Systematic Thinking for Social Action*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- ❖ Weiss, Carol H. (1987). Evaluating Social Programs: What Have We Learned? *Society* 25, no. 1: 40–45.