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# Course Description

This course surveys a range of approaches to comparative public policy. 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 Objectives

By the end of the course students should be able to:

* Demonstrate 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.
* 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).
* Critically discussing the merits of the different approaches, and of situate their own research within this field of competing theories.

# Required Materials and Texts

* Articles and book chapters available on Avenue and/or through the library website
* White, Linda A. 2017. Constructing Policy Change: Early Childhood Education and Care in Liberal Welfare States. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Available for purchase at the Campus Store or through UTP website (including ebook). Ebook (one users at a time) and hard copy (on reserve) available at Mills Library.

# Course Evaluation – Overview

1. Participation - 20%, ongoing
2. Weekly reading posts – 10%, ongoing
3. Discussion leadership – 10%, date determined first week of class
4. Critical review – 15%, date chosen by student
5. Term paper précis – 10%, November 5
6. Term paper – 35%, December 10

# Course Evaluation – Details

## 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.

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. This requirement is waived on week 2 and on weeks with five assigned readings instead of the usual four.

Your participation grade will include the presentation of a **brief overview** of your research findings for our final seminar.

## Weekly reading posts (10%), ongoing

To help you prepare for class, I will post a reading guide and some discussion questions on Avenue by Wednesday at 5pm. You are required to **post a brief (350-500 word) response by Saturday 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.

## Discussion facilitation (10%), due date 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 Tuesday at 1.30pm.** 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.

## Critical review essay (15%, due via email 11.59pm before relevant class, date selected by student)

There are eleven weeks of readings in the class (excluding the first and last week). 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 via email, the night before class at 11.59pm (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?

## Term paper précis and final paper (10% and 35%, due via email at 11.59pm on November 5 and December 10)

You will prepare a term paper that considers policy variation in time and/or space. The paper might try to explain why policies are the same/different across two polities, or why they change to stay the same across time.

The paper should be focused on reviewing the existing literature, rather than providing original research data. That is, the paper should engage existing accounts about how the outcome in question came to be. It should carefully describe the various claims of causality in existing accounts, set out points of disagreement within them, and evaluate the persuasiveness of their arguments.

The final paper should be 4500-6000 words, exclusive of bibliography. MA students are expected to submit a paper closer to the lower word limit and cite at least 10 scholarly sources. PhD students are expected to submit a paper closer to the higher word limit, and cite at least 15 scholarly sources. Source minimums include course readings. Students should choose a standard system of referencing and use it consistently. Late papers will be assessed a penalty of 2 percentage points per day.

As a step to ensure the timely completion of the paper, students should submit a précis of about 1000 words, including a preliminary bibliography, by November 5. This précis should precisely and clearly set out what the paper seeks to explain. What is the pattern of variation over time and/or space that is at the heart of the paper? It should also present some of the arguments in the existing literature that will be mobilized in the paper.

# Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Starred (\*) readings are available on Avenue as pdfs. All other readings are available through the library’s e-journal collection. The White book should be purchased or borrowed (note library copy available on reserve).

## Week 1 (September 4): Introduction to course

No assigned readings:

## Week 2 (September 11): Context of a place and a discipline

Readings:

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. “Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the final report.” nctr.ca.

* Preface and Introduction (p.1-23) and Calls to Action (319-337)

National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. 2019. Reclaiming Power and Place: Executive Summary of the Final Report. <https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/>

* See especially Introduction and Calls to Justice (All Canadians)

Goodman, Nicole, Karen Bird, and Chelsea Gabel. 2017. “Towards a More Collaborative Political Science: a Partnership Approach.” Canadian Journal of Political Science 50 (1): 201–18.

Nath, Nisha, Ethel Tungohan, and Megan Gaucher. 2018. “The Future of Canadian Political Science: Boundary Transgressions, Gender and Anti-Oppression Frameworks.” Canadian Journal of Political 51 (3): 619–42.

Additional reading:

Ahmed, Sara. 2017. Living a Feminist Life. Duke University Press.

Hill, Susan M. 2017. The Clay We Are Made of: : Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

MacDonald, Fiona. 2017. “Knocking Down Walls in Political Science: in Defense of an Expansionist Feminist Agenda.” Canadian Journal of Political Science 50 (2).: 411–26. doi:10.1017/S0008423916001190.

Week 3 (Date TBD, tentatively September 19): Introduction to theory and methods

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?

Readings:

\*Smith, Linda. 2012. Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, 2nd Edition. London: Zed Books. Read Chapter 9: Responding to the Imperatives of an Indigenous Agenda: A Case Study of Maori

\*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.

\*Yanow, Dvora. 2007. “Qualitative-Interpretive Methods in Policy Research,” in Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller and Mara J. Sidney (eds.) *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods* (New York: CRC Press), 405-415.

Additional Reading:

Gaudry, Adam. 2015. “Researching the Resurgence.” In Research as Resistance, edited by Leslie Brown and Susan Strega. Insurgent Research and Community-Engaged Methodologies in 21st-Century Academic Inquiry

**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.**

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

**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.**

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance. University of Minnesota Press.

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

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

## Week 4 (September 25): Power Resources Approaches

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?

Readings:

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

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.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2011. “From Indigenous Economies to Market-Based Self-Governance: a Feminist Political Economy Analysis.” Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne De Science Politique 44 (02). Cambridge University Press: 275–97. doi:10.1017/S0008423911000126.

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.

**Esping-Andersen, Gosta. 1990. The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Princeton University Press.**

 **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.

**Korpi, Walter. 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, “Swedish Social Democracy: Death of a Model?” *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (2000) 27-59.

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.**

## Week 5 (October 2): Pluralism and Neo-pluralism

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?

Readings:

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

Voth, Daniel. 2016. “Her Majesty's Justice Be Done: Métis Legal Mobilization and the Pitfalls to Indigenous Political Movement Building.” Canadian Journal of Political Science 49 (2). Cambridge University Press: 243–66.

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”).

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).

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

**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.**

## Week 6 (October 9): Rational choice institutionalism

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?

Readings:

March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1996. “Institutional Perspectives on Political Institutions.” Governance 9 (3): 247–64.

\*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.

Pasternak, Shiri. 2015. “How Capitalism Will Save Colonialism: the Privatization of Reserve Lands in Canada.” Antipode 47 (1). (10.1111): 179–96. doi:10.1111/anti.12094.

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.

Additional Reading:

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 1996)**

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].

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

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

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

## Week 7 (October 16): Fall Break, no class

## Week 8 (October 23): Historical Institutionalism and institutional change

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? A longstanding criticism of historical institutional approaches is that they only have room for *exogenous* institutional change. We therefore also ask, can we theorize *endogenous* change in institutions?

Readings:

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

\*Grace, Joan. (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.

Hawkesworth, Mary. 2003. “Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions.” The American Political Science Review 97 (4). American Political Science Association: 529–50.

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

\*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.

Additional readings:

**\*Costa, Giuliana. (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.**

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.

**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 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.

**Streeck, Wolfgang, & Thelen, Kathleen. (2005). Beyond Continuity. New York: Oxford University Press, see especially chapter 1.**

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

**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.

## Week 9 (October 30): Ideas

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?

Readings:

\*Berman, S. 1998. The Social Democratic Moment: Ideas and Politics in the Making of Interwar Europe. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Chapter 2.

Jacobs, Alan. M. 2009. How Do Ideas Matter?: Mental Models and Attention in German Pension Politics. Comparative Political Studies, 42(2), 252–279.

Bleich, Erik. 2002. Integrating Ideas into Policy-Making Analysis: Frames and Race Politics in Britain and France. Comparative Political Studies 35(9):1054-1076.

Maddison, Sarah. 2012. “Evidence and Contestation in the Indigenous Policy Domain: Voice, Ideology and Institutional Inequality.” Australian Journal of Public Administration 71 (3). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111): 269–77. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2012.00775.x.

Additional readings:

**Béland, Daniel, & Cox, Robert H. (Eds.). 2011. Ideas and politics in social science research. Oxford: Oxford University Press. See especially chapter 1 and 3.**

Boothe, Katherine. 2019. “‘Getting to the Table’: Changing Ideas About Public and Patient Involvement in Canadian Drug Assessment.” Journal of Health Policy, Politics & Law 44 (4)

Blyth, Mark. 1997. “Any more bright ideas?” The ideational turn of comparative political economy. Comparative Politics, 29(2), 229–250.

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

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

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

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

**Schneider, Anne, & Ingram, Helen. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334–347.**

**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.

## Week 10 (November 6): Learning and Cross-jurisdictional influences

Some of the earlier uses of ideas as an explanatory factor (see Heclo 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? 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?

Readings:

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.

**Illical, 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 Grace Skogstad, *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism, and Domestic Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Additional readings:

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

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

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.

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

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, Kurt. 2005. “Theories of Policy Diffusion: Lessons from Latin American Pension Reform.” W*orld Politics*, 57, 2: 262-295.**

## Week 11 (November 13): Public opinion

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?

Readings:

Burstein, Paul. 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.

Harrell, Allison, Stuart Soroka & Kiera Ladner. 2013. Public Opinion, Prejudice and the Racialization of Welfare in Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 37(14): 2580-2597.

Bittner, Amanda, and Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant. 2017. “Digging Deeper Into the Gender Gap: Gender Salience as a Moderating Factor in Political Attitudes.” Canadian Journal of Political Science 50 (2).: 559–78. doi:10.1017/S0008423917000270.

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.

Additional readings:

**Burstein, Paul. 2003. The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 29–40.**

**Cutler, Fred. (2004). Government responsibility and electoral accountability in federations. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism,* 34(2), 19–38.**

Cutler, Fred. (2008). Whodunnit? Voters and Responsibility in Canadian Federalism. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 41(03), 627.

**Downs, Anthony. 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, Richard. 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, Elizabeth, Blais, Andre, Nadeau, Richard, & Nevitte, Neil. (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.**

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

**Jacobs, Alan M., & Matthews, J. Scott. (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, Lawrence. R. (1993). The Health of Nations: Public Opinion and the Making of American and British Health Policy. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

**Page, Benjamin. and Robert Shapiro. 1983. Effects of Public Opinion on Policy. American Political Science Review 77(1): 175-190.**

Soroka, Stuart. N., & Wlezien, Christopher. 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, Christopher, & Soroka, Stuart N. (2010). Federalism and Public Responsiveness to Policy. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 41(1), 31–52.**

## Week 12 (November 20): Explaining policy variation 1

Over the next two weeks, we will read and discuss a book-length example of comparative policy research, explaining cross- and intra-national policy variation. The goals is to examine how White responds to and expands on existing theories of public policy *and* to gain an understanding of how an extended (i.e. thesis-length!) research project is structured.

Readings:

White, Linda A. 2017. Constructing Policy Change. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapters 1-4

## Week 13 (November 27): Explaining policy variation 2

Readings:

White, Linda A. 2017. Constructing Policy Change. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chapters 5-8

## Week 14 (December 4): Research presentations

No assigned readings

# Course Policies

## Submission of Assignments

All assignments should be typed using a standard 12-point font, single spaced, and standard 1 inch margins. All written assignments require formal citations and a bibliography. Any standard citation style is acceptable ([for example, APA or Chicago style](https://library.mcmaster.ca/research/citing)).

All written assignments are to be submitted in via email at the specified time on their due date.

## Grades

Grades will be based on the McMaster University grading scale:

Please note that in graduate school, a B- or below is a fail. A grade of B or B+ is passable, but an indication that there are serious concerns about the quality of the work that should be discussed with the instructor.

| **MARK** | **GRADE** |
| --- | --- |
| 90-100 | A+ |
| 85-90 | A |
| 80-84 | A- |
| 77-79 | B+ |
| 73-76 | B |
| 70-72 | B- |
| 69-0 | F |

## Late Assignments

The weekly reading responses are an important element of students’ participation grade. Because the student discussion leaders rely on their colleagues to submit discussion questions in a timely fashion, no late reading responses will be counted towards the participation grade. The same policy applies to critical review papers: you select the due date, so if you cannot complete it before class one week, please choose a different week to write on.

There will be a penalty of 2% per day (including weekends) for late précis or final papers. If you become seriously ill or experience an emergency 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.

## Absences, Missed Work, Illness

In the event of an absence for medical or other reasons, students should review and follow the Academic Regulation in the Graduate Calendar “Requests for Relief for Missed Academic Term Work”.

Participation in discussion is a crucial element of student learning in this class, and the discussion suffers when contributors are absent. If students are unavoidably absent, they should contact the instructor as soon as possible. Unexcused absences will impact participation grades.

## Avenue to Learn

In this course we will be using Avenue to Learn. 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.

## Turnitin.com

In this course we will be using a web-based service (Turnitin.com) to reveal authenticity and ownership of student submitted work. Students will be expected to submit their work electronically either directly to Turnitin.com or via Avenue to Learn (A2L) plagiarism detection (a service supported by Turnitin.com) so it can be checked for academic dishonesty. Students who do not wish to submit their work through A2L and/or Turnitin.com must still submit an electronic and/or hardcopy to the instructor. No penalty will be assigned to a student who does not submit work to Turnitin.com or A2L. All submitted work is subject to normal verification that standards of academic integrity have been upheld (e.g., on-line search, other software, etc.). For more information please refer to the [Turnitin.com Policy](http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity).

## Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the RISO policy. Students requiring a RISO accommodation should submit their request to their Faculty Office normally within 10 working days of the beginning of term in which they anticipate a need for accommodation or to the Registrar's Office prior to their examinations. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

## Policy on Children in Class

Currently, the university does not have a formal policy on children in the classroom. The policy described here is a reflection of my own beliefs and commitments to student, staff and faculty parents.

1) All breastfeeding babies are welcome in class as often as is necessary to support the breastfeeding relationship.

2) For older children and babies, I understand that minor illnesses and unforeseen disruptions in childcare often put parents in the position of having to chose between missing class to stay home with a child and leaving him or her with someone you or the child does not feel comfortable with. While this is not meant to be a long-term childcare solution, occasionally bringing a child to class in order to cover gaps in care is perfectly acceptable.

3) I ask that all students work with me to create a welcoming environment that is respectful of all forms of diversity, including diversity in parenting status.

4) In all cases where babies and children come to class, I ask that you sit close to the door so that if your little one needs attention and is disrupting learning for other students, you may step outside until their need has been met. Non-parents in the class, please reserve seats near the door for your parenting classmates.

# University Policies

## Academic Integrity Statement

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academiccredentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academiccredit or advantage. This behaviour 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 types of academic dishonesty please refer to the [Academic Integrity Policy](http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity)**.**

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 Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students who require academic accommodation must contact [Student Accessibility Services (SAS)](https://sas.mcmaster.ca/) 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. 28652 or e-mail sas@mcmaster.ca. For further information, consult McMaster University’s Policy for [Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.](http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicAccommodation-StudentsWithDisabilities.pdf)

## 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 Modification

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.