

**Political Science 974**  
**Seminar in Politics and Public Policy**  
**Spring 2022**  
**M: 4:30-7pm**

Prof. Paru Shah  
Bolton 646  
[shahp@uwm.edu](mailto:shahp@uwm.edu)  
Office Hours: M 2-3pm and by appt.

**Course Description and Objectives:**

This course is a seminar on public policymaking in the American context. While we will focus on recent scholarship on the policymaking process, we will also read several “classics” that deal with the relationship between the policy process and policy outcomes. Our study of policymaking will be based on the proposition that a rigorous understanding of policymaking depends upon a sophisticated understanding of institutions and political behavior. Many of the scholars we will read built their professional reputations in one or more of the traditional subfields in American politics (Congress, voting, public opinion, interest groups, etc.) and their conceptualizations of policy processes and outcomes are explicitly based on their understandings of these more traditional subfields. Though we will not ignore the details of the policymaking process, we will make a concerted effort to understand the impact of broad societal forces on policy development, choice, implementation and evaluation. We will spend a significant amount of time discussing examples from specific substantive policy areas, but this is probably not a course for students whose interests are limited to a single policy area.

\*\*Students who have no formal background in American politics should meet with me before enrolling in the course.

At the end of the course, each student should be able to:

1. Identify distinct interpretations of democracy and their implications for our understanding of public policymaking.
2. Describe and discuss the significance of various categories of public policy and explain the pros and cons of prominent policy typologies.
3. Identify and discuss various theoretical orientations towards public policymaking and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches.
4. Explain the fundamental characteristics of and the political dynamics associated with the various stages in the policy process.
5. Discuss techniques and demonstrate the ability to implement techniques for estimating policy impacts and evaluating policy effectiveness.

**Time Allocation**

This is a three-credit class. Students, on average, should expect to spend nine hours a week on activities related to POL SCI 974.

## **Panther Community Health and Safety Standards**

UWM has implemented reasonable health and safety protocols, taking into account recommendations by local, state and national public health authorities, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a member of our campus community, you are expected to abide by the Panther Interim COVID-Related Health & Safety Rules, which were developed in accordance with public health guidelines.

These standards apply to anyone who is physically present on campus, UWM grounds, or participating in a UWM-sponsored activity:

- All individuals visiting UWM facilities must wear face coverings while indoors;
- Unvaccinated students coming to campus are required to test weekly for COVID-19; and,
- You should check daily for COVID-19 symptoms and not come to campus if you are feeling sick.

Additional details about student and staff expectations can be found on the UWM COVID-19 webpage.

### **Required Readings:**

In addition to readings available on Canvas, we will be reading most of the following books (available on Amazon for purchase or rent, or in the library):

1. Sabatier, Paul and Christopher Weible. 2017. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Routledge, NY.
2. Stone, Deborah. 2001. *Policy Paradox*. WW Norton & Company.
3. Kingdon, John. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. Pearson.
4. Baumgartner, Frank and Jones, Bryan. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. University of Chicago Press.

### **Course Requirements:**

Class Participation:	10% (30pts)
Discussant Role:	10% (30pts)
Reaction Papers/Mini Empirical Papers:	30% (90pts)
Final Paper:	25% (75pts)
Final Exam:	25% (75pts)

### **Class Participation and Discussion**

To develop the knowledge and competencies required to satisfy these objectives, it will be very important for you to prepare carefully for class and to participate fully in class activities. You will also need to spend time *thinking* about the issues we raise in class. As this is a seminar, the burden of preparation and discussion will be shared by all. Failure to participate in class discussions will be considered an indicator that you are not prepared.

## Discussants

Each week, we will read and discuss a number of articles. Though all students are expected to read all of them carefully and prepare to discuss them in class, each week one or two student(s) will lead discussion on the readings.

*For the presentation/discussion leadership, the following guidelines apply:*

- 1) You must email a typed list of the questions you plan to raise during the discussion to me by 5:00pm the day before your presentation. This should be a specific set of questions with which you will start your discussion. Include both specific points and general issues you wish to raise. This should be your guideline for the class discussion and as such, should be as complete and as far-reaching as possible. My notes for discussion, for example, usually span at least one typewritten page of questions for each work. In the case of an entire book, I might have a page for each chapter. This is the sort of coverage for which you should aim.
- 2) Your extensive list of questions should be *analytical* in nature. Everyone in the class has done all the reading. Therefore, asking what the authors said about something or what their findings were with respect to some model is not useful. You should certainly give a short introduction summarizing the material in the readings for the day to refresh everyone's memory, but don't ask students to regurgitate the material. Ask them what they thought of a certain assertion the authors made or whether a given analysis was problematic in their view or how the authors might better test their second hypothesis. Don't ask them what the assertion was or how the analysis was conducted or what their second hypothesis suggested.
- 3) If you are sharing your presentation with another person, you are still expected to turn in discussion questions over *all of the material*. In addition, as you are "on" that day, you should have something to say about all of the material during class. You may split presentation duties and may have one of you "more" responsible for a certain portion of the reading than the other (at least for the summary part of the presentation). But during the discussion, you should jump in and add comments and questions whenever relevant and should make sure all of your questions are covered as well, even on the material for which you are not directly responsible. Be a team – be devil's advocate to each other – complement one another in terms of background knowledge and expertise – but certainly, be prepared to cover everything.

## Weekly Reaction Papers/Mini-Empirical Papers

During the **first three weeks of class**, you will be required to submit weekly reaction papers. The reaction papers should be based on the required readings, and should respond to some or all of the questions listed under the topic heading and covered by the readings. While the papers should describe the main ideas being presented, they should not be annotative bibliographies that summarize what each author presents; they should be organized around ideas and as much as possible relate to theoretical and/or conceptual concerns, not simply description. The papers should include an evaluative/critical paragraph of the research. Are their findings new and/or

nonobvious? Are their methods innovative? Do they advance understanding of their question? Is their model superior to others on point in terms of prediction? What ramifications does the work have for the way we understand politics and public policy? Be sure to substantiate any claims you make.

For the **last 10 weeks of the course**, you will be required to write 6 “mini” research papers (3-5 pages long). The purpose of this exercise is to begin working with data, thinking about the research questions that flow from the weekly readings, and practicing writing succinctly and clearly. We will discuss possible data cites and I will provide some examples in class.

Each weekly reaction/mini-empirical paper will be worth 10 points, and is due at the beginning of class.

### **Empirical Paper**

You are required to write an empirical paper for this class, on a topic of your choice. Given the time constraints of a 15-week course, this will be a paper that focuses on replication of another study, or a pilot study (20-25 pages).

*My expectation is that all of you have had POL SCI 700 and 701 or their equivalent. If this is not the case, please come and see me.*

The paper must include the following, and over the course of the semester, I will ask you to turn in different sections to assure you are on the right path.

1. *An extensive, comprehensive literature review* of the work done in your area of interest. This requires substantial searching in the various databases maintained by the library, and a large amount of reading. You should note that once you find an adequate number of sources to begin with, you should consult their references for further readings on topic. You must read each of the sources you find carefully, summarize them, critically analyze the findings reported in them, show how their work is related to your research question, and draw from them the findings you deem to be worthwhile considerations in your research. This literature review will be sort of an extended version of the weekly papers. That is, do the same thing you did for the weekly papers, only on a much grander scale.
2. *A well-formulated and thought-out research question* that poses some problem of interest to judicial politics scholars. Tell me why what you wish to study is important, why we need a study such as yours, and what you will tell us through your research. *Tell me what your theory is*, and how you will apply that theory to the research question you seek to answer.
3. *A list of hypotheses to be tested*. You should explain each of your hypotheses, justifying why you think they will be confirmed or disconfirmed. Presenting the hypotheses in tabular form at the end of the paper is oftentimes useful as well.
4. *Description of the data to be used, the operationalization of the variables, and the methodology to be employed*. Tell me in detail how the data were collected, how reliability and validity concerns were addressed, and how you obtained the data. (Note: I will get you links to potential data sources and discuss them in class.) Choose variables to test your hypotheses and defend their utility in testing the hypotheses you hope to test. Explain how each variable is measured, why you made the choices you did in measurement, and why you

think they are the best measures possible. Finally, discuss the methodology you will use and tell me why it is appropriate. What does this method do and how does it work? Why do you use it over other available alternatives?

5. *Presentation of the model and the results of the estimation.* Given your hypotheses, variables, and methodology, what model will you test? Before estimating it using your method, discuss the bivariate relationships among the variables in your data. Is there enough support at the bivariate level to expect relationships to remain once controlling for other influences? After you've discussed what the data tells you up front, continue with the estimation of your model and provide your results in tabular and/or graphical form. What did you find? Which of your hypotheses are confirmed? Which are disconfirmed? Which variables are significant and at what level? How well does your model fit your data? What is your reduction in error? How much influence do the individual variables exude on your dependent variable? Which is the most important? How much confidence can you have in your findings?
6. *Discussion of the findings.* What can you conclude from the findings of the analysis? Is the relationship among the variables as you expected it to be? If not, can you speculate as to why you obtained findings you did not expect? What are the issues we should have with your findings? Are they time bound? Issue bound? Are there problems in your operationalization, perhaps? What still needs some explanation? What have we learned? How do your findings comport with other studies on point?
7. *Conclusions and directions for future research.* Recap your most significant findings, and tell us why your study was important and what we have learned from it. Tell us what we still don't know and where we should go from here. What will you do in future research? What should others do to build on your work?

Each of you will present your paper the last week of class, and another student will be assigned as a peer reviewer. More details will be given in class.

### Final Exam

There is will one exam given during finals week, which will cover the entire course and will be delivered as a prelim question.

### Grade distribution:

Letter grades will be assigned according to the following distribution:

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-
100-94%	93-90%	89-88%	87-82%	81-80%	79-78%	77-72%	71-70%	69-68%	67-62%	61-60%

Students are encouraged to keep track of their progress in the course and consult with me in person should they have questions or concerns about their performance. Please note I will not discuss grades via email or telephone.

### CLASS POLICIES (READ CAREFULLY):

**Attendance Policy:** This course is designed to be an intensive seminar with student participation and discussion. In order for rich classroom discussion, students must attend all sessions. If you have an emergency or scheduling conflict, please notify me.

**E-mail:** The best way to contact me is via e-mail, but I am generally off-line after 9pm and before 9am.

**Academic Misconduct:** Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary action and disciplinary sanctions by the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. If you are unfamiliar with university rules related to cheating and plagiarism, please consult:

<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/OSL/DOS/conduct.html>

**Disability Accommodations:** At the beginning of the semester, students with disabilities who need special accommodations should notify the instructor by presenting a letter prepared by the Student Accessibility Center (SAC). To ensure that the most appropriate accommodations are provided, students should contact the SAC Office. For more information, see:

<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/DSAD/SAC/SACltr.pdf>

**Religious Beliefs Accommodation:** On occasion, students may find it necessary to miss class in order to observe a religious holiday. In order to ensure reasonable accommodation, students should inform the instructor of the conflict prior to the holiday.

[http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/acad%2Badmin\\_policies/S1.5.htm](http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/acad%2Badmin_policies/S1.5.htm)

**Military Duty:** Students called up for active military duty should contact the instructor for accommodation. For more information on the university's policies, see:

<http://www3.uwm.edu/des/web/registration/militarycallup.cfm>

**Discriminatory Conduct:** For information on definitions of discrimination, harassment, abuse of power, and the reporting requirements of discriminatory conduct, see:

[http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/acad%2Badmin\\_policies/S47.pdf](http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/acad%2Badmin_policies/S47.pdf)

**Course Schedule**  
**\*Subject to Change**

**I. Introduction**

***Week 1***

***January 24: Introduction to Course***

***Week 2***

***January 31: What is Public Policy?***

Discussion Question: How do political scientists think about and study public policy?

***Reaction paper #1 Due***

- Robert E. Goodin, Michael Moran and Martin Rein. 2009. "Overview of Public Policy: The Public and Its Policies." Robert E. Goodin (ed). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier and Weible. 2014. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Introduction
- Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson. 2014. "After the 'Master Theory': Downs, Schattschneider and the Rebirth of Policy-Focused Analysis." *Perspectives on Politics*. 12, 3. 643-662.
- Herrera, Veronic and Alison Post. 2019. "The Case for Public Policy Expertise in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, forthcoming.

***Week 3***

***February 7: Studying Policy: Theories, Types and Typologies***

Discussion Questions: What makes a good theory? Which one of these theories is a good theory of public policy? Why?

***Reaction paper #2 Due***

***Research Question Due***

- Sabatier and Weible. 2014. *Theories of the Policy Process*. Part I; Chapters 1-6
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. and Steven M. Maser. 1990. "The Conceptual Architecture of Public Policy: A Critical Reconstruction of Lowi's Typology." *Journal of Politics*. 52:1101-1123.
- Smith, Kevin B. 2002. "Typologies, Taxonomies, and the Benefits of Policy Classification." *Policy Studies Journal*. 30:379-395.
- Yi, H., & Feiock, R. C. 2014. Renewable energy politics: policy typologies, policy tools, and state deployment of renewables. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(3): 391-415.

## ***Week 4***

### ***February 14: Studying Policy: Epistemology and Methodology***

Discussion Questions: What is the relationship between ontology, epistemology and methodology? Based on our readings so far, how would you characterize the study of public policy? How do we “know” policy is working or effective or different? Is it the same or different than “mainstream” political science? How?

#### ***Reaction paper #3 Due***

- Peter A. Hall. 2003. “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics.’ In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- David Marsh and Paul Furlong. 2002. A skin, Not a Sweater: Ontological and Epistemology in Political Science.
- Kathryn Edin. 2014. “Special Symposium on Qualitative and Mixed Methods for Policy Analysis.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 33, 2. 345-494.

## **II. Constructing Public Policy**

## ***Week 5***

### ***February 21: Problem Definition and Framing***

#### ***Discussants:***

Discussion Questions: How do “problems” and “issues” get defined and framed? How do issues reach the policy agenda? What determines whether issues on the policy agenda get acted upon? How does the policy agenda change?

#### ***Mini-Empirical Paper #1 Due***

#### ***Literature Review Draft Due***

- Stone, Deborah. 1997. Stone: Policy Paradox
- Bachrach and Baratz. 1963. “Decisions and Nondecisions: an Analytical Framework,” *American Political Science Research*, 57 (3): 632-642.
- Robinson, Scott and Warren Eller. 2010. “Participation in Policy Streams: Testing the Separation of Problems and Solutions in Subnational Policy Systems,” *Policy Studies Journal*, 38 (2):199-216.

## **Week 6**

### **February 28: Agenda Setting**

#### **Discussants:**

Discussion Questions: How does the structure of Congress affect the policy-making process and policy outcomes? What are the motivations and incentives driving congressional behavior? In what ways does legislative organization affect policies and outcomes? To what extent and how do “voters” control congressional behavior and public policy?

#### ***Mini-Empirical Paper #2 Due***

- Kingdon, John. 1995. Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies.
- Baumgartner, Frank and Jones, Bryan. 1993. Agendas and Instability in American Politics.

## **Week 7**

### **March 7: Interest Groups and Policy Making**

#### **Discussants:**

Discussion Questions: Why is it difficult for interests to organize into groups? Why and how do some do so anyway? What resources do interest groups bring to bear on the political process, and how does this vary by type of interest group? How do interest groups attempt to influence public policy? How successful are they?

#### ***Mini-Empirical Paper #3 Due***

#### ***Hypotheses, Concepts and Methods/Data Due***

- Ostrom, Elinor. 2000, “Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, v. 14, no. 3, pp. 137-158.
- Austen-Smith and Wright, “Counter-Active Lobbying,” *AJPS*, 1994, Vol. 38 (1), pp. 25-44.
- Jacobson, Gary. 1999. “The Effect of the AFL-CIO’s Voter Education Campaigns on the 1996 House Elections.” *Journal of Politics*, 61(1): 185-194.
- Levitt, Steven D. 1998. “Are PACS trying to influence Politicians or Voters?” *Economics and Politics*, 10(1): 19-36.
- Kluver, Heike, Christine Mahoney, and Marc Opper. 2015. “Framing in Context: how interest groups employ framing to lobby the European Commission.” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4): 481-498.

**Week 8**

**March 14: Public Opinion, Parties, and Citizen Participation**

**Discussants:**

Discussion Questions: What role does public opinion play in policy making? Is public policy responsive to public opinion or does it shape public opinion? How does policy feedback affect public opinion?

**Mini-Empirical Paper #4 Due**

- Jacobs, Lawrence, and Shapiro, Robert, Politicians Don't Pander, chs. 1,2.
- Canes-Wrone and Shotts, "The Conditional Nature of Presidential Responsiveness to Public Opinion, *AJPS*, 2004, Vol. 48 (4), pp. 690-706.
- Pierson, Paul, "When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change," *World Politics*, 1993, Vol. 45 (July), pp. 595-628.
- Soss, Joe and Schram, Sanford, "A Public Transformed: Welfare Reform as Policy Feedback," *APSR*, Feb., 2007.

**Week. 9**

**March 21: Spring Break!**

**Week 10**

**March 28: Implementation**

**Discussants:**

Discussion Questions: To what extent is – and should - implementation be considered in the policy design process? How can policy makers insure that policies are carried out to meet their objectives? How can appointed officials control bureaucratic behavior at the point of contact?

**Mini-Empirical Paper #5 Due**

**Paper Rough Draft #1 Due**

- Wood, B. Dan. 1992. "Modeling Federal Implementation as a System." *American Journal of Political Science*. 36:40-67.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review*. 87:334-347.
- Whitford, A. B. 2007. "Decentralized Policy Implementation." *Political Research Quarterly*. 60:17-30.
- Elmore, Richard, "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions," *Political Science Quarterly*, 94 (Winter, 1979-80), pp. 601- 616.

### III. Change

#### *Week 11*

#### **April 4: Path Dependence, Policy Feedback, and Change**

#### **Discussants:**

#### ***Mini-Empirical Paper #6 Due***

- Steffen Ganghof. 2007. "The Political Economy of High Income Taxation: Capital Taxation, Path Dependence, and Political Institutions in Denmark." *Comparative Political Studies*, 40. (1059-1084).
- Wolfgang Streeck and Kathleen Thelen. 2005. "Introduction." *Beyond Continuity : Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacob Hacker. 2005. "Policy Drift: The Hidden Politics of US Welfare State Retrenchment." In *Beyond Continuity*.

#### *Week 12*

#### **April 11: Policy Innovation, Diffusion and Transfer**

#### **Discussants:**

Discussion Questions: How do governments innovate, and how do innovations diffuse across governments (state or national)? What determines whether policy innovations diffuse and the order in which they do so?

#### ***Mini-Empirical Paper #7 Due***

#### ***Paper Rough Draft #2 Due***

- Eric M. Patashnik and Julian E. Zelizer. 2013. "The Struggle to Remake Politics: Liberal Reform and the Limits of Policy Feedback in the Contemporary American State." *Perspectives on Politics*. 11 (4). 1071-1087.
- Colin Crouch and Maarten Keune. 2005. "Changing Dominant Practice: Making Use of Institutional Diversity in Hungary and the UK." In *Beyond Continuity*.
- Bricker, Christine, and Scott LaCombe. "The Ties that Bind Us: The Influence of Perceived State Similarity on Policy Diffusion." *Political Research Quarterly* (2020).
- Mintrom, Michael, "Policy Entrepreneurs and the Diffusion of Innovation," *American Journal of Political Science*," July, 1997, pp. 738-770.

## IV. Public Policy Issues

### *Week 13*

#### *April 18: Criminal Justice and Immigration*

##### *Discussants:*

##### *Mini-Empirical Paper #8 Due*

- Valcore, Jace L., and Mary Dodge. "How hate crime legislation shapes gay and lesbian target groups: an analysis of social construction, law, and policy." *Criminal justice policy review* 30.2 (2019): 293-315.
- Pickett, Justin T. "Public opinion and criminal justice policy: Theory and research." *Annual Review of Criminology* 2 (2019): 405-428.
- DeMora, Stephanie L., Loren Collingwood, and Adriana Ninci. "The role of super interest groups in public policy diffusion." *Policy & Politics* 47.4 (2019): 513-541.
- Ybarra, Vickie D., Melina Juárez Pérez, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. "Do Perceptions Match Reality? Comparing Latinos' Perceived Views of State Immigration Policy Environments with Enacted Policies." *Policy Studies Journal* 47.3 (2019): 774-792.
- Filindra, Alexandra, and Sara Wallace Goodman. "Studying public policy through immigration policy: Advances in theory and measurement." *Policy Studies Journal* 47.3 (2019): 498-516.

### *Week 14*

#### *April 25: Rights and Policy*

##### *Discussants:*

##### *Mini-Empirical Paper #9 Due*

- Daniel Q. Gillion, *The Political Power of Protest: Minority Activism and Shifts in Public Policy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), Ch. 1, 3-5 (available via ebook at library)
- Celene Reynolds, 2019. "The Mobilization of Title IX across U.S. Colleges and Universities, 1994- 2014," *Social Problems*, 66:245-273.
- Rose, Deondra. "Policy Feedback and the Racialization of Affirmative Action, 1961-1980." *International Journal of Public Administration* (2019): 1-11.

***Week 15***

***May 2: Inequality and Representation***

***Discussant:***

***Mini-Empirical Paper #10 Due  
Peer Reviews Due***

- Larry M. Bartels, “Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind,” *Perspectives on Politics* 3, no. 1 (March 2005): 15-31
- Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page, “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens,” *Perspectives on Politics* 12, no. 3 (September 2014): 564-581
- Vesla M. Weaver and Amy E. Lerman, “Political Consequences of the Carceral State,” *American Political Science Review* 104, no. 4 (November 2010): 817-833
- Vesla Mae Weaver, “Why white people keep calling the cops on black Americans,” *Vox*, May 29, 2018, <https://www.vox.com/first-person/2018/5/17/17362100/starbucks-racial-profiling-yale-airbnb-911>

***Week 16***

***May 9: Paper Presentations***

***Week 17***

***Final - online***