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**Overview**

This course serves as a foundation and overview of major issues and theories in contemporary public policymaking, incorporating perspectives and analytical frameworks from a variety of disciplines. It aims to provide exposure to, and an appreciation for, the classic texts, concepts, theories and arguments that have informed and shaped public affairs-related scholarship. It identifies questions and debates in the foundational literature that shape the way we think about and refine theory to address public policy questions and problems today. In other words, this is a course on *how to think about public policy.*

You will notice that this course draws primarily on seminal texts that have shaped public policy scholarship and practice at key points in the evolution of the discipline. Given our focus on mastering the intellectual history of the field (and because this is a course drawing on English-language literature), this inevitably means our readings are selected from a rather un-diverse pool of scholars, representing largely male, Anglo-American perspectives set in democratic contexts. As you read, keep this in mind. Think about how this has shaped the trajectory of the field: the problems that drive inquiry, which questions are asked (and how), how research questions are framed and justified, and the intended audiences of scholarship. We adopt this approach because, as public policy scholars, we need to start at the beginning to understand how the discipline has evolved – and where it needs to continue to evolve. Quite often, this evolution has been in reaction to perceived gaps, myopia or biases in the existing literature. Thus, it is necessary to understand these roots and to always keep the historical context in mind: how did the prevailing issues of the day, the extant literature, and the norms and practices of the profession shape inquiry at these times in history?

To gain a robust understanding of our discipline’s past and future requires very careful and critical reading. As such, the primary assignments in this course center around reading reflection essays as well as in-class discussions. You should plan on dedicating at least 10 hours per week outside of class to completing the reading, writing the reflection essays, and preparing for in-class discussion. The final book review assignment is intended to empower you to identify a contemporary text that you believe will shape the future canon of the public policy discipline. What makes for a (would-be) classic, and why?

**Course Schedule**

1. August 26: The Purposes and Paradoxes of Public Policy
2. Sept.2: No Classes (Labor Day):
3. Sept.9: State versus Markets
4. September 16: Who Governs? Influence, Interest Groups and Public Opinion
5. September 23: Collective Action in Public Policy
6. September 30: Representation
7. October 7: Bureaucracies
8. October 14: Decision Making
9. October 21: Agenda-Setting
10. October 28: Policy Framing and Advocacy
11. November 4: Policy Delegation and Enforcement
12. November 11: Evidence and Public Policy: Climate Change
13. November 18: Institutions: Democratic Backsliding
14. Nov.25-30 Thanksgiving Break
15. December 2: Inequality: Race and Public Policy
16. December 9: Presentations on the “Future Canons”

Class Participants:

Garcia, Cynthia: cynthiagarcia.saucedo@gmail.com

Garrison, Amanda: a.garrison@wustl.edu

Hoang, Vuong: vhoang@colgate.edu

Igdal, Andrew: andrewigdal17@gmail.com

Kwon, Yongtae (Aaron): yongtae.kwon@utexas.edu

Sutter, Derek: derekjsutter@utexas.edu

Van Wie, Ryan: ryanvanwie@gmail.com

Wang, Yuer: yuerw@utexas.edu

Yarckin, Ben benjaminyarckin@gmail.com

Zhang, Chunyang: zcy2022@outlook.com

Zhang, Yingxin: yingxin.zhang@utexas.edu

**Required Books**

We have five required books for this course. Please note that I have required books for purchase (or check out from library) whenever more than 20% of the text is assigned as required reading. For excerpts from texts that are 20% or less of a published book, or if the book is out of print and unavailable, I have found the book in the library and scanned and uploaded the selected sections in Canvas. This ensures that we are fully in compliance with fair-use copyright policies.

Please note that some of these books are available electronically via the [UT library](http://www.lib.utexas.edu), so you may access them that way instead of purchasing a copy. I have ordered these books to be available through the UT Bookstore, for your convenience, or you may find copies through other venues. Please ensure that you purchase the correct edition of the book.

Stone, Deborah. 2011. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making, 3rd edition*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Available on [Amazon](https://www.amazon.com/Policy-Paradox-Political-Decision-Making/dp/0393912728/ref%3Dsr_1_1?qid=1686601116&refinements=p_27%3ADeborah+Stone&s=books&sr=1-1&text=Deborah+Stone&ufe=app_do%3Aamzn1.fos.006c50ae-5d4c-4777-9bc0-4513d670b6bc#customerReviews) or available through the UT Library: PCL Stacks H 97 S83 2011. (note: this book is expensive to buy new. If you are unable to obtain a used copy, please let me know and I can make a copy available for your use).

Alexander, Michelle. 2020. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press (10th Anniversary Edition). Available through the UT Library at [https://ebookcentral.proquest.
com/lib/utxa/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=5651869](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=5651869) or via [Amazon](https://www.amazon.com/s?k=The+New+Jim+Crow%3A+Mass+Incarceration+in+the+Age+of+Colorblindness&i=stripbooks&crid=1K939H5HP7U9L&sprefix=the+new+jim+crow+mass+incarceration+in+the+age+of+colorblindness%2Cstripbooks%2C104&ref=nb_sb_noss_1).

Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, 2nd Edition*. New York: Harper Collins. Available used on [Amazon](https://www.amazon.com/Agendas-Alternatives-Policies-Classics-Political/dp/0321121856/ref%3Dsr_1_1?crid=3GLZARRSRKSS9&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.injXj0s_ImmIhTtqKHH8f3yPBvX9-oXAg8tQ4FOovEfGjHj071QN20LucGBJIEps.kozjlNKhS0B34eteS3-4gVSDcIIDQgR53QrqIatgnV0&dib_tag=se&keywords=Agendas%2C+Alternatives%2C+and+Public+Policies%2C+2nd+Edition&qid=1722466738&s=books&sprefix=agendas%2C+alternatives%2C+and+public+policies%2C+2nd+edition%2Cstripbooks%2C95&sr=1-1) or available through the UT Library: PCL Stacks JK 274 K62 1984.

Nordhaus, William. 2013. *The Climate Casino: Risk, Uncertainty, and Economics for a Warming World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Available on [Amazon](https://www.amazon.com/Climate-Casino-Uncertainty-Economics-Warming/dp/030021264X) or through the [UT Library.](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/%20%20lib/utxa/detail.action?docID=3421326&pq-origsite=primo) (it is also available via Canvas)

Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Available on Amazon or available through the UT Library: PCL HD 1286 O87 1990 or electronic copy. (The PDF version – available via the library and via Canvas)

All other required readings are available on Canvas in PDF format (accessed through the UT Library) or available as free downloads on the internet (see links in the reading schedule). NOTE: I reserve the right to subtract readings from the required list during the course of the semester if adjustments to the reading load are needed.

**Assignments and Grading**

***Please note:***

The late penalty is 10% grade deduction for every 24-hour period after the deadline. Extensions due to medical or other valid reasons must be requested in advance of the deadline, unless they are emergency situations.

You are PhD students, and as such I expect you to abide by the highest standards of academic ethics. We work on the honor code, and I expect you to be extra vigilant about plagiarism (intentional and unintentional). Do not use ChatGPT or any other kind of “online assistance” in your writing. If I suspect you are using ChatGPT, I may ask to see you and have you provide an oral discussion of the assignment to properly assess your understanding of the material. Your grades for any particular assignment will reflect the outcome of that verbal discussion.

**I. In-Class Participation (25%)**

Minimal participation in classroom discussion requires that you read, think about, and bring to class the assigned reading materials; be prepared to discuss the reading materials; and show respect for other participants and the instructor. The discussion evaluation guideline attached to the end of this syllabus differentiates contributors in the following areas: mastery of material, quality of ideas, effectiveness of argumentation, respectful and active engagement of others in the discussion, and general impression.

Positive class participation is not based on a quantitative measure of how many times you speak in class. Rather, good participation entails actively staying engaged during class by asking questions, making useful comments, and posing an argument relevant to the topic at hand. A willingness to play devil’s advocate is encouraged. I especially encourage you to engage with each other – not just me.

This seminar involves a lot of reading. In order to manage this workload and facilitate a lively discussion each week, students writing a reflection essay for an assigned week will also serve as informal discussion leaders. Being a discussion leader means being ready to present the assigned reading (which could be a section of a book or an article), focusing roughly on: (1) the central research questions or topics; (2) the core argument, (3) a critical discussion of the evidence or discussion of the assigned section; (4) key take-aways and overall significance for each week’s learning objectives in the context of the other assigned readings. For some weeks, students will be assigned in teams to this task. You will not need to prepare anything in writing, nor will you need to formally present anything. But you should be ready to jump in with comments, be ready to answer my (and your classmates’) questions, and generally play point guard or in-resident expert on your assigned bit.

Does this mean you get to skip the rest of the reading? Not a chance. But it does mean that you should be better able to manage your workload and class preparation appropriately.

**III. Reading Synthesis Essays (3 @ 15% each = 45%)**

*“I didn't have time to write a short letter, so I wrote a long one instead.” ~ Mark Twain*

All students must complete a weekly readings reflection for 3 class sessions, not including week 1, 2 or week 16. You may revise and resubmit one (and one only!) of these three essays at any point in the semester in order to improve your grade. This choice is provided in order to give you opportunities to absorb my feedback (and perhaps come chat with me), adjust your reading and writing strategy, and strengthen your editing skills. After all, this is a harder assignment than it may appear at first glance, and I am apparently a tough grader (or so students tell me). If you should choose to revise and resubmit an essay, it must be re-submitted no later than December 2 (the last day of class)

Each essay should be between 1,500-2,000 words, and submitted via Canvas by Sunday evening at 5:00 pm. We will distribute a sign-up list at the beginning of the semester to ensure we have three essay writers for each class session. These essay writers will also serve as discussion leaders during class.

The objective of the weekly reflections essay is to incentivize critical thinking about the assigned readings and help you develop the skills to draw out key observations and lessons. Your essay should not simply reiterate talking points from the reading(s). Instead, the essay should summarize/synthesize the essential concepts and arguments that you took away from the reading(s) and the identify questions and issues you would like to explore in class discussion. Note: this assignment will at first seem quite difficult (writing -2,000 words on top of all this reading – really?). However, you will quickly learn that this structured exercise does three things: it helps you read faster, identify the key arguments and significance of the work(s), and retain the information. Bonus learning objectives: this assignment will help you learn to write concisely and cultivate reading and writing skills that will be useful when you approach your own literature reviews in future research.

To complete this without going too far into the weeds or spending too much time reading and taking notes, I suggest first using the following process prior to writing:

Step 1: Complete the assigned reading. Read SMART. What does this mean? It means reading for the main argument and concepts, not for every detail. Do not take detailed notes as you are reading – this will bog you down and prevent you from seeing the bigger picture. Instead, jot down the key concepts you come across on a post-it or scrap piece of paper. The goal here is to read efficiently and effectively. How else will you get through all of this reading?

Step 2: Sit back, stare at the wall or sky, and think for 10-15 minutes. How does these assigned readings fit into the topic for the week, and the themes of this course? What are the core concepts and/or key contributions of these works? How does it fit into the “intellectual history” of public policy? Hint: take the opportunity to discuss these questions with your classmates outside of class.

Step 3: Now think critically. Scholars are also human beings. We tend to write from a place of historical and political context, and from personal experience, professional training, and belief/value systems. To this end, think about who the authors are, their personal perspectives, and the context in which they are writing. How do you think this influenced the questions they posed for study, their intended audiences, their particular “take” on these questions, their method of inquiry, and their focus on select factors or variables? With this in mind, what were some of your key reactions to these readings– agreements, disagreements, points of confusion or discomfort, moments of wanting with respect to the questions or arguments NOT discussed, or ideas on how this work apply to contemporary issues?

Here are some things to keep in mind as you think about organizing your essay:

1. Please put your name and the full citations of these readings on the document (not just the file name). Due to Texas allergies, I often will print and provide feedback in writing to give my watery and itchy eyes a break.
2. Do some quick research: who is/are the author(s)?
3. What are the key policy issues of focus and research questions of these texts, and how does these texts fit into the theme for the week?
4. (If applicable) what are the core concepts introduce and developed in the text(s)?
5. What are the arguments, methods, and evidence offered by the author(s)?
6. What, in sum, are the key take-aways from this/these text(s)? If there are multiple readings in the week, were are you able to identify points of agreement or disagreement between the authors? In other words, if – three, ten, or twenty years from now – you need to recall why we read these texts and what they contributed to our study of public policy, what would you want to have captured?

Please note that I am NOT asking you to evaluate or critique the readings. We will do this in class. Rather the goal is to understand, summarize, synthesize, and place in context of our broader study of the field of public policy.

Please do not take this as a “free pass” on completing the readings for the weeks in which you’ve decided not to write a reflective essay. Weekly completion of assigned readings is a hard requirement. In fact, I designed this reflection essay assignment to help guide your reading for all assigned texts in this course – and other courses! Thus, my suggestion is to complete this exercise for every week (mentally or on scratch paper), even if you are only turning in polished essays for six weeks. Why? Because your understanding of the texts will skyrocket, you will be well prepared for class discussion, and you will learn and retain more than if you simply skim the readings or read without structure. And this is a habit for reading and note taking that, if well honed, will serve you very well once you begin your dissertation research.

**Reflection Essays are due by the 5:00 pm Sunday evening (before the class day).** Please post them to Canvas under Assignments.

How will these be graded? Each reflection note will be assessed holistically on a scale of 1-15, with 15 = “excellent” across all criteria.

Part I: Summary and Key Points (12 points)

1. Accuracy of content (as an indicator of your understanding of the assigned texts)
2. Comprehensiveness: did you in fact glean the key arguments and concepts? Were you able to explain these arguments and concepts well in your own words (and do so very concisely)?
3. Did you aptly articulate the key significance of this/these works for the broader literature on public policy? In other words, are you able to summarize the core contribution of this work and how it advances research or informs policy in our field?

Part II: Writing Quality (3 points)

1. Quality of writing. Yes, I care a LOT about this, and so should you. Being an excellent writer is extremely important to any career in academic and/or policy. How clear, concise, coherent, and grammatically accurate is your writing? How engaging is your writing?

**III. “Future Canon” Book Review (30%)**

This class is organized around the perceived “foundational texts” or “canons” of public policy literature. As previously discussed, that means we will focus in this course on texts that were often written decades ago, most often by scholars who represent a narrow slice of our world’s demography. But, of course, the field of public policy has grown and become significantly more diverse over the past 100 years in both its scholar population and scope of thought.

To this end, our final assignment focuses on identifying and reflecting on notable works (in this case, books) from recent years (from 2010-present) that may, in due course, become the canonical texts that are assigned in future iterations of this course. Our goal here is to discover these texts and to think critically about why we believe they will become the “future canons.” This is also an opportunity to identify texts that expand our understanding of the issues, questions, and methods that are redefining the field, and the scholars who are making these important contributions.

This exercise looks much like your weekly reflection notes, but in expanded form. It follows a three-step process:

* 1. **Pitch (5%):** Identify a book, published (1st edition) on or after January 1, 2010, that you believe will become part of the “future canon.” Write up a brief (1-2 paragraph) justification for your choice, and submit it (via Canvas) by October 30. All selections must be approved, and all students should coordinate with each other to ensure that no two students are reading the same text. Note: this is a bespoke opportunity to find a text that is also aligned with your theoretical or methodological areas of interests. Be strategic!
	2. **Panel Presentation (10%)** On December 2 (the last day of class), each of you will sit on a 3-4 person panel and provide an 8-10 minute presentation on your selected “future canonical text.” Time will be strictly enforced to make sure we get through all the presentations.

This presentation will count for 10% of your final grade. Your grade on this part of the assignment will focus not only on the substance of the presentation, but the quality of the oral and visual presentation. We will talk in class about what is entailed in a quality presentation of this length and format, which is (quite intentionally) very similar to the kind of presentation you will eventually give as a teacher in a classroom or a scholar/practitioner at a professional conference or other forum.

* 1. **Final Essay (15%):** On Dec.9, your written version of the presentation is due. This should take the form of a 2,000-2,500 word book review, structured in a way that follows the prompts of the reflection essay. However, in addition to covering these discussion points, you should also think critically about how this selected work satisfies the criteria for a “canonical text.” Moreover, you should comment on how the book fits into the existing literature. This may or may not require some additional research. Where does this book fill a critical gap in the literature or break new ground? What is significantly new and value-added in this text that makes it, in your mind, potential required reading for future public policy students? If done well, you will learn how to write a book review for publication (and learn a lot in the process about how to analyze a publication, including how to read and provide a peer review on any article submitted to a professional journal). This part of the assignment will be graded much like the weekly reflection essays.

**Reading Schedule**

(\* = no reading reflections assigned for this day)

**\*Week 1 (August 26): Paradoxes of Public Policy**

Deborah Stone. 2011. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 3rd ed. {Required book – please purchase or check out via library}

**\*Week 2 (September 2): No Class (Labor Day)**

(please note that my Monday and Tuesday office hours will be canceled this week due to travel to Ireland for my daughter’s college graduation)

**\*Week 3 (September 9): States vs. Markets**

Skinner, Andrew Stewart. 1996. “The Role of the State,” in  A System of Social Science: Papers Relating to Adam Smith, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed: Ch.8 (26 pages)

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1963. “Uncertainty and the Welfare Economics of Medical Care.” *American Economic Review* 53: 941-73. (33 pp)Gersch

Coase, Ronald. 1960. “The Problem of Social Cost.” Reprinted in *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 56(4), 2013, pp.837-877. (41 pp)

Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1966. “Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective,” in *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Boston: Belknap / Harvard University Press, pp.5-30. (26 pp)

Boyer, Robert. 2005. “State and Market: A New Engagement for the Twenty-First Century?” in R. Boyer and Daniel Drache, eds., *States Against Markets: The Limits of Globalization*. London: Routledge, pp.62-84. (23 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Akerlof, George. 1970. “The Market for ‘Lemons’: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84(3): 488-500. (13 pp)

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1951. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Wiley.

Bardhan, Pranab. 1989. "The New Institutional Economic and Development Theory: A Brief Critical Assessment." *World Development* 17(9) (September): 1389-95.

Berger, Peter L. 1986. *The Capitalist Revolution: Fifty Propositions about Prosperity, Equality, and Liberty*. Basic Books.

Campbell, John L. and Leon N. Lindberg. 1990. "Property Rights and the Organization of Economic Activity by the State." *American Sociological Review* 55(5): 634-77.

Chang, Ha-Joon. 2002. *Kicking Away the Ladder: Policies and Institutions for Development in Historical Perspective*. Anthem

Coase, Ronald H. 1988. *The Firm, the Market, and the Law*. University of Chicago Press.

Crouch, Colin and Wolfgang Streeck, eds. 1997. *Political Economy of Modern Capitalism*. Sage.

Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton University Press.

Evans, Peter. 2005. “The Challenges of the ‘Institutional Turn’: New Interdisciplinary Opportunities in Development Theory,” in *The Economic Sociology of Capitalism*, edited by Victor Nee and Richard Swedberg, Princeton University Press, 2005, pp.90-116.

Fligstein, Neil. 2005. "States, Markets, and Economic Growth". *The Economic Sociology of Capitalism*, edited by Victor Nee and Richard Swedberg. Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 119-143.

Fligstein, Neil. 2001. *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies*. Princeton University Press.

Friedman, Milton. 1957. A *Theory of the Consumption Function*. Princeton University Press.

Galbraith, Kenneth. [1952]1956. *American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power*. Houghton Mifflin. (revised edition)

Granovetter, Mark S. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 9: 481-510.

Hall, Peter A. and David Soskice, eds. 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press.

Hayek, Friedrich. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom*. University of Chicago.

Hodgson, Geoffrey M. 1988. *Economics and Institutions: A Manifesto for a Modern Institutional Economics*. Polity Press.

Hollingsworth, J. Rogers, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Wolfgang Streeck, eds. 1994. *Governing Capitalist Economies: Performance and Control of Economic Sectors*. Oxford University Press.

Keynes, John Maynard. 1931. "The Pure Theory of Money. A Reply to Dr. Hayek". *Economica,* **34** (34): 387–397.

Keynes, John Maynard. 1936. *A General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Klitgaard, R., 2021. *Adjusting to Reality: Beyond 'State versus Market' in Economic Development*. Routledge.

Marshall, Alfred. [1890]1961. *The Principles of Economics*. 9th (variorum) ed. 2vols. Macmillan.

Marx, Karl. [1867]1990. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. 1. Penguin Books.

North, Douglass C. 1977. "Markets and Other Allocation Systems in History: The Challenge of Karl Polanyi." *Journal of European Economic History* 6: 703-16.

North, Douglass C. 1981. *Structure and Change in Economic History*. New York: W.W. Norton. . 1986.

North, Douglass. 2005. “Capitalism and Economic Growth,” in *The Economic Sociology of Capitalism*, edited by Victor Nee and Richard Swedberg. Princeton University Press, 2005. Pp. 41-52. (12 pp)

Pauly, Mark. 1968. “The Economics of Moral Hazard: Comment.” *The American Economic Review* 58(3): 531-537.

Polyani, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation.* Polity Press.

Przeworski, A., 2003. *States and Markets: A Primer in Political Economy*. Cambridge University Press.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber, and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Polity Press.

Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990.* Cambridge University Press.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development*. Harvard University Press.

Schwartz, Herman. 2018 (4th ed). *States vs Markets: Understanding the Global Economy*. Springer.

Simon, H.A. 1955. “A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 69(1): 99-118.

Smith, Adam. [1776]1976. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Oxford University Press.

Stigler, George. 1971. "The Theory of Economic Regulation." *Bell Journal of Economics* 2(Spring): 3-21.

Swedberg, Richard. 2005. “The Economic Sociology of Capitalism: An Introduction and Agenda,” in *The Economic Sociology of Capitalism*, edited by Victor Nee and Richard Swedberg. Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 3-40.

Theodore J. Lowi. 1979. *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*, 2nd Edition. W.W. Norton & Company.

Tilly, Charles. 1985. “War Making and State Making as Organized Crime,” in Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge University Press, Ch.5. (22 pp)

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974-1989. *The Modern World System*. Vols. 1-3. Academic Press.

Weber, Max. 1919. “Politics as a Vocation.”

White, G. and Wade, R., 1988. “Developmental States and Markets in East Asia: An Introduction.” in *Developmental States in East Asia.* Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp.1-29.

White, Harrison C. 1981. ‘Where Do Markets Come From?’ *American Journal of Sociology* 87:3, 517–47.

Wolf, Charles, Jr. 1990. *Markets or Governments: Choosing Between Imperfect Alternatives*. The MIT Press.

**Week 4 (September 16): Who Influences Policy? Interest Groups and Public Opinion**

Lowi, Theodore. 1967. “The Public Philosophy: Interest-Group Liberalism.” *American Political Science Review*, 61(1): 5-24. (20 pp)

Olson, Mancur, Jr. 1971. “A Theory of Groups and Organizations,” in *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups* (2nd edition). Harvard University Press, Ch.1. (48 pp)

Downs, Anthony. 1972. “Up and Down with Ecology: The ‘Issue-Attention’ Cycle.” *The Public Interest*, 28: 38-50.

(13 pp)

Grossman, G.M. and Helpman, E., 2001. *Special Interest Politics*. MIT press, Ch.1 (40 pp)

Page, B.I. and Shapiro, R.Y., 1983. “Effects of Public Opinion on Policy.” *American Political Science Review*, 77(1), pp.175-190. (16 pp)

Burstein, P., 2003. “The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda.” *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), pp.29-40. (12 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Berry, J.M. and Wilcox, C., 2018. *The Interest Group Society*. Routledge.

Baum, M.A. and Potter, P.B., 2008. The relationships between mass media, public opinion, and foreign policy: Toward a theoretical synthesis. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 11(1), pp.39-65.

Baumgartner, F.R. and Leech, B.L., 1998. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton University Press.

Baumgartner, F.R. and Leech, B.L., 2001. “Interest Niches and Policy Bandwagons: Patterns of Interest Group Involvement in National Politics.” *The Journal of Politics*, 63(4), pp.1191-1213. (23 pp)

Cigler, A.J., Loomis, B.A. and Nownes, A.J. eds., 2015. *Interest Group Politics*. CQ Press.

Clemens, E.S., 1997. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. University of Chicago Press.

Heclo, Hugh. 1978. “Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment,” in Anthony King, ed. *The New American Political System.* American Enterprise Institute, pp.268-287.

Holsti, O.R., 2009. *Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy*. University of Michigan Press.

Holsti, O.R., 1992. “Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus.”  *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), pp.439-466.

Key, V.O. 1961. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. Alfred Knopf, Ch.1. (16 pp)

Kollman, K., 1998. *Outside lobbying: Public Opinion and Interest Group Strategies*. Princeton University Press.

Lasswell, Harold. 1936. “Elite” in *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. Peter Smith, Ch.1.

Mills, C. Wright. 1958. “The Structure of Power in American Society.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 9(1): 29-41.

Risse-Kappen, T., 1991. “Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies.” *World Politics*, 43(4), pp.479-512.

Soroka, S.N. and Wlezien, C., 2010. *Degrees of Democracy: Politics, Public opinion, and Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Stigler, George J. 1971. “The Theory of Economic Regulation,” *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* 2(1): 3-21.

Truman, David. 1971 [1951]. “Group Politics and Representative Democracy,” and “Group Interests and Public Opinion,” in *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*, 2nd edition. Alfred A. Knopf.

**Week 5 (September 23): Collective Action in Public Policy**

Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press. {Available via Canvas or UT electronic library} (216 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Chong, D., 2014. *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*. University of Chicago Press.

Elster, J., 1985. “Rationality, Morality, and Collective Action.” *Ethics*, 96(1), pp.136-155.

Hardin, R., 2015. *Collective Action*. RFF Press.

Keohane, R.O. 2005. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Harvard University Press.

Olson, M., 1989. Collective Action” in *The invisible Hand.* Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 61-69.

Ostrom, E., 2010. “Analyzing Collective Action. *Agricultural Economics*, 41, pp.155-166.

Ostrom, E., 2000. “Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(3), pp.137-158.

**Week 6 (September 30): Bureaucracies**

Weber, Max. 1921. “The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organization: An Ideal-Type Construction.” Reprinted in Merton, Robert K. et al., eds. 1952. *A Reader in Bureaucracy*. Free Press, pp. 18-27. (10 pp)

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books. Ch.1-6. (108 pp)

Barnett, M.N. and Finnemore, M., 1999. “The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations.” *International Organization*, 53(4), pp.699-732. (34 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Barnett, M. and Finnemore, M. 2019. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Cornell University Press.

Kaufman, H., 2010. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Routledge.

Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. “Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony.” *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 340-63.

Selznick, P., 1943. “An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy. *American Sociological Review*, 8(1), pp.47-54.

Selznick, P., 1953. *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization* (Vol. 3). University of California Press.

Simon, Herbert A. 1997. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations*. 4th Edition. Free Press, Chs.1, 4, and 5.

**Week 7 (October 7): Political and Bureaucratic Representation**

Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. “Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes”,” *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628-65. (38 pp)

Paxton, P., Hughes, M.M. and Green, J.L., 2006. “The international women's movement and women's political representation, 1893–2003.” *American Sociological Review*, 71(6), pp.898-920. (23 pp)

Childs, S. and M.L. Krook., 2008. “Critical Mass Theory and Women's Political Representation.” *Political Studies*, *56*(3), pp.725-736. (12 pp)

Schwindt-Bayer, L.A. and Mishler, W., 2005. “An Integrated Model of Women's Representation.” *The Journal of Politics*, *67*(2), pp.407-428. (22 pp)

Keiser, Lael R., Vicky M. Wilkins, Kenneth J. Meier, and Catherine A. Holland. 2002. “Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative Bureaucracy.” *American Political Science Review* 96(3): 553-564. (12 pp)

An, Seoung-Ho, Miyeon Song, and Kenneth J. Meier. 2021. “Representative Bureaucracy and the Policy Environment: Gender Representation in Forty-Four Countries.” *Public Administration* 100(4): 900-922. (23 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Bishu, S.G. and Kennedy, A.R., 2020. “Trends and Gaps: A Meta-Review of Representative Bureaucracy.” *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *40*(4), pp.559-588.

Fenno, Richard F. 2003. Going Home: Black Representatives and Their Constituents, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Grissom, J.A., Nicholson‐Crotty, J. and Nicholson‐Crotty, S., 2009. “Race, Region, and Representative Bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review*, *69*(5), pp.911-919.

Jones, B.D. and Baumgartner, F.R., 2004. “Representation and Agenda Setting.” *Policy Studies Journal*, *32*(1), pp.1-24.

Kelly, R.M., 1998. “An Inclusive Democratic Polity, Representative Bureaucracies, and the New Public Management.” *Public Administration Review*, *58*(3), pp.201-208.

Kennedy, B., 2014. “Unraveling Representative Bureaucracy: A Systematic Analysis of the Literature.” *Administration & Society*, *46*(4), pp.395-421.

Kingsley, J. Donald. 1944. *Representative Bureaucracy: An Interpretation of the British Civil Service*. Antioch Press.

Lim, H.H., 2006. “Representative Bureaucracy: Rethinking Substantive Effects and Active Representation.” *Public Administration Review*, *66*(2): 193-204.

Lublin, David, 1999. The Paradox of Representation: Racial Gerrymandering and Minority Interests in Congress, Princeton University Press.

Mansbridge, Jane, 2003. “Rethinking Representation,” American Political Science Review, 97(4): 515–28.

Meier, K.J., 1975. “Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis.” *American political science review*, *69*(2), pp.526-542.

Meier, K.J., 2019. “Theoretical Frontiers in Representative Bureaucracy: New Directions for Research.” *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, *2*(1), pp.39-56.

Meier, K.J., Wrinkle, R.D. and Polinard, J.L., 1999. “Representative Bureaucracy and Distributional Equity: Addressing the Hard Question,” *The Journal of Politics*, *61*(4): 1025-1039.

Meier, K.J. and Bohte, J., 2001. “Structure and Discretion: Missing Links in Representative Bureaucracy.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(4), pp.455-470.

Pande, R., 2003. “Can Mandated Political Representation Increase Policy Influence for Disadvantaged Minorities? Theory and Evidence from India.” *American Economic Review*, 93(4), pp.1132-1151.

Phillips, Anne. 1998 [1995]. *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford University Press. Chs.1-4. (114 pp).

Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel, 1967. The Concept of Representation. Berkeley: University of California.

Przeworksi, Adam, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin, eds. 1999. Democracy, Accountability, and Representation. Cambridge University Press.

Riccucci, N.M. and Saidel, J.R., 1997. “The Representativeness of State-Level Bureaucratic Leaders: A Missing Piece of the Representative Bureaucracy Puzzle.” *Public Administration Review*, pp.423-430.

Saidel, J. R., & Loscocco, K. 2005. “Agency Leaders, Gendered Institutions, and Representative Bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review*, 65(2): 158–170.

Sapiro, Virginia. 1981. “When are Women’s Interests Interesting?” American Political Science Review, 75 (September): 701–721

Shapiro, Ian, Susan C. Stokes, Elisabeth Jean Wood and Alexander S. Kirshner (eds.). 2009. Political Representation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sowa, J.E. and Selden, S.C. 2003. “Administrative Discretion and Active Representation: An Expansion of the Theory of Representative Bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review*, *63*(6): 700-710.

Subramaniam, V., 1967. Representative bureaucracy: A reassessment. *American Political Science Review*, 61(4), pp.1010-1019.

Theobald, N.A. and D.P. Haider-Markel. 2008. "Race, Bureaucracy, and Symbolic Representation: Interactions between Citizens and Police." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19 (2): 409–426.

Wilkins, V.M., 2007. Exploring the causal story: Gender, active representation, and bureaucratic priorities. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(1), pp.77-94.

**Week 8 (October 14): Decision-Making**

Lindblom, Charles. 1959. “The Science of Muddling Through,” *Public Administration Review* 19(2): 79-88. (12 pp)

Janis, Irving L. 1972. Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning. Ch.1, 2, and 8 (74 pp).

Suggested: for a great literature review on the impact of Janis’ work, see Paul’t Hart. 1991. “Irving Janis’s Victims of Groupthink.” *Political Psychology*, 12(2): 247-278.

Allison, Graham T. 1969. “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis.” *American Political Science Review* 63(3): 689-718. (30 pp)

Rosati, J.A., 1981. “Developing a Systematic Decision-Making Framework: Bureaucratic Politics in Perspective.” *World Politics*, 33(2), pp.234-252. (20 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Brunsson, N., 2007. *The Consequences of Decision-Making*. Oxford University Press.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., and Olsen, J.P. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 17 (1): 1–25. (26 pp)

Edwards, W., 1954. “The Theory of Decision Making.” *Psychological bulletin*, *51*(4), p.380+.

Jones, B.D., 1994. *Reconceiving Decision-making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

Lasswell, Harold D. 1956. *The Decision Process: Seven Categories of Functional Analysis*. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Press, 1956.

Lowi, T., 1970. Decision Making vs. Policy Making: Toward an Antidote for Technocracy.” *Public Administration Review*, 30(3): 314-325.

Mintz, A. and DeRouen Jr, K., 2010. *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, J., 1995. “Decision‐making in the European Union: Towards a Framework for Analysis.” *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2(1), pp.69-93.

Putnam, Robert D. 1988. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.

Shapiro, M.J. and Bonham, G.M., 1973. “Cognitive Process and Foreign Policy Decision-Making.” *International Studies Quarterly*, *17*(2), pp.147-174.

Simon, H.A., 1966. *Theories of Decision-Making in Economics and Behavioural Science*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Teisman, G.R., 2000. “Models for Research into Decision‐Making Processes: On Phases, Streams and Decision‐Making Rounds.” *Public Administration*, 78(4), pp.937-956.

Zahariadis, N., 2003. *Ambiguity and Choice in Public Policy: Political Decision Making in Modern Democracies*. Georgetown University Press.

**Week 9 (October 21): Agenda-Setting**

Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, 2nd Edition*. New York: Harper Collins. (230 pp – chapters will be selected at a later date).

Birkland, T.A., 1998. “Focusing Events, Mobilization, and Agenda Setting.” *Journal of Public Policy*, *18*(1), pp.53-74.

***Recommended Reading:***

Baumgartner, Frank R. and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Baumgartner, F.R., 2016. “John Kingdon and the Evolutionary Approach to Public Policy and Agenda Setting. In *Handbook of Public Policy Agenda Setting.* Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 53-66.

Birkland, T.A., 2017. “Agenda Setting in Public Policy.” in *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis.* Routledge, pp. 89-104.

Birkland, T.A., 1997. *After Disaster: Agenda Setting, Public Policy, and Focusing Events*. Georgetown University Press.

Bratton, K.A. and Haynie, K.L., 1999. “Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: The Effects of Gender and Race.” *The Journal of Politics*, *61*(3), pp.658-679.

Cook, F.L., Tyler, T.R., Goetz, E.G., Gordon, M.T., Protess, D., Leff, D.R. and Molotch, H.L., 1983. “Media and Agenda Setting: Effects on the Public, Interest Group Leaders, Policy Makers, and Policy.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47(1), pp.16-35.

Dearing, J.W. and Rogers, E., 1996. *Agenda-Setting*. Sage.

Herweg, N., Zahariadis, N. and Zohlnhöfer, R. 2023. “The Multiple Streams Framework: Foundations, Refinements, and Empirical Applications.” In *Theories of the Policy Process.* London: Routledge*,* pp. 29-64.

Perry, H.W., 2009. *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court*. Harvard University Press.

Rogers, E.M., Dearing, J.W. and Bregman, D., 1993. “The Anatomy of Agenda-Setting Research.” *Journal of Communication*, 43(2), pp.68-84.

Sabatier, P.A., 1991. “Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 24(2), pp.147-156.

Wood, B.D. and Peake, J.S., 1998. “The Dynamics of Foreign Policy Agenda Setting.” *American Political Science Review*, 92(1), pp.173-184.

**Week 10 (Oct.28): Policy Framing and Advocacy**

Sabatier, Paul A. 1988. “An Advocacy Coalition Framework for Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein.” *Policy Sciences* 21: 129-168. (40 pp)

Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Chs.1 and 2.

Busby, J.W., 2007. “Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics.” *International Studies Quarterly*, 51(2), pp.247-275. (29 pp)

Weaver, R.K., 1986. “The Politics of Blame Avoidance.” *Journal of Public Policy*, *6*(4), pp.371-398. (28 pp)

***Recommended Reading:***

Callaghan, K. and Schnell, F., 2005. *Framing American Politics*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Entman, R.M., 2004. *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and US Foreign Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

Gen, S. and Wright, A.C., 2013. “Policy Advocacy Organizations: A Framework Linking Theory and Practice. *Journal of Policy Practice*, *12*(3), pp.163-193.

Goffman, E., 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press.

Green, D., 2016. *How Change Happens.* Oxford University Press.

Jenkins-Smith, H.C., Nohrstedt, D., Weible, C.M. and Ingold, K., 2018. “The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Overview of the Research Program.” *Theories of the Policy Process*, pp.135-171.

Keck, M.E. and Sikkink, K., 1999. “Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics.” *International Social Science Journal*, 51(159), pp.89-101. (13 pp)

Mintrom, M. and Luetjens, J., 2017. “Policy Entrepreneurs and Problem Framing: The Case of Climate Change.” *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(8), pp.1362-1377.

Norris, P., 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge University Press.

Sabatier, P.A. and Weible, C.M., 2019. “The advocacy coalition framework: Innovations and clarifications.” in *Theories of the Policy Process,* 2nd ed. Routledge, pp. 189-220.

Strolovitch, D.Z., 2008. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Van Hulst, M. and Yanow, D., 2016. “From Policy “Frames” to “Framing”: Theorizing a More Dynamic, Political Approach.” *American Review of Public Administration*, 46(1), pp.92-112.

**Week 11 (November 4): Policy Implementation, Delegation and Enforcement**

Smith, T.B., 1973. “The Policy Implementation Process.” *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), pp.197-209. (13 pp)

Pülzl, H. and Treib, O., 2007. “Implementing Public Policy.” In *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis.* Routledge, pp.115-134. (20 pp)

McCubbins, Mathew and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. “Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Policy Patrol versus Fire Alarms.” *American Journal of Political Science* 28(1): 165-179. (15 pp)

Miller, G.J., 2005. “The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models.” *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, *8*(1), pp.203-225. (22 pp)

Shapiro, Susan. 2005. “Agency Theory.” *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol.31: 263-284. (22 pp)

Hawkins, Darren et al., eds. 2006. *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, Ch.1 (pp.3-38) and 7 (pp.199-228). (66 pp)

***Recommended:***

DeLeon, P. and DeLeon, L., 2002. “What Ever happened to Policy Implementation? An Alternative Approach.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4), pp.467-492.

Gailmard, Sean. 2014. “Accountability and Principal–Agent Theory.” In Mark Bovens (ed) et al, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Grindle, M.S.(ed). 2017. *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.

Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. Russell Sage.

McCubbins, Mathew D. Roger G. Noll, and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. “Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control.” *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 3: 243-277.

Moe, Terry. 1984. “The New Economics of Organizations.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 28: 739-777.

Montjoy, R.S. and O'Toole, L.J., 1979. “Toward a Theory of Policy Implementation: An Organizational Perspective.” *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), pp.465-476.

O'Toole Jr, L.J., 2000. “Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), pp.263-288.

Pollack, M.A., 1997. “Delegation, Agency, and Agenda Setting in the European Community.” *International Organization*, 51(1), pp.99-134.

Pollack, M.A., 2003. *The Engines of European Integration: Delegation, Agency, and Agenda Setting in the EU*. OUP Oxford.

Pressman, J.L. and Wildavsky, A., 1984. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work At All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation* (Vol. 708). Univ of California Press.

Ross, S.A., 1973. “The Economic Theory of Agency: The Principal's Problem.” *The American Economic Review*, 63(2), pp.134-139.

Van Meter, D.S. and Van Horn, C.E., 1975. “The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework.” *Administration & Society*, 6(4), pp.445-488.

Waterman, R.W. and Meier, K.J., 1998. “Principal-Agent Models: An Expansion?” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(2), pp.173-202.

**Week 12 (November 11): Evidence and Public Policy in Global Climate Change**

Nordhaus, William. 2013. *The Climate Casino: Risk, Uncertainty, and Economics for a Warming World*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

***Recommended Reading:***

Bennett, W.L. and Livingston, S., 2018. “The Disinformation Order: Disruptive Communication and the Decline of Democratic Institutions.” *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), pp.122-139.

Cairney, P., 2016. *The Politics of Evidence-Based Policy Making*. Springer.

Cartwright, N. and Hardie, J., 2012. *Evidence-Based Policy: A Practical Guide to Doing It Better*. Oxford University Press.

Davies, H.T. and Nutley, S.M. eds., 2000. *What Works?: Evidence-based Policy and Practice in Public Services*. Policy Press.

D'ignazio, C. and Klein, L.F. ,2023. *Data Feminism*. MIT Press.

Freelon, D. and Wells, C., 2020. “Disinformation as Political Communication.” *Political Communication*, 37(2), pp.145-156.

Head, B.W., 2008. “Three Lenses of Evidence‐Based Policy.” *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(1), pp.1-11.

Head, B.W., 2016. “Toward More “Evidence‐Informed” Policy Making?” *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), pp.472-484.

Humprecht, E., Esser, F. and Van Aelst, P., 2020. “Resilience to Online Disinformation: A Framework for Cross-National Comparative Research.” *The International Journal of Press/Politics*,25(3), pp.493-516.

Majone, G., 1989. *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. Yale University Press.

Marmot, M.G., 2004. “Evidence Based Policy or Policy Based Evidence?” *BMJ*, 328 (7445), pp.906-907.

Nichols, T., 2017. *The Death of Expertise: The Campaign Against Established Knowledge and Why It Matters*. Oxford University Press.

Oreskes, N., 2004. “Science and Public Policy: What’s Proof Got to Do With It?” *Environmental Science & Policy*, 7(5), pp.369-383.

Parkhurst, J., 2017. *The Politics of Evidence: From Evidence-Based Policy to the Good Governance of Evidence*. Taylor & Francis.

Sanderson, I. 2002. “Evaluation, Policy Learning and Evidence‐based Policy Making.” P*ublic Administration*, 80(1), pp.1-22.

Tucker, J.A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., Stukal, D. and Nyhan, B., 2018. “Social Media, Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature.” *(Working Paper, March 19, 2018)*.

**Week 13 (November 18): Democratic Backsliding**

Bermeo, Nancy. 2016. “On Democratic Backsliding,” *Journal of Democracy*, 27(1): 5-19. (15 pp)

Graham, M.H. and Svolik, M.W., 2020. “Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States.” *American Political Science Review*, 114(2), pp.392-409. (18 pp)

Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R., 2021. “The Anatomy of Democratic Backsliding.” *Journal of Democracy*, 32(4), pp.27-41. (15 pp)

Waldner, D. and Lust, E., 2018. “Unwelcome Change: Coming to Terms with Democratic Backsliding.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1), pp.93-113. (21 pp)

***Recommended Readings:***

Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J.A., 2013. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York: Crown Currency.

Arendt, H. 1968. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 2nd ed.

Bauer, M.W. and Becker, S., 2020. “Democratic Backsliding, Populism, and Public Administration.” *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 3(1), pp.19-31.

Diamond, L., 2008. *The Spirit of Democracy: The Struggle to Build Free Societies Throughout the World*. Macmillan.

Sandel, M.J., 1998. *Democracy’s Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Harvard University Press.

Glasius, M., 2018. “What Authoritarianism Is… and Is Not: a Practice Perspective.” *International Affairs*,94(3), pp.515-533.

Graham, M.H. and Svolik, M.W., 2020. “Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States.” *American Political Science Review*, 114(2), pp.392-409.

Haggard, Stephen and Robert Kaufman. 2021. *Backsliding: Democratic Regress in the Contemporary World*. New York: Cambridge University Press Elements Series in Political Economy. (93 pages)

Huq, A. and Ginsburg, T., 2018. “How to Lose a Constitutional Democracy.” *UCLA L. Rev.*, 65, p.78+.

Little, A.T. and Meng, A., 2023. “Measuring Democratic Backsliding.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, pp.1-13.

Lührmann, A. and Lindberg, S.I., 2019. “A Third Wave of Autocratization is Here: What is New About It?” *Democratization*, 26(7), pp.1095-1113.

Mainwaring, S. and Pérez-Liñán, A., 2014. *Democracies and Dictatorships in Latin America: Emergence, Survival, and Fall*. Cambridge University Press.

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Origins of Democracy and Dictatorship*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mudde, C. and Kaltwasser, C.R., 2017. *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Stasavage, D., 2020. *The Decline and Rise of Democracy: A Global History from Antiquity to Today*. Princeton University Press.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1835]1945. *Democracy in America*. Trans by Henry Reeve. 2 vols. New York: Vintage Books.

Vachudova, Anna M., 2020. “Ethnopopulism and Democratic Backsliding in Central Europe.” *East European Politics*, 36(3), pp.318-340.

Weyland, K., 2001. “Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics.” *Comparative Politics*, pp.1-22.

Weyland, K., 2020. “Populism’s Threat to Democracy: Comparative Lessons for the United States.? *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(2), pp.389-406.

**\*Week 14 (November 25-30): Fall Break – No Class**

**Week 15 (December 2): Race and Public Policy**

Alexander, Michelle. 2020. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press (10th Anniversary Edition). Available through the UT Library at [https://ebookcentral.proquest.
com/lib/utxa/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=5651869](https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/utxa/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=5651869)

***Recommended Reading:***

Anderson, Carol. 2016. *White Rage: The Unspoken Truth of Our Racial Divide*. Bloomsbury.

Canon, David T. 1999. *Race, Redistricting and Representation: The Unintended Consequences of Black Majority Districts*. University of Chicago Press.

DiAngelo, R., 2022. *White Fragility: Why Understanding Racism Can Be So Hard for White People)*. Beacon Press.

Gilens, M., 2009. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

Joseph, Peniel. 2022. *The Third Reconstruction: America's Struggle for Racial Justice in the Twenty-First Century*. Blackstone Publishing.

Kendi, Ibram X. 2017. *Stamped from the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America*. Bold Type Books.

Krysan, M., 2000. “Prejudice, Politics, and Public Opinion: Understanding the Sources of Racial Policy Attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), pp.135-168.

**Marable, Manning. 1984. *Race, Reform, and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction and Beyond in Black America, 1945‒2006*. Macmillan Press.**

Masuoka, N. and Junn, J., 2013. *The Politics of Belonging: Race, Public Opinion, and Immigration*. University of Chicago Press.

Rothstein, R., 2017. *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. Liveright Publishing.

Tate, Katherine. 1993. *From Protest to Politics: The New Black Voters in American Elections*. Harvard University Press.

Wilkerson, Isabel. 2020. *Caste: The Origins of Our Discontents*. Random House.

Wilson, W.J., 2012. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

**\*Week 16 (December 9): In-Class Presentations on “The Future Classics”**

No required readings

**Additional Syllabus Material**

**A Few Notes on Course Etiquette**

* Before you send me an email, check the course syllabus, other handouts, and the course website to see if you can find the information you are looking for. Note that I check email at least once a day, usually in the morning. However, I do not always check email over the weekend or after 10 pm. Therefore, please plan ahead. If I don’t respond within 24 hours, please follow-up.
* Please use the class Slack channel if you have questions about assignments, readings, deadlines, Canvas mistakes (I hate Canvas), etc. If you have these questions, chances are others do as well. So let’s share the information widely!
* Texting, checking Facebook, surfing the web, etc. are unacceptable during class-time. Your participation grade will be impacted if you spend time in class undertaking such activities.
* Please respect your peers’ preferred pronouns and names, and treat everyone in the class with respect and kindness. You are free to call me Dr. Weaver, Prof. Weaver or Dr. Kate - whatever you feel comfortable with.
* The syllabus is depending on the pacing of the course and student interests. If we need to slow down and eliminate material in order to achieve our learning goals, we will. I do promise not to ADD readings or assignments.
* Please contact me if you have anything you would like to talk to me about that would help me work with you. Students with University-recognized disabilities who may need classroom accommodations should contact me as soon as possible. All discussions will remain confidential.

**University Electronic Mail Notification Policy**

I will use e-mail and Canvas announcements as the means of communication with students in this course. You will be responsible for checking your e-mail regularly, recognizing that certain communications may be time-critical. The University of Texas recommends that you check e-mail daily and requires you to check at least twice per week. You are responsible for keeping the University informed of e-mail address changes. The complete text of this policy and instructions for updating your e-mail address are available at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.html>.

**About Canvas and Zoom**

Check the course Canvas site regularly for class work and announcements or request that Canvas sends you a daily update. The university's IT staff occasionally schedules downtimes for the Canvas site, as noted on the Canvas login page. Scheduled downtimes are not an excuse for late work. The ITS Help Desk at 475-9400 provides technical support for Canvas Monday - Friday, 8 am to 5 pm. <http://www.utexas.edu/its/helpdesk/>

Zoom links, when needed, are available through our Canvas site.

**Statement on Commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion:**

My goal for this class is to foster a learning environment that is inclusive of diverse views and welcoming to people who represent the broad spectrum of human backgrounds and experiences, including ability and health status, age, race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, gender, nationality and immigration status, political views, religion, social class, and more. Please note that I would like to use and respect your pronouns and preferred name. Please let me know if these are different from what shows up on our official class rosters.

One objective of our collective inquiry in this class is to understand how implicit and explicit biases have shaped the trajectory of theory, scholarship and practice in public policy and have contributed to the problem of the “politics of numbers.” This often entails critically engaging with the literature that represents “conventional wisdoms” that perpetuate such biases. Our task is to interrogate how these biases have, over time, influenced the way we define, measure, evaluate and report on progress in development.

In our classroom discussions and collaborate work, we will follow the “4-C” Principles (adopted from Alexandra Sedlovskaya, [*Diversity and Inclusion: Building Connection and Community in Physical, Online, and Hybrid Classrooms*](http://app.academic.hbsp.harvard.edu/e/er?cid=email%7Celoqua%7Cthe-faculty-lounge-9-22-20-b%7C590545%7Cfaculty-lounge-newsletter%7Cnewsletter-subscribers%7Cvarious%7Csep20202036&acctID=13922189&s=1578928263&lid=3936&elqTrackId=0c87c9c8cd174d4e91d4c803e0b8a20a&elq=1253b74e91e74e6185f54a7c5616b5fb&elqaid=2036&elqat=1)):

1. ***Curiosity:*** We are all here to learn, and this learning happens through collaboration. If you have a question, please ask it. Do not worry about how it will come across. We’re all in this together.
2. ***Candor:*** We must talk about issues candidly. We want to ensure that different perspectives and different voices are heard. This may mean you hear opinions or experiences from other students that you have not been exposed to, or that may counter your values and worldviews. This candor is not just encouraged, it is expected.
3. ***Courtesy:*** Every member of our class must be able to voice their questions and views respectfully. In return, we all must listen and respond respectfully. Many times, we avoid uncomfortable conversations; we don’t speak up for fear we might offend someone, appear “dumb” or face reprisal. We will not let that fear constrain our conversations. We will always operate from a place of good intentions, and will avoid being defensive or judgmental. We will not tolerate attacks on anyone’s personal identity or values. All discussion must be grounded in the principles of courteous and mutually respectful dialogue. Repeated violations of this principle will result in deductions from your participation score.
4. ***Courage:*** It takes a lot of effort and courage to achieve the above three principles. It takes even more courage to listen and truly try to understand perspectives that are different from our own. As Dr. Sedlovskaya argues: “listening and understanding are not the same as agreeing. It’s how learning happens. Learning takes courage.”

***University-wide Resources:***

* If you experience harassment or discrimination on the basis of personal identity, the University of Texas’ **Office for Inclusion and Equity** handles and investigates these complaints. Call to report discrimination 512-471-1849 or email: equity@utexas.edu.
* The **Title IX Office** offers support services and resources to our community members who have experienced or have been accused of sexual misconduct. Call Title IX at 512-471-0419 or email: titleix@austin.utexas.edu.
* The **Campus Climate Response** team has a form online at <https://diversity.utexas.edu/ccrt/> to report incidences of bias.
* **Student Emergency Services** provides outreach, advocacy, intervention, financial and emotional support and referrals to campus and community resources. Call for crisis support 512-471-5017 (Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm) or email: studentemergency@austin.utexas.edu.

**Harassment Reporting Requirements**

[Senate Bill 212 (SB 212)](http://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/86R/billtext/html/SB00212F.htm), which took effect as of January 1, 2020, is a Texas State Law that requires all employees (both faculty and staff) at a public or private post-secondary institution to promptly report any knowledge of any incidents of sexual assault, sexual harassment, dating violence, or stalking "committed by or against a person who was a student enrolled at or an employee of the institution at the time of the incident". Please note that both the instructor and the TA for this class are mandatory reporters and MUST share with the Title IX office any information about sexual harassment/assault shared with us by a student whether in-person or as part of a journal or other class assignment. Note that a report to the Title IX office does not obligate a victim to take any action, but this type of information CANNOT be kept strictly confidential except when shared with designated confidential employees.  A confidential employee is someone a student can go to and talk about a Title IX matter without triggering that employee to have to report the situation to have it automatically investigated. A list of confidential employees is available on the [Title IX website](https://t.e2ma.net/click/zvo1jc/nagzvw/rp219q).

**On Academic Integrity**

Students are expected to respect The University of Texas’ standards regarding academic dishonesty. You owe it to yourself, your fellow students, and the institution to maintain the highest standards of integrity and ethical behavior. A discussion of academic integrity, including definitions of plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration, as well as helpful information on citations, note taking, and paraphrasing, can be found at the Office of the [Dean of Students web page](http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php) and the [Office of Graduate Studies](http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/ethics/transcripts/academic.html). The University has also established disciplinary procedures and penalty guidelines for academic dishonesty, especially Sec. 11.304 in Appendix C of the Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities section in UT's General Information Catalog.

**Emergency Evacuation Recommendations:**

The following recommendations regarding emergency evacuation from the Office of Campus Safety and Security, 512-471-5767,<http://operations.utexas.edu/units/csas/terms.php>:

1. Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when a fire alarm is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside.
2. Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of each classroom and building you may occupy. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building.
3. Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class. In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors.
4. Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.
5. Behavior Concerns Advice Line (BCAL): 512-232-5050
6. Link to information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at:<https://preparedness.utexas.edu/emergency-plans>

**For Students with Disabilities**

Any student with a documented disability who requires academic accommodations should contact Services for Students with Disabilities at 471-6259 (voice) or 512-410-6644 (Video Phone) as soon as possible to request an official letter outlining authorized accommodations.

**Policies on Religious Holidays**

By UT Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

**On Campus Safety and Wellness Resources**

More information on how to sign up for emergency text alerts, contact information for various UT offices, wellness resources, and campus initiatives relating to safety and/or wellness can be found at <https://www.utexas.edu/campus-life/safety-and-security>