

POL 317H1(F): Comparative Public Policy

Michael James Donnelly*

University of Toronto Department of Political Science

Fall 2015

This course serves as an introduction to public policy, with a focus on wealthy democracies. We will begin by spending two weeks looking at the questions that motivate many studies of policy:

- Who controls the actions of democratic states? Whose preferences are enacted?
- Why do policies differ across time and space? Why to they change?

These questions cut to the heart of all democratic theories. They are also crucial to understanding your roles as a participant in a democratic society, whether as a voter, a policy-maker, a tax-payer, or a service user.

The focus of the course is on big-picture policy questions. Since this course is meant to feed into POL 474, where you will look more carefully at the policy evaluation process, we will spend less time here on policy outputs and more time on policy inputs. In other words, we will try to understand how policies come to be and how they change. We will examine four clusters of policies that are important in every country:

1. Social policy, or “Who gets what and how much”?
2. Labour and public employment policies, or “How is work life shaped by the state?”
3. Criminal justice policies, or “Against whom does the state wield force”?
4. Immigration and citizenship policies, or “Who is a part of our society”?

When we are finished, you will be able to **describe** policy variation on these issues. This description will enable you to **analyze** theories of policy formation, critiquing their strengths and weaknesses, and making a critical judgement about their explanatory power. Finally, you will also be able to **communicate** your description and analysis with others, both orally and in writing.

*Note the ‘James.’ There is a Michael W. Donnelly in the Department, so be careful about emails.

1 Contact Information

Office: Sidney Smith 3105
Office Phone: 416-978-0344
Email: mj.donnelly@utoronto.ca
URL: <http://www.MichaelJDonnelly.net>

Please note that this is a tentative syllabus, and is subject to change.

2 Prerequisites

Please see the 2014-2015 Faculty of Arts and Sciences Calendar to see the list of prerequisites.

3 Logistics

- Class: UC 163 Wednesdays 12:00pm - 2:00pm
- Michael's Office hours: 3:00-5:00pm on Wednesdays.¹ Appointments by email are also available.
- Email policy: I will respond to all emails within **two working days**. If I have not gotten back to you by then, feel free to send a reminder. Do not email questions about an assignment less than three days before it is due.

4 Course Requirements

Your final grade is based on participation, two short policy memoranda, and a long paper.

- **Participation (20%)**: I expect you to come to class having read the assigned materials and prepared to discuss them. Attendance is mandatory. If you expect to miss class, or if you miss class unexpectedly, it is essential that you communicate with me.
 - Most class sessions will include both lectures and discussions. Your participation in the discussions is important to you and to your classmates. I expect most students to contribute on any given day, and all students to contribute multiple times over the course of the semester. I will occasionally **cold-call** students.
 - After each class, please enter your participation **self-report** on Blackboard. You will evaluate your own preparation (did you read?), attention (did you listen?), and contribution (did you speak?). I will show you how to do this at the end of class on the first day. I will spot-check self-reports, so be honest!
 - I expect you to put your phones away when class starts. If you take notes on computers or tablets, you may keep them on your desk, but you may not check email, news sites, Facebook, etc. during class. If I notice you doing this, I will make a note and deduct all of your participation points for that week.

¹These hours are subject to change. Check Portal for announcements.

- I expect classroom discussions to be civil and respectful. You will disagree with me, with the readings, and with each other quite frequently. That is good. It means we are all thinking hard about public policy, one of the most controversial topics we can study. When you participate in class, be careful to consider your tone, and to avoid racist, sexist, homophobic, or sectarian comments.
- **Policy Memoranda** (10% X 2): Twice over the course of the semester, you should write a 400 word (one side of one page, single-spaced) policy memo. This should examine a single policy in two countries, comparing and contrasting the policies of the two states. This exercise is **descriptive**, that is, your job is to tell me what the policy is in each country, not to analyze which is better. These memos are **self-scheduled**. You may turn the first one in during week 5 or 7 and the second one during week 9 or 11. The policy should come from the relevant issue area (social policy in Week 5, labour markets in Week 7, etc.). The first memo will be graded and returned by November 4.
- **Long Paper** (50%): This paper will be an in depth (3-4,000 words) examination of policies in an issue area of your choice. You will choose an area, describe the variation across at least three countries, and explain why the policies vary. A rough draft is due (on Blackboard and peerScholar) at 10:00pm on November 17. The papers are due (on Blackboard) December 8 by 5:30pm.
 - **Feedback** (10%): You will also be tasked with providing **written feedback** to two of your peers. We will do this using the peerScholar module on Blackboard.

4.1 Long Paper Details

The comparison should focus on the **causes** of the policies in question. You will examine three or four countries, describing the types of policies and how you might measure them in a broader selection of countries. You will not have space to describe every detail about each case, so you must make analytic choices about the most important aspects of the policy for determining the causes.

You should clearly describe the theoretical framework in which you are working and provide initial evidence for your theory. Some potential issues are listed below. Feel free to pick an issue not on this list, but clear the topic with me by email before Week 6.

- Minimum wages
- Unemployment benefits
- Income taxes
- Consumption/value added taxes
- Taxes on capital
- Public sector union regulation
- Private sector union regulation
- Utility regulation
- Public sector procurement
- Anti-discrimination laws
- Drug regulation
- Divorce
- LGBT rights

- Abortion
- Prisons and punishment
- Domestic violence prevention
- Education funding
- Education curricula
- Teacher training
- Health care/insurance funding
- Food safety
- Trade policy
- Defense procurement

After you have chosen your topic, you should submit a short (about one page single spaced) topic selection memo (due Week 6). In this memo, you should:

1. Identify a topic
2. Identify cases (these may be tentative)
3. Describe a measurement strategy, including possible sources of those measurements (i.e. your own categorizations, using the OECD's measures, etc.)
4. Identify three scholarly works that are relevant to your topic and/or your cases.

Table 1 displays the criteria for the paper itself, while Table and 2 display the criteria for the feedback. An **A** paper or feedback packet will have more than one aspect falling into the "Excellent" category and none in the "Poor" or "Fair." A **C+** item will display mostly "Fair" performance, while a failing item will be mostly "Poor."

5 Plagiarism and Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity will not be tolerated. See the university policies² for more details. The Writing Center³ can also assist you in avoiding plagiarism.

6 Late Assignments and Appeals

Late assignments will receive deductions of 20% per day. Students are strongly advised to make rough drafts and hard copies before handing anything in and to keep those copies until after grades are posted on ROSI.

Grade appeals must be made by email within 48 hours of receiving the grade. They must include a 100-200 word statement of why the assignment deserves to be re-graded. The grade will change only in cases where the second grading is more than 10 points different from the first (i.e. a 60 will not be changed unless the second grading produces a score of 70+ or 50-). **Grades can go up or down on the second grading.**

²<http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity>

³<http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/home>

Table 1: Final Draft Criteria

	Points	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Theoretical framework	8	Missing or incoherent	Coherent, but contains logical gaps, does not connect to other theories	Draws on existing literature, does not add to it or explain nuances.	Innovative or displaying clear grasp of underlying mechanisms and structures.
Connection to readings	4	Does not cite readings	Ignores some important readings on syllabus	Makes appropriate citations to readings on syllabus	Cites appropriate readings on and off syllabus
Case selection	8	Do not vary in key independent/dependent variables. Incorrect number of cases.	Vary on some IV's/DV's, but not those appropriate to the framework.	Well-chosen cases.	Well chosen cases displaying unusual or striking insight.
Measurement	8	Does not consider measurement issues.	Mentions measurement, but uses poorly designed measures.	Measures are appropriate for theory.	Measures display unusual insight.
Organization	4	Hard to follow.	Overall organization is good, but lower levels display incoherence	Well-structured	Good transitions and all parts are clearly linked to thesis
Writing and graphics	8	Many grammatical/spelling mistakes, poor or inappropriate graphics	Competent writing, reasonable graphics, poor link between the two	Well integrated writing and graphics	Exceptionally insightful and creative writing and graphics

Table 2: Feedback Criteria

	Points	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Engagement	4	Not tied to papers	Engages, but does not display a clear grasp of the theory and cases	Clear grasp of the paper	Displays critical evaluation and adds insight
Theoretical sophistication	4	Does not grasp theory or evidence	Displays understanding of theory and evidence, but does not add to it	Adds some insights	Adds many insights, will be especially beneficial to recipients
Tone	4	Is disrespectful	Is respectful but not critical	Includes respectful criticism. May include cliched compliments	Includes respectful criticism and useful compliments

7 Readings

Below, you will find a detailed listing of readings for each class session. Most classes will be based on two to four assigned articles or book chapters (typically about three hours worth of careful reading, though a bit longer in weeks 2 and 3). You should read carefully and be prepared to discuss both the theory and the evidence. Some of the evidence is going to rely on knowledge - of history, politics, statistics, or past work - that you do not have. That is to be expected. If you read the evidence and cannot understand exactly what it means, make sure to bring that up in class.

We will use the following books, available at various bookstores:

- Mancur Olson. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971
- Alberto F Alesina and Edward L Glaeser. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004
- Ruud Koopmans et al. *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005
- James Q Wilson. *Bureaucracy*. New York: Basic Books, Incorporated, 1989

You are expected to own all four books. Some of these books are classics, and have been published and republished repeatedly. Feel free to buy the cheapest editions available, though if you are only asked to read some chapters, you should check with me to make sure you are reading the right chapters. If an entire book is assigned, you are responsible for understanding the basic argument and why we should believe it. All other readings will be available through the library or posted to Blackboard.

8 Course Outline

Week 1: Introductions, logistics, etc.

September 16

- Woodrow Wilson. “The Study of Administration”. In: *Political Science Quarterly* 2.2 (1887), pp. 197–222
- Richard Simeon. “Studying Public Policy”. In: *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 9.4 (1976), pp. 548–580
- Pages 1-65⁴ of Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*

Policy Causes

Week 2: Interests, institutions, and ideas: What causes variation in public policies? This section introduces three possible sources of differing preferences and differing outcomes.

September 23

⁴You may skim Chapter 2, but make sure you understand the argument.

- Sven Steinmo. “Political institutions and tax policy in the United States, Sweden, and Britain”. In: *World Politics* 41.4 (1989), pp. 500–535
- Peter A Hall. “Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain”. In: *Comparative Politics* 25.3 (Apr. 1993), pp. 275–296
- Walter Korpi. “Power Resources and Employer-Centered Approaches in Explanations of Welfare States and Varieties of Capitalism: Protagonists, Consenters, and Antagonists”. In: *World Politics* 58 (2006), pp. 167–206

Week 3: Does public opinion shape the outcome of democratic politics? If so, whose preferences matter? Is it the rich? The media? Politicians? September 30

- Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens”. In: *Perspectives on Politics* 12.3 (Sept. 2014), pp. 564–581
- Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza. “Social Policy Responsiveness in Developed Democracies”. In: *American Sociological Review* 71 (2006), pp. 474–494

Week 4: Analyzing policy causes as social scientists. What strategies do political and social scientists use to provide evidence for their theories? How do we measure key concepts? October 7

- Chapter 3 of Gary King, Robert O Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994
- Irwin Garfinkel, Lee Rainwater, and Timothy M Smeeding. “A Re-examination of Welfare States and Inequality in Rich Nations: How In-kind Transfers and Indirect Taxes Change the Story”. In: *Policy Analysis* 25.4 (2006), pp. 897–919
- APSA - Migration and Citizenship. “Symposium: How to Measure Immigration Policies”. In: *Migration and Citizenship* 1.2 (2013)

Social Policy

Week 5: How much and to whom? October 14

- Paul Pierson. “The New Politics of the Welfare State”. In: *World Politics* 48.2 (1996), pp. 143–179
- Daniel Béland and André Lecours. “The Politics of Territorial Solidarity”. In: *Comparative Political Studies* 38.6 (2005), p. 676
- Kathleen Thelen. “Varieties of Capitalism: Trajectories of Liberalization and the New Politics of Social Solidarity”. In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 15.1 (June 2012), pp. 137–159

Week 6: Why do some states “care” more than others? October 21

- Chapters 3-6 Alesina and Glaeser, *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*
- Evelyne Huber, Charles C Ragin, and John D Stephens. “Social democracy, Christian democracy, constitutional structure, and the welfare state”. In: *American Journal of Sociology* (1993), pp. 711–749

**Topic
selection
memo
due**

Labour, Public Employment, and Bureaucracies

Week 7: How do states influence the labour market?

October 28

- Chapters 1, 6, and 9 of Wilson, *Bureaucracy*
- Peter A Hall and David Soskice. “An introduction to varieties of capitalism”. In: *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Chap. 1, pp. 1–69

Week 8: Who works? For whom?

November 4

- Florence Jaumotte. “Labour Force Participation of Women: Empirical Evidence on the Role of Policy”. In: *OECD Economic Studies* 37.2 (2003), pp. 51–107
- Jonas Pontusson, David Rueda, and Christopher R Way. “Comparative Political Economy of Wage Distribution: The Role of Partisanship and Labour Market Institutions”. In: *British Journal of Political Science* 32.2 (2002), pp. 281–308

Criminal Justice

Week 9: Politics and Crime

November 11

- Felipe Estrada. “The Transformation of the Politics of Crime in High Crime Societies”. In: *European Journal of Criminology* 1.4 (Oct. 2004), pp. 419–443
- Eva-Maria Euchner et al. “From morality policy to normal policy: framing of drug consumption and gambling in Germany and the Netherlands and their regulatory consequences”. In: *Journal of European Public Policy* 20.3 (Mar. 2013), pp. 372–389

Week 10: Inequalities

November 18

- John R Sutton. “Imprisonment and Social Classification in Five Common-Law Democracies, 1955–1985”. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 106.2 (2000), pp. 1955–1985
- Bruce Western. “Poverty Politics and Crime Control in Europe and America”. In: *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews* 40.3 (2011), pp. 283–286

Immigration and Citizenship Policy

Week 11: Who can come? Who can stay?

November 25

**Draft
due**

- Read the introduction and two or three chapters of Koopmans et al., *Contested citizenship*
- Chapter 2 Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos. *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012

Week 12: How do natives respond?

December 2

**Feedback
due**

- Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J Hopkins. “Public Attitudes Toward Immigration”. In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 17 (2014), pp. 1–25
- Chapter 2 of Rafaela Dancygier. *Immigration and Conflict in Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010