

Fall 2019 | Mon., 6:30pm-9:10pm | Classroom: Swen Parson Hall 150

# PSPA 723: Seminar in Administrative Theory

Christopher Goodman

Office: IASBO Building (2nd Floor)

Office Hours: By appointment

[cgoodman@niu.edu](mailto:cgoodman@niu.edu)

This course is designed as a survey of public policy research and theory for doctoral students. As such, we will be pursuing three goals.

1. We will be examining the public policy research literature, exploring both the intellectual foundations and current developments.
2. We will be examining the craft of conducting policy research. In particular, you will be learning how to read and use the literature as a resource for your research efforts.
3. We will explore how you as scholars can and should participate in the policy-related scholarly community. In doing so, we will assist you in identifying your own interests and voice as a policy scholar.

Your goals should be to improve your understanding and capabilities in all three areas.

## Textbooks

### Required

There is a single required textbook for this course.

Weible, Christopher M. and Paul A. Sabatier. 2017. *Theories of the Policy Process*. 4e. Routledge.

Additional required readings, as detailed below, will be available either online through the library or on [Blackboard](#).

### Recommended

Here is a list of books that we will draw from during the course. You will note that we are reading portions of some of these works. Others are books that we will refer to during our discussions. Any required readings from these books are available on-line. But at some point you should get around to reading them in their entirety.

Birkland, Thomas A. 2015. *Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making*. 4e. Routledge.

Dunn, William N. 2019. *Public Policy Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. 6e. Routledge.

Heineman, Robert A., Bluhm, William T., Peterson, Steven A., and Kearney, Edward N. 2001. *The World of the Policy Analyst: Rationality, Values and Politics*. 3e. CQ Press.

McCool, Daniel C. 1994. *Public Policy Theories, Models and Concepts: An Anthology*. Pearson.

Parsons, Wayne. 1995. *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*. Edward Elgar.

Smith, Kevin B. and Larimer, Christopher W. 2016. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. 3e. Westview Press.

Stone, Deborah. 2011. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. 3e. W.W. Norton

Theodoulou, Stella Z. and Cahn, Matthew A. 2012. *Public Policy: The Essential Readings*. 2e. Pearson.

Weimer, David L. and Vining, Aidan R. 2017. *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice* 6e. Routledge.

## Assignments

Class Participation	20%
Research Sketch	10%
Literature Review/Research Proposal	25%
Homework	15%
Final Examination	30%

**Class Participation.** Since this class is a doctoral seminar, students are expected to come to class each week having completed the assigned readings and prepared to discuss the relevant topics. You

should take time in advance of class to think about the arguments being made and whether you agree or disagree with the author's point of view—and why. You should also develop the ability to be critical of each other's thinking.

I will not be providing many lectures during the class. Rather each topic will be explored through a discussion format. That means you will be called upon in class by your instructor and expected to contribute to the discussion. It is unacceptable for you to have come to class having not read the material.

*Article Presentation.* I will also ask you (and perhaps with a partner) to present an article during the semester. The team will provide an overview of the article—providing copies of a summary of key points to the class, will ask some questions seeking to stimulate a discussion about the article, and will link the reading to the other articles read for that class.

**Homework.** I will provide 1 short paper assignment. This “thought paper” will be based on a question similar to those that you will see in the course's final exam and in your future comprehensive exams. You will have 2 weeks this assignment, and the paper will be between 4-5 pages long.

**Research Paper.** You will need to prepare a research paper over the period of semester, first as a preliminary research sketch, then as a research proposal with a literature review.

The topics that you choose must be in the form of a research question. You must frame your question in such a way that it is amenable for hypothesis testing - there must be a relationship between an independent and dependent variable. Your literature review will be developed through the following assignments:

- Assignment 1 – Topics due for approval (September 16). Provide a paragraph describing your topic.
- Assignment 2 – Provide a research sketch and an attached list of key articles that you believe are most relevant to your topic. (October 21)
- Assignment 3 – Final version of your literature review. (December 2)

The research sketch, due at or before the beginning of the Oct. 21 class session, should provide a rough outline of a possible research project. This sketch should be about 4-6 double-spaced pages in length, and should include the following:

- Identification of your research question
- Description of the relevant literatures
- Specification of a conceptual model and hypothesis/ hypotheses
- Identification of the unit of analysis
- Specification of possible methods for conducting the study
- a list of at least 10 key references

The topics that you choose must be in the form of a research question. You must frame your question in such a way that it is amenable for hypothesis testing in support of a theory. That means there must be a relationship between an independent and dependent variable. The research paper itself should expand on the elements of the research sketch and provide a review of the relevant literature on the substantive issues. Under the best circumstances, this would be a topic that will link to your eventual dissertation research. This literature review should be roughly 15 pages long – it should be similar to the literature review present in a research article. In addition, at the end of the paper, you should briefly summarize how you would approach testing these hypotheses empirically – are there data that are available? Would the data allow you to identify your dependent and independent variables? Briefly, if you can, describe the empirical methods that you might use when analyzing this data.

Throughout the term we will take time in class to discuss the art of doing a literature review in the policy sciences. The final literature review will be due at the beginning of class December 2nd.

**Class Presentations.** Students make presentations on their completed research paper on December 2nd. Students should also anticipate taking questions from your colleagues and your instructor at the end of each presentation.

**Final Examination.** There will be a final examination consisting of two essay questions (with some choice of questions). The date of the final is December 9th.

## **Course Methodology & Policies**

### **Communications**

Course announcements will be made via email so it is imperative that you check your e-mail daily. “I didn’t get the email” is never a valid excuse. The most effect method of communicating with me is using email; however, you are also encouraged to schedule a meeting at my office or a phone call.

### **Late Assignments**

Late assignments **WILL NOT** be accepted without a valid NIU excuse. If you have a schedule conflict on any day an assignment is due, please contact me beforehand to make arrangements for turning in your assignment early.

### **Accessibility**

If you need an accommodation for this class, please contact the Disability Resource Center as soon as possible. The DRC coordinates accommodations for students with disabilities. It is located on the 4th floor of the Health Services Building, and can be reached at 815-753-1303 or [drc@niu.edu](mailto:drc@niu.edu).

Also, please contact me privately as soon as possible so we can discuss your accommodations. Please note that you will not be required to disclose your disability, only your accommodations.

The sooner you let me know your needs, the sooner I can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

## **Academic Integrity**

Good academic work must be based on honesty. The attempt of any student to present as his or her own work that which he or she has not produced is regarded by the faculty and administration as a serious offense. Students are considered to have cheated, for example, if they copy the work of another or use unauthorized notes or other aids during an examination or turn in as their own a paper or an assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else. Students are guilty of plagiarism, intentional or not, if they copy material from books, magazines, or other sources without identifying and acknowledging those sources or if they paraphrase ideas from such sources without acknowledging them. Students guilty of, or assisting others in, either cheating or plagiarism on an assignment, quiz, or examination may receive a grade of F for the course involved and may be suspended or dismissed from the university.

A faculty member has original jurisdiction over any instances of academic misconduct that occur in a course which the faculty member is teaching. The student shall be given the opportunity to resolve the matter in meetings with the faculty member and the department chair. If the facts of the incident are not disputed by the student, the faculty member may elect to resolve the matter at that level by levying a sanction no greater than an F for that course. The faculty member shall notify the student in writing whenever such action is taken, and Student Conduct shall receive a copy of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report indicating final disposition of the case, which will be placed in the student's judicial file. In all matters where the charge of academic misconduct is disputed by the student or if the faculty member feels a sanction greater than an F in the course is appropriate (such as repeated offenses or flagrant violations), the faculty member shall refer the matter to Student Conduct, making use of the Academic Misconduct Incident Report. Additional sanctions greater than an F in a course can be levied only through the system of due process established and overseen by Student Conduct or through the university's research misconduct procedures noted below. Suspension or dismissal from the university for academic misconduct will result in a notation of that action on the transcript of a graduate-level student.

The university has adopted additional policies and procedures for dealing with research misconduct among its students, faculty, and staff. The guidelines, entitled Research Integrity at Northern Illinois University, are available in department offices, in the office of the dean of the Graduate School, and online at [www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/I2.shtml](http://www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/I2.shtml), and pertain to the intentional commission of any of the following acts: falsification of data, improper assignment of authorship, claiming another person's work as one's own, unprofessional manipulation of experiments or of research procedures, misappropriation of research funds.

If a graduate student fails to maintain the standards of academic or professional integrity expected in his or her discipline or program, the student's admission to the program may be terminated on

recommendation of the student's major department. A statement on students' rights to the products of research is available in department offices, in the office of the dean of the Graduate School, and online at [www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/I11.shtml](http://www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/I11.shtml).

## Course Outline

**Week 01, 08/26:** Introductions

**Week 02, 09/02:** *No Class – Labor Day*

**Week 03, 09/09:** Theory and Public Policy

- McCool, D. C. (1995). The theoretical foundation of policy studies. In McCool, D. C., editor, *Public Policy, Theories, Models, and Concepts*, pages 1–27. Prentice Hall, New Jersey
- DeLeon, P. (1999). The stages approach to the policy process: Where has it gone, where is it going? In Sabatier, P. A., editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 19–32. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1st edition
- Sabatier, P. A. (2007). The need for better theories. In Sabatier, P. A., editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 3–17. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition
- Weible, C. M. (2017). Introduction: The scope and focus of policy process research and theory. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 1–16. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition
- Nowlin, M. C. (2011). Theories of the policy process: State of the research and emerging trends. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(S1):S41–S60
- Petridou, E. (2014). Theories of the policy process: Contemporary scholarship and future directions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1):S12–S32

**Week 04, 09/16:** Policy Rationales and Typologies, Policy Design

*Due:* Topics

Rationales for Public Policy

- Munger, M. (2000). Policy analysis as a profession and a process: An overview. In Munger, M., editor, *Analyzing Policy*. W.W. Norton, New York, [Online](#).
- Bozeman, B. (2002). Public-value failure: When efficient markets may not do. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2):134–151

Policy Typologies

- Lowi, T. J. (1972). Four systems of policy, politics, and choice. *Public Administration Review*, 32(4):298–310

- Heckathorn, D. D. and Maser, S. M. (1990). The contractual architecture of public policy: A critical reconstruction of lowi's typology. *The Journal of Politics*, 52(4):1101–1123
- Gormley, W. T. (1986). Regulatory issue networks in a federal system. *Polity*, 18(4):595–620

**Week 05, 09/23:** Policy Design and Policy Tools

- Schneider, Ingram, and deLeon, “Democratic Policy Design: Social Construction of Target Populations” pp. 105-150.
- Soss, J. (1999). Lessons of welfare: Policy design, political learning, and political action. *American Political Science Review*, 93(2):363–380
- Schram, S., Soss, J., Fording, R., and Houser, L. (2009). Deciding to discipline: Race, choice, and punishment at the frontlines of welfare reform. *American Sociological Review*, 74(3):398–422
- Pierce, J. J., Siddiki, S., Jones, M. D., Schumacher, K., Pattison, A., and Peterson, H. (2014). Social construction and policy design: A review of past applications. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(1):1–29

**Week 06, 09/30:** Information, Decision Making, and Multiple Streams

- Jones, B. D. (2003). Bounded rationality and political science: Lessons from public administration and public policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(4):395–412
- Lindblom, C. (1959). The science of “muddling through”. *Public Administration Review*, 19(2):79–88
- Lindblom, C. (1979). Still muddling, not yet through. *Public Administration Review*, 39(6):517–526
- 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
- Kingdon, J. E. (1995). *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policy*. Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Boston, MA, 2nd edition, Chs 5 and 7
- Eissler, R., Russell, A., and Jones, B. D. (2014). New avenues for the study of agenda setting. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(S1):S71–S86

Recommended

- Herweg, N., Zahariadis, N., and Zohlnhöfer, R. (2017). The multiple streams framework: Foundations, refinements, and empirical applications. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition

**Week 07, 10/07:** Models of Policy Innovation and Change I : Advocacy Coalition Framework

- Heiclo, h. (2013). Issue networks and the executive establishment. In Theodoulou, S. Z. and Cahn, M. A., editors, *Public Policy: The Essential Readings*, pages 69–77. Pearson, New York, 2nd edition
- Jenkins-Smith, H. C., Nohrstedt, D., Weible, C. M., and Ingold, K. (2017). The advocacy coalition framework: An overview of the research program. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 135–173. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition
- Elgin, D. J. and Weible, C. M. (2013). A stakeholder analysis of colorado climate and energyissues using policy analytical capacity and theadvocacy coalition framework. *Review of Policy Research*, 30(1):114–133

**Week 08, 10/14:** Models of Policy Innovation and Change II: Innovation in the States and Punctuated Equilibrium

- Berry, F. S. and Berry, W. D. (2017). Innovation and diffusion models in policy research. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 253–300. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition
- Mintrom, M. and Vergari, S. (1998). Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms. *The Journal of Politics*, 60(1):126–148
- Volden, C. (2006). States as policy laboratories: Emulating success in the children’s health insurance program. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2):294–312
- Shipan, C. R. and Volden, C. (2012). Policy diffucusion: Seven lessons for scholars and practitioners. *Public Administration Review*, 72(6):788–796
- Baumgartener, F. R., Jones, B. D., and Mortensen, P. B. (2017). Punctuated equilibrium theory: Explaining stability and change in public policymaking. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 55–102. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition
- Boushey, G. (2012). Punctuated equilibrium theory and the diffusion of innovations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1):127–146

**Week 09, 10/21:** Policy Feedbacks and Narrative Policy Framework

*Due:* Research sketch

- Mettler, S. and SoRelle, M. (2017). Policy feedback theory. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 103–134. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition
- Mettler, S. and Welch, E. (2004). Civic generation: Policy feedback effects of the gi bill on political involvement over the life course. *British Journal of Policy Studies*, 34(3):497–518



- Wichovsky, A. and Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Measuring how administration shapes citizenship: A policy feedback perspective on performance management. *Public Administration Review*, 68(5):908–920
- Jones, M. D., McBeth, M. K., and Ranaelli, C. M. (2017). The narrative policy framework. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, pages 173–214. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4th edition

#### Recommended

- Soss, J., Fording, R. C., and Schram, S. (2011). The organization of discipline: From performance management to perversity and punishment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21:i201–i232

#### **Week 10, 10/28:** Institutionalism: The Limits of Control and Exchange

- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pg 3-35
- Moe, T. M. (1984). The new economics of organizations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(4):739–777
- Williamson, O. E. (1985). Public and private bureaucracies: A transaction cost perspective. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 1(306-342)
- Vining, A. R. and Weimer, D. L. (2016). The challenges of fractionalized property rights in public-private hybrid organizations: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Regulation and Governance*, 10(2):161–178

#### **Week 11, 11/04:** Institutions and Collective Action

- Ostrom, E. (2007). Institutional rational choice: An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework. In Sabatier, P. A., editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, chapter 2. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition
- Ostrom, E. (1992). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pg 30-45, 69-76.
- Crawford, S. E. S. and Ostrom, E. (1995). The grammar of institutions. *American Political Science Review*, 89(3):582–600
- Ostrom, E. (2000a). Collective institutions and the evolution of social norms. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(3):137–158
- Ostrom, E. (2000b). The danger of self-evident truths. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 33(1):33–44

#### Recommended

- Ostrom, E. (2011). Background on the institutional analysis and development frameworks. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1):7–27

**Week 12, 11/11:** Social Capital

Due: Short paper

- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(S):S95–S120
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in america. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28(4):664–683
- Knack, S. (2002). Social capital and the quality of government: Evidence from the states. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(4):772–785
- Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(1):7–20
- Aldrich, D. P. and Crook, K. (2008). Strong civil society as a double-edged sword: Siting trailers in post-katrina new orleans. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(3):379–389

**Week 13, 11/18:** Implementation

- Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(2):145–174
- O’Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2):263–288
- Popkine, S. J., Galster, G. C., Temkin, K., Herbig, C., Levy, D. K., and Richter, E. (2003). Obstacles to desegregating public housing: Lessons learned from implementing eight consent degrees. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 22(2):179–199
- Saetren, H. (2005). Facts and myths about research on public policy implementation: Out-of-fashion, allegedly dead, but still very much alive and relevant. *Policy Studies Journal*, 33(4):559–582

**Week 14, 11/25:** Policy Analysis and Overview of Theories

- Smith, K. and Larimer, C. (2013). What should we do? the field of policy analysis. In *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO
- Carlson, D. (2011). Trends and innovations in public policy analysis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(S1):13–26
- Weimer, D. L. and Vining, A. R. (2017). Landing on your feet: How to confront policy problems. In *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*, chapter 15. Routledge, New York, 6th edition
- Schlager, E. (2007). A comparison of frameworks, theories, and models of policy processes. In Sabatier, P. A., editor, *Theories of the Policy Process*, chapter 10. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2nd edition

Recommended

- Heikkila, T. and Cairney, P. (2017). Comparison of theories of the policy process. In Weible, C. M. and Sabatier, P. A., editors, *Theories of the Policy Process*, chapter 8. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 4 edition

**Week 15, 12/02:** Presentations

*Due:* Literature review

**Week 16, 12/09:** Final Exam