

## Public Policy 510 Syllabus

### **The Politics of Public Policy (Section 2)** **Tuesdays & Thursdays, 1-2:30pm** **Fall 2015**

Prof. Shobita Parthasarathy  
4202 Weill Hall Ph: 764-8075 E-mail: [shobita@umich.edu](mailto:shobita@umich.edu)  
Office Hours: Thursday, 9-11am or by appointment ([sign up here](#))

GSI: Leann Down  
3202 Weill Hall E-mail: [ldown@umich.edu](mailto:ldown@umich.edu)  
Office Hours: Wednesdays, 2-4pm or by appointment

This course uses a cross-national approach to help students understand the dynamics of the political environment, and to develop strategies to engage with it. Students will learn how to be effective participants in public policymaking, as analysts, administrators, and advocates, by gaining tools to help them assess a political environment, recognize the unique challenges that it imposes, and explore what motivates and constrains the various actors in it. Students will learn these skills in comparative perspective, with exposure to a variety of domestic policymaking environments in the United States, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. Thus, students will also learn how to use comparison as a political and policy analysis tool. A comparative perspective to understanding the political environment offers the following benefits: 1) It clarifies analytical tools, by showing how they work (or don't work) in different contexts; 2) It offers alternative approaches and models for politics and policymaking; 3) It brings the factors unique to the target political environment into sharp relief, providing clues to the more permanent aspects of a particular society; and 4) It helps the analyst understand how the target political environment fits in the global arena. In this course, we will explore a number of case studies in comparative perspective, including debates about immigration, public health, genetically modified organisms, dam-building, and energy. With each of these countries and case studies, we explore and compare the various actors in the political environment: governments, interest groups, social movements, advisory committees, and the corporate sector. This course is required for Ford School students and for the STPP Program (For more information on the STPP Program, please see: <http://stpp.fordschool.umich.edu>).

Overall, the course trains students:

- To think critically about the process of policymaking
- To identify and map the interests, stakeholders, institutions, and political cultures that surround any issue, particularly in different domestic policy environments, and to understand how this;
- To assess the factors of a political environment relevant to policy advocacy and engagement.
- To anticipate the issues and challenges that may arise when they are engaged in the policymaking process in different domestic political environments;
- To recognize To improve their written and oral communication skills;
- To work in teams; and
- To understand the policymaking environments of countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, in comparative perspective with the United States.

Requirements for this course include careful reading of assignments **before** class sessions, mandatory attendance **and** participation in class, multiple writing assignments of varying lengths and styles, group writing assignments, an oral presentation, and multiple opportunities for self and group reflection and assessment. Grading and information about the assignments is provided in the **Assignment Guide** for the course. **Please read it VERY carefully (and continue to refer to it over the course of the semester.)** You will need to become familiar with the course's [Canvas site](#). All assignments must be submitted via Canvas, in the "Assignments" section. Many of the course readings will be posted in the Canvas "Resources" section.

**Office Hours:** To sign up for my office hours, click [here](#). If you can't make it to our office hours, both Leann and I are available by appointment.

**Course policies:**

**Plagiarism:** Plagiarism will be harshly penalized. For more information on what constitutes sourcing, see UM's plagiarism handout: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/handouts/plagiar.pdf>. For *all* papers, I expect proper sourcing and citation. I do not care which method (e.g., APA, MLA, etc.) you use, so long as you are consistent through the paper. Also, when citing a source over the course of multiple sentences, cite after the first sentence. In addition, *do not use Wikipedia as a direct source*. It is anonymously produced, with un-vetted contributors from all over the world, so the information you find there should *never* be automatically trusted as legitimate. That said, I understand that **Wikipedia** can be extremely useful to introduce you to a particular topic. My suggestion is that you use it to learn the basics about a particular subject, and then follow the links provided there (or the insights you gain) to find a more credible source.

**Laptops:** I will permit the use of laptops (and other electronic devices) in the classroom, on an honor system. Electronic devices can be helpful for easy access to the readings and note-taking, but they should be used only for PubPol 510-related activities. If Leann or I discover *anyone* doing non-510-related activities on the laptop during classtime, then that person will get a zero for class participation for that day. I reserve the right to ban laptops in the classroom, but I hope I won't have to!

**Participation:** As you will note from the Assignment Guide, active participation (not simply attendance) is an important part of this course. It gives you an opportunity to actively engage with course material and with your classmates. It is also required, in order to receive a good grade in the course. Active participation involves: 1) coming to all classes; 2) participating at least once per class; 3) making valuable contributions based on ongoing classroom discussion, the lectures, and readings; and 4) knowing when you've been dominating the conversation and pulling back. We'll be discussing some sensitive topics in class, so please be respectful in your contributions and aware of the variety of perspectives on all issues. In addition, in order to active participation, I reserve the right to "cold call" students (i.e., call on students who have not raised their hand to participate). That said, in order to receive a good participation grade, you will have to both volunteer to participate *and* respond well to cold calls.

If you anticipate that you might have trouble participating in class, please come and speak with me. I will be happy to give you strategies to increase and improve your participation.

**Grades:** There are multiple assignments in the course, which means that at any given time, there are many moving parts. It is tempting to think that the first few papers are inconsequential, because they seem to be worth relatively little in the grand scheme of the course. However, if you find yourself doing poorly on the short papers, this is a worrisome sign of your comprehension of course concepts and development in writing skills—and foreshadows your performance in the more heavily-weighted assignments due later in the semester. If you are performing poorly on the first papers (e.g., consistently scoring below the mean), please speak with Leann or I immediately, to see how you can improve your performance. The longer you wait, the more difficult it will become to improve your grade.

If you believe you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, we can work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities to help us determine appropriate accommodations. I will treat any information you provide as private and confidential.

**Assignment/Grade Breakdown** (more information is available in the Assignment Guide):

Class participation (including reading responses):	15%
Short Memo #1:	5%
Stakeholder Memo:	10%
Research Memo:	15%
Group Comparative Political Environment Assessment:	15%
Strategy memo:	15%
Roundtable oral presentation:	10%
Initial writing self-assessment, politics reflection, and final self-critique:	10%
Peer questions and critiques:	5%

**Syllabus:** While the syllabus is fairly stable (especially for the first few weeks), I reserve the right to make slight changes to it. I do not expect, however, the themes, assignments, or even the readings to change significantly. If I do make even a slight alteration, I will tell you at least a week in advance.

## Class and Assignment Schedule

**Tues., Sept. 8: Introduction to the Course**

### **I. Introduction to Comparative Politics**

**Thurs., Sept. 10: American Politics in Comparative Perspective**

When reading, consider and prepare responses to the following questions:

- Read the Assignment Guide for 510 and come prepared with questions and requests for clarification.
- Who were the major players in the health care and climate change debates (include institutions, decisionmakers, experts, and stakeholders)
- What were the major issues of controversy/negotiation in the two debates?
- What role does politics play in the policy process?

Skocpol, Theda (2013). "Naming the Problem: What It Will Take to Counter Extremism and Engage Americans in the Fight against Global Warming." Prepared for the Symposium on *The Politics of America's Fight Against Global Warming*. pp. 21-95.

**Tues., Sept. 15: The Nuts and Bolts of the Political Process**

- What is unique about the political process in the US context? What are the roles of the different branches of government? And what are the implications of its status as a "common law" system?
- What does *comparing* the two US debates tell you about the politics of policymaking in this country?

Skocpol, Theda (2013). "Naming the Problem: What It Will Take to Counter Extremism and Engage Americans in the Fight against Global Warming." Prepared for the Symposium on *The Politics of America's Fight Against Global Warming*. pp. 96-130.

**Thurs., Sept.17: Political Institutions in Comparative Perspective**

**\*\* Short Memo #1 Due at 1:10pm on Thursday September 22<sup>nd</sup> (before class)! \*\***

- What are the similarities and differences among the political structures (institutions and laws) among the countries discussed in the two articles?
- Can you identify political institutions that seem similar on the surface across countries, but actually behave quite differently (e.g., legislatures, courts)? How are they different? Why?
- Are there cultural differences that might be important in understanding the behavior of these institutions?

Kathryn Harrison (2010). "The Comparative Politics of Carbon Taxation." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 6: 507-529.

Katherine Boothe and Kathryn Harrison (2009). "The Influence of Institutions on Issue Definition: Children's Environmental Health Policy in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*. 11.3: 287-307.

**Tues., Sept. 22: Issue Framing in Comparative Perspective**

- What is issue framing? Who frames an issue? How does issue framing shape its political outcome?
- How does historical, national, or other aspects of national *cultural* context shape how an issue is framed?

Shobita Parthasarathy (forthcoming). *Patently Political: Biotechnology, Markets, and Morality in the United States and Europe*. Chapter 4. Book manuscript under review.

Sheila Jasanoff and Sang-Hyun Kim (2009). "Containing the Atom: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and Nuclear Power in the United States and South Korea." *Minerva*. 47: 119-146.

**Thurs., Sept. 24: Identity, Diversity, and Politics**

- How does an individual's background shape how they see and understand the world, including their approaches to politics (and how they see)?
- What external factors, including an individual's community and environment, shape how individuals approach politics?
- How can policymakers pay attention to these different—but all rational—perspectives and still make policy?

Take the "Race Test", one of the Implicit Association Tests available at [UnderstandingPrejudice.org](http://UnderstandingPrejudice.org).

Bruce Drake (2015). "[Divide between blacks and whites on police runs deep.](#)" *Factank: news in the Numbers*. April 28.

Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (1995). "Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Black Man." *The New Yorker*. October 23. pp. 56-65.

Paul Longmore (2003). *Why I Burned My Book and Other Essays on Disability*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. Chapter 13.

**\*\* Politics Reflection Due Friday, September 25<sup>th</sup>, 10am! \*\***

## **II. What is a Stakeholder?**

**Tues., Sept. 29: Understanding Stakeholders**

- What is the organization's history and mission? How does the organization you have chosen try to influence policymaking (what arguments and tactics does it use)?
- On what basis does it try to convince people (including the government) to support it?
- How is it different from government institutions, or experts?

Walker, Jack (1991), *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press: Chapter 2.

Snow, David A. (2010). *A Primer on Social Movements*. New York: W. W. Norton: Chapter 1.

*Assignment: Find an example of a stakeholder that operates at the national level in any country (a group that you think behaves like an interest group or like a social movement). Using the readings, assess whether this organization seems more like an interest group or a social movement. Why do you think this?*

**Thurs., Oct. 1: Stakeholders and Political Strategy**

- What are the similarities and differences between the political strategies used by health advocates and businesses in these articles?
- How might the strategies of these groups be shaped by their context, the historical moment, and the issue that they work on? (And how might their strategies change in a different context?)
- How might you develop the strategy of a stakeholder you support based on the readings for today?

Nancy Tomes (2011). "From Outsiders to Insiders: The Consumer-Survivor Movement and Its Impact on US Mental Health Policy." *Patients as Political Actors*. Edited by Beatrix Hoffman, Nancy Tomes, and Mark Schlesinger. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Beatrix Hoffman (2011). "Don't Scream Alone': The Health Care Activism of Poor Americans in the 1970s." *Patients as Political Actors*. Edited by Beatrix Hoffman, Nancy Tomes, and Mark Schlesinger. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Vineeta Yadav (2008). "Business lobbies and policymaking in developing countries: the contrasting cases of India and China." *Journal of Public Affairs*. 8:67-82.

**\*\* Group Stakeholder Proposal Due Friday October 2nd, 10am! \*\***

**\*\* Roundtable Group Meetings during the week of October 5th! \*\***

**Tues., Oct. 6: Understanding Writing for a Policy Audience**

Guest Speakers: Ford School Writing Instructors

Reading TBD.

**\*\* Writing Self-Assessment Due Wednesday, October 7<sup>th</sup>, 10am! \*\***

**Thurs., Oct. 8: Stakeholders and Framing**

- How do stakeholders invoke specific frames in their political advocacy? What tactics do they use?
- How do they try to ensure that their framing becomes the dominant approach to solving the social/policy problem?
- What makes a particular frame more or less successful in a policy debate?

Abigail C. Saguy and Kevin W. Riley (2005). "Weighing Both Sides: Morality, Mortality, and Framing Contests over Obesity." *Journal of Health Policy, Politics, and Law*. 30.5: 869-923.

*Assignment: Think of one example of how a stakeholder has framed its political arguments in order to gain supporters for its position. How does the stakeholder use language and images to support this frame? What makes this frame particularly historically or culturally resonant? What are the competing frames—deployed by opposing stakeholders—in this debate?*

**Tues., Oct. 13: Stakeholders and Political Advocacy in China**

- How does the Chinese political environment shape political advocacy in the country (think about arguments and tactics)?
- How does the scope and style of political advocacy in China compare to other countries that you know about?

China Development Brief (2013). *The Diversification of Public Advocacy in China*. A Special Report from China Development Brief, Sponsored by the Canada Fund.

**Thurs., Oct. 15: Stakeholders and Social Networks**

- In what ways do social networks shape politics?
- How might the nature of social networks differ depending on the kinds of groups and issues involved, and geographic location?
- How might online social networks differ from those that are developed in person or in particular communities?

Merlyna Lim (2012). “Clicks, Cabs, and Coffee Houses: Social Media and Oppositional Movements in Egypt, 2004-2011.” *Journal of Communication*. 62: 231-248.

Cordero Guzmán, Nina Martin, Victoria Quiroz-Becerra, and Nik Theodore (2008). “Voting with their Feet: Nonprofit Organizations and Immigrant Mobilization.” *American Behavioral Scientist*. 52.4: 598-617.

**\*\* Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup>, 10am, Stakeholder Memo Due! \*\***

**Tues., Oct. 20: FALL STUDY BREAK, NO CLASS!**

**III. The Politics of Expertise and Institutions**

**Thurs., Oct. 22: Stakeholders and the Politics of Expertise**

- What factors shape how policy domains identify and define relevant knowledge and expertise?
  - And how do policy domains maintain these definitions even when challenged?
- What strategies to stakeholders use to challenge definitions of relevant knowledge and expertise in a policy domain?
- How might calls for “evidence-based” policymaking be political in and of themselves?

Gwen Ottinger (2010). “Buckets of Resistance: Standards and the Effectiveness of Citizen Science.” *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. 35: 244-270.

Maria and Jim Powell et al. (2011). “Invisible People, Invisible Risks: How Scientific Assessments of Environmental Health Risks Overlook Minorities—and How Community Participation Can Make Them Visible.” *Technoscience and Environmental Justice: Expert Cultures in a Grassroots Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

**Tues., Oct. 27: The Politics of Technical Expertise**

- What is the function of the bureaucracy in democratic contexts? (And in non-democratic contexts?)

- How does national context shape bureaucratic decisionmaking?
- How does the role of, and attitudes toward, civil service compare across countries?

Daniel Carpenter (2006). "The Evolution of National Bureaucracy in the United States." In *The Executive Branch*, edited by Joel D. Aberbach and Mark A. Peterson, New York: Oxford University Press.

Arthur Daemrich (2015). "Dispute settlement and legitimacy of the World Trade Organization: Adjudicating knowledge claims in the Brazil-United States cotton case." In Stephen Hilgartner, Clark Miller, and Rob Hagendijk, eds., *Science and Democracy: Making Knowledge and Making Power in the Biosciences and Beyond*. New York: Routledge.

**Thurs., Oct. 29: Bureaucratic Politics in Comparative Perspective**

- Why did the US and France adopt different approaches to economic valuation?
- What were the consequences of the US and French differences?
- What are the costs and benefits of using economics knowledge and expertise to value nature?

Sheila Jasanoff (1991). "Acceptable Evidence in a Pluralistic Society." In *Acceptable Evidence: Science and Values in Risk Management*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**\*\* Research Memo Due on Friday October 30<sup>th</sup>, 10am \*\***

**Tues., Nov. 3: The Court as a Site of Politics**

- How do stakeholders use the courts in order to conduct political/policy advocacy?
- How might legal standing rules in different countries affect the use of the courts by political actors?

Rajamani, Lavanya (2007). "Public Interest Environmental Litigation in India: Exploring Issues of Access, Participation, Equity, Effectiveness and Sustainability." *Journal of Environmental Law*. 19(3): 293-321.

Bonine, John E. "Standing to Sue: The First Step in Access to Justice." Mercer University Law School lecture, January 1999.

**IV. Outsider Pressure and "Unconventional" Political Strategy**

**Thurs., Nov. 5: Narmada: A Valley Rises**

- What tactics did opponents of the Narmada Dam use to challenge the government? And what tactics did dam proponents (including the government) use?
- To whom were these tactics directed? Which were successful, and which were not?
- Why did these players choose these tactics?

Sanjeev Khagram (2004). "India's Narmada Projects: Historical Genesis and the First Transnational Reform Campaign." *Dam and Development: Transnational Struggles for Water and Power*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Arundhati Roy (2000). "The People vs. the God of Big Dams." *The Times of India*.

Pablo S. Bose (2004). "Critics and Experts, Activists and Academics: Intellectuals in the Fight for Social and Ecological Justice in the Narmada Valley, India." *IRSH*. 49: 133-157.



**Tues., Nov. 10: Comparative Cultures of Mobilization**

- In what ways were the Narmada Dam protests uniquely Indian?
- How does the Indian environmental movement compare to its counterparts in other countries, which we've read about this term or which you know about personally?

Taylor, Verta and Nella Van Dyke (2004), "'Get up, Stand up': Tactical Repertoires of Social Movements," In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Wiley-Blackwell.

Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha (2009). "Ecological Conflicts and the Environmental Movement in India." *Environmental Issues in India: A Reader*. Edited by Mahesh Rangarajan. White Plains, NY: Pearson ELT.

*Assignment: Come to class prepared with an example of stakeholder activity from a country other than India, which you think effectively illustrates the political culture of values of that country.*

**Thurs., Nov. 12: Group Memo Discussion; Reflecting on How National Context Shapes Policymaking**

- How do US, German, and British approaches to biotechnology differ?
- Why have these countries adopted such different approaches?
- What does Jasanoff's analysis tell us about the national structural and cultural factors that shape politics and policy?
- What uniquely national factors do you think have shaped the political debate on your roundtable topic?

Jasanoff, Sheila (2005). "In the democracies of DNA: ontological uncertainty and political order in three states." *New Genetics and Society*. 24(2): 139-156.

**V. Roundtables**

**\*\* Roundtable Press Release is due on Canvas, Sunday, Nov. 15th, 5pm \*\***

**Tuesday, Nov. 17: Roundtable #1**

**Thursday, Nov. 19: NO CLASS! (but don't forget to turn in Roundtable #1 Critique!)**

**\*\* Group Comparative Political Env't Assessment Memo due Monday, Nov. 23<sup>rd</sup>, 10am \*\***

**Tuesday, Nov. 24: Roundtable #2**

**Thursday, Nov. 26: THANKSGIVING BREAK**

**Thursday, Dec. 1: Roundtable #3**

**Tuesday, Dec. 3: Roundtable #4**

**Tuesday, Dec. 8: Roundtable #5**

**\*\* Roundtable Self/Group Critique due Thursday, December 10th at 1:10pm on Canvas\*\***

**Thursday, Dec. 10: Semester wrap-up; Considering Comparative Politics**

**\*\* Strategy Memo due Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup> at 10am on Canvas \*\***