

PPG 2008H: Comparative Public Policy

Michael J. Donnelly*

Updated September 18, 2018

This course is designed to expose MPP students to the scholarly literature on public policy across a wide range of countries. Though most SPPG students will find their careers in Canada, studying these other countries will deepen our knowledge of public policy, even Canadian policy. After all, as Sartori¹ wrote, “(h)e who knows only one country knows none” (p. 245).

We will examine major theories and research paradigms, with a focus on the relationship between theory, research design, and measurement. Our emphasis will be on comparing wealthy countries, though we will draw on policies from the developing world as well.

We will begin by examining the sources of public policy, asking how institutions, ideas, and interests shape policy. Then, we will turn to how policy shapes society, thinking carefully about how we measure policies when they are embedded in widely varying political, economic, and social systems.

Finally, in order to focus our study, most of our readings will draw on policies meant to deal with a central thematic challenge in today’s societies — managing various forms of diversity.

When you complete this course, you will be able to **describe** the range of variation in policies, **analyze** the causes and consequences of policy variation, and **communicate** those ideas both orally and in writing. Your descriptions will draw on scholarly, policy, and journalistic sources, and your analyses will be both theoretically sophisticated and practically relevant. Finally, because you have produced original comparative research yourself, you will be able to critically **evaluate** the quality of other research.

*Note the “J.” There is another (retired) UT political scientist named Michael Donnelly. If you email him, I will not respond.

¹Giovanni Sartori. “Comparing and Miscomparing”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3.3 (1991), pp. 243–257.

1 Contact Information

Office: SS 3105

Office Phone: 416-978-0344

Email: mj.donnelly@utoronto.ca

URL: <http://www.MichaelJDonnelly.net>

2 Prerequisites

This course has no prerequisites, though I assume you have some background knowledge of basic economics, basic theories of political behavior and political institutions, and basic statistics. If you do not have this background, **please contact me before or during the first week of class** to discuss preparations for the course.

3 Logistics

- Lectures: Wednesdays 10-12 & 2-4, UC 314
- Michael's Office hours: 12:30-2:30pm on Mondays. 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. If you email me about an assignment less than two days before it is due, I cannot guarantee that I will respond in time for you to use my comments.

4 Course Requirements

Your final grade is based on participation, 3 short presentations, one short paper, and one long paper.

- **Participation** (total of 30%): I expect you to come to class having read the assigned materials and prepared to discuss them. Attendance is mandatory. You are professionals, so if you expect to miss class, or if you miss class unexpectedly, I expect you to let me know quickly.
 - Excused absences: If you expect to miss class, or if you miss class unexpectedly with a good reason, it is essential that you communicate with me. If you notify me of your absence, I will make a note, and typically ask you to submit a 1-2 page discussion of the week's readings. This response will summarize (1 para) and critique the argument of one or more (your choice) of the readings.
 - **Class participation** (15%): Most class sessions will include presentations, 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.

Notāte Bene!

- * The Munk School is committed to creating and fostering a positive learning environment based on open communication, mutual respect, and inclusion. The School encourages behaviour that is welcoming, supportive, and respectful of cultural and individual differences at all times, both within and outside the classroom. In this course, each voice in the classroom has something of value to contribute to class discussion. Please respect the different experiences, beliefs and values expressed by your fellow students, faculty member(s), and guest speakers.
- * This class allows the use of laptops for note-taking and looking up supporting information during lectures and activities, but checking emails, playing on Facebook, etc. is disrespectful and unprofessional. If you need to check your email, step out of class and return when you have finished.
- **Reading discussions** (3X5 = 15%): Each week from week 3-9 (October 3-November 14), two groups (to be assigned letters A-J) will be responsible for leading a discussion on each reading. One group will be assigned to summarize and justify (that is, identify the strong points of) an article or chapter, and another group will be assigned to critique (or identify the weak points of) that same reading. Each group should aim to present for 10-15 minutes. This will be followed by an open class discussion. Most weeks, we will do this twice (with four groups involved).
- **Policy description** (5%): In Week 2 (September 26), you will turn in a short description of the key aspects of some policy in two countries (not US or Canada). You may choose any policy. This should be 1 page, single spaced, and can include tables, figures, lists, or other means of clearly communicating the key aspects of that policy. **Note: You may use a second page for citations, but not for any graded content.**
- **Long Paper** (total of 65%): This is a group assignment. I will assign groups (numbered 1-5) in Week 2, based on your topical preferences. This research paper will be either an in depth comparison of the **cause(s) or consequence(s)** of a single policy. It may be a qualitative study of at least six countries or jurisdictions² **OR** a quantitative examination of policy in a wider range of countries.
 - **Topic Selection Memo** (2%): In week four (**October 10**), you will submit a memo (500-1,000 words) detailing (1) the policy area you will examine, (3) an outline of your theory, and (4) a tentative list of cases or data. The theorization here should be tentative but detailed, so that I can tell whether you will be able to complete the project. It should identify the relevant literature, the approach you are taking, and a tentative thesis or hypothesis. I will not grade it on substance, but will grade it on completeness.
 - **Bibliography** (2%): In week five (**October 17**), you will submit an annotated bibliography for your paper. It should include 15-30 sources, which can be scholarly articles or books, government reports or web sites, primary sources, or other forms of information that you will use. Each entry should be followed by 2-3 sentences explaining the content and value of the source.

²You may also choose to examine three countries in at least two periods. For example, you may study British, French, and Australian housing policy before and after the Thatcher 'revolution,' providing you with a total of six cases.

- **Measurement Memo** (10%): In week six (**October 24**), you will submit a memo (750-1,500 words) describing your measurement strategy. This should detail your approach to measuring the policy output whose causes/consequences your paper is meant to identify, as well as those causes or consequences. For each, you should include:
 1. The underlying concept you want to measure
 2. The type of measurement (i.e. a typology, a ranking, ordered categories, continuous variable, etc.)
 3. The measurement strategy and its justification (i.e. how it relates to the underlying concept)
 4. A tentative application of that measurement strategy to at least 3 cases, so that the reader can judge the credibility of your approachSubmit this online (where it will be graded for completeness), and bring a **hard copies** to class, where we will exchange them and discuss them with each other.
- **Rough Draft** (1%): You should submit a rough draft before class during Week 10 (**November 21**). This should be a complete paper. I will not grade it on substance, but will grade it on completeness.
- **Final Oral Presentations** (10%): During weeks 10-12 (November 21-December 5), each group will give a 30 minute formal presentation of their paper, and then lead a discussion on the topic. The goal is to (1) communicate your argument (2) get feedback from your peers and (3) help your colleagues understand the broader policy area.
- **Feedback** (10%): This is an individual assignment. You owe your peers careful reads of their papers and good advice on how to improve them. It is due **December 5**
- **Final draft** (30%): This is the final version of the paper. It is due at 11:59pm on **December 12**.

4.1 Long Paper Details

This is a group paper. I will assign groups in Week 2. Qualitative papers should be about should cover six countries (or three countries at two time points) in about 8,000 words.³ Quantitative papers should be of similar length, and should include data from at least four countries over a substantial time period or 12 countries over a shorter time period. If you intend to write a quantitative paper, contact me early so we can make sure it is doable. You may mix quantitative and qualitative approaches.

The comparison should focus on their **causes or consequences**. You will examine the cases in order to clarify the criteria by which you measure the concepts under consideration. You will not have space to describe every detail about each case, so you must make analytic choices. Pay careful attention to Table 1, which should guide your research and writing from the start. You should clearly describe the theoretical framework in which you are working and provide (initial) evidence for your theory. The evidence may be derived both from other scholarly research and from data appropriate to your argument.

³Word counts are approximate. Write as much as you need to write to make your point. Brevity will be rewarded.

Tables and Figures: This paper should present its argument in whatever form is most efficient. Frequently, that will mean incorporating tables and figures. When doing this, make sure to design them to highlight the main message.⁴ You should tell the reader the main takeaway both in text and in table/graphic form.

Formatting The paper should be structured such that an educated reader can skim it and understand the basic argument and evidence before reading it more carefully. That means including an abstract, section headings, etc. Since many of your readers (including the person grading them!) will print out the papers, please make sure to supplement the use of color with the use of different shading/plotting symbols. In other words, if red and blue appear as very slightly different shades of gray when printed, there needs to be another way that the information contained in the colors is communicated.

Collaboration I will assign paper groups based on a survey that I will send around during the first week of classes. From there, you are responsible for developing a topic and dividing the work as you see fit. There are many models of successful collaboration. Since paper groups will have 3-5 members, there is some opportunity to divide the research and writing according to comparative advantage, especially if you have pre-existing knowledge of particular countries or research techniques. However, since anything your group submits will have your name on it, everyone should be accountable for every piece of the paper. As you are all professionals, I do not anticipate any serious disagreements. If you do encounter issues, get in touch with me early in the process.

5 General rules for assignments

Submission All assignments will be submitted directly through Canvas.⁵ In the case of the rough draft, this will randomly give you access to two of your classmates' rough drafts for your comments.

For record-keeping purposes, all authors should submit all assignments. You will receive the same grade, but in order to make sure everyone gets credit, separate copies must be submitted on Canvas.

Plagiarism Plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity will not be tolerated. See the university policies⁶ for more details. The Writing Center⁷ can also assist you in avoiding plagiarism.

Citations, formatting, and style In all written work, you may use any standard format and any citation approach (in-text, footnotes, endnotes, etc.) that works for you. Just be consistent,

⁴For some thoughts on statistical graphics, see Andrew Gelman and Antony Unwin. "Infovis and Statistical Graphics: Different Goals, Different Looks". In: *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 22.1 (2013), pp. 2–28.

⁵All written work should be turned in to Canvas in .doc/.docx/.pdf format. Do not use a format, such as .pages, that makes me do work to convert it if I am not on a Mac.

⁶<http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity>

⁷<http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/home>

Table 1: Final Draft Criteria

	Poor (F/B-)	Fair (B/B+)	Good (A-/A)	Excellent (A/A+)
Theoretical framework	6	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.
Case/data selection	6	Vary on some IV's, but not those appropriate to the theoretical framework.	Well-chosen cases/data.	Well chosen cases displaying unusual or striking insight.
Measurement	6	Mentions measurement, but displays illogical or poorly designed measures.	Measures are appropriate for theory.	Measures display unusual insight.
Organization	4	Overall organization is good, but lower levels display incoherence	Well-structured	Well-structured with good transitions and all parts are clearly linked to thesis
Writing	4	A few mistakes or issues	Writing makes paper easy to follow	Exceptionally insightful and creative writing
Style and graphics	4	Some useful graphics	Clear, easy to understand, and useful graphics	Tables or graphics that tell the story of the paper in a particularly insightful way

and cite anything that is not common knowledge. Since you are professionals, I will pay close attention to issues of grammar, diction, and clarity.

6 Late Assignments and Appeals

Late assignments will receive deductions of 20% per day. When submitting to Canvas, recognize that it can be slow, and that can sometimes push your submission past the deadline. Similarly, it is sometimes down for maintenance. I will not grant extensions for normal Canvas delays, so make sure to leave yourself a time cushion.

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 in person⁸ within two weeks of receiving the grade. They must include a 100-200 word written 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.**

7 Readings

Below, you will find a detailed listing of readings for each class session. Most classes will be based on one or two assigned articles or a short book (typically about three hours worth of reading). You should read carefully — though not necessarily comprehensively — and be prepared to discuss both the theory and the evidence. Some of the evidence is going to rely on knowledge - of history, 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 your discussion question or in class. Starred (*) readings are optional, though if your policy descriptions or your long paper on a related topic, you should certainly read them.

A note on reading critically All of the readings have been chosen to stimulate discussion, and none of them should be seen as above reproach. Indeed, the class is designed to help you be a sophisticated consumer of studies that claim to learn lessons by looking at multiple countries. Part of that means knowing how to spot an unwarranted assumption here or a dodgy measurement decision there. None of the readings are designed to deceive, but you should nonetheless read them with a sceptical eye.

We will use the following books, available in the bookstore, the library, or online:

- Gary King, Robert O Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994
- Rafaela Dancygier. *Immigration and Conflict in Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010
- Ruud Koopmans et al. *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005

⁸In the case of the final paper, if you are out of town, we can arrange a Skype meeting.

You are expected to buy these books in hard copy and bring them to class when we are discussing them.

8 Course Outline

- Week 1: Introductions, logistics, etc. September 19
- Robert Putnam. “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century - The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture”. In: *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30.2 (2007), pp. 137–174
 - Woodrow Wilson. “The Study of Administration”. In: *Political Science Quarterly* 2.2 (1887), pp. 197–222
- Week 2: Competing theories of diversity policy September 26
- Evan S Lieberman and Prema Singh. “The Institutional Origins of Ethnic Violence”. In: *Comparative Politics* 45.1 (2016), pp. 1–24
 - Arend Lijphart. “The Puzzle of Indian Democracy : A Consociational Interpretation”. In: *The American Political Science Review* 90.2 (1996), pp. 258–268
- Week 3: Research design October 3
- (Pro - A, Anti - B) Chapters 1, 3, and 4 of King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*
 - (Pro - C, Anti - D) Dani Rodrik. “Why We Learn Nothing from Regressing Economic Growth on Policies”. In: *Seoul Journal of Economics* 25.2 (2012), pp. 137–151. ISSN: 1225-0279. DOI: [10.1017/CB09781107415324.004](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781107415324.004). arXiv: [arXiv:1011.1669v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1669v3). URL: <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2083897>
 - * Stephen Chaudoin, Jude Hays, and Raymond Hicks. “Do We Really Know the WTO Cures Cancer?” In: *British Journal of Political Science* November (2016), pp. 1–26. ISSN: 14692112. DOI: [10.1017/S000712341600034X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712341600034X)
- Week 4: Measuring and typologizing October 10
- (Pro - E, Anti - F) Introduction and Chapters 1-3 of Koopmans et al., *Contested citizenship*
 - (Pro - G, Anti - H) Christophe Bertossi and Jan Willem Duyvendak. “National models of immigrant integration: The costs for comparative research”. In: *Comparative European Politics* 10.3 (2012), pp. 237–247
- Week 5: Quantitative measurement October 17
- APSA - Migration and Citizenship. “Symposium: How to Measure Immigration Policies”. In: *Migration and Citizenship* 1.2 (2013), pp. 4–53
- Note: read the intro, conclusion, and two or three of the sections.
- (Pro - B, Anti - J) IMPIC (pp. 8-13) and IMPALA (pp. 15-21)

– (Pro - A, Anti - I) Peters (pp. 28-33) and Ruhs (pp. 34-39)

- Jan Teorell et al. *The QOG Standard Dataset 2018 Codebook*. Gothenburg: The QoG Institute, 2018. URL: https://www.qogdata.pol.gu.se/data/qog_std_jan18.pdf
Note: Skim only

Week 6: LGBT Rights

October 24

- (Pro - D, Anti - E) Phillip M. Ayoub. “Cooperative transnationalism in contemporary Europe: Europeanization and political opportunities for LGBT mobilization in the European Union”. In: *European Political Science Review* 5.02 (2012), pp. 279–310
- (Pro - F, Anti - C) Chapters 2 and 12 of Manon Tremblay, David Paternotte, and Carol Johnson, eds. *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State: Comparative Insights into a Transformed Relationship*. eBook. New York: Routledge, 2016. ISBN: 9781409410669. DOI: [10.1177/1363460713481747](https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460713481747) **Note: Electronic edition available through library**

Week 7: Immigration and feedback

October 31

- Dancygier, *Immigration and Conflict in Europe* Note: Read chapters 1-4 plus the conclusion
 - (Pro - H, Anti - A) Chapters 1-2
 - (Pro - I, Anti - G) Chapter 3
 - (Pro - B, Anti - J) Chapter 4
- * Dal Bó et al. working paper (on Canvas)

Week 8: Diversity and the welfare state

November 7

- (Pro - F, Anti - C) Chapter 6 of Alberto F Alesina and Edward L Glaeser. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004 (on Canvas)
- (Pro - E, Anti - D) H. Finseraas. “Poverty, ethnic minorities among the poor, and preferences for redistribution in European regions”. In: *Journal of European Social Policy* 22.2 (2012), pp. 164–180

Week 9: Political integration of migrants

November 14

- (Pro - G, Anti - I) Rafaela M. Dancygier. “Electoral rules or electoral leverage? explaining muslim representation in England”. In: *World Politics* 66.2 (2014), pp. 229–263. ISSN: 10863338. DOI: [10.1017/S0043887114000021](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887114000021)
- (Pro - J, Anti - H) Sara Wallace Goodman. “Controlling immigration through language and country knowledge requirements”. In: *West European Politics* 34.2 (2011), pp. 235–255. ISSN: 01402382. DOI: [10.1080/01402382.2011.546569](https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2011.546569)
- * Jens Hainmueller, Dominik Hangartner, and Giuseppe Pietrantuono. “Naturalization fosters the long-term political integration of immigrants”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.41 (2015), pp. 12651–12656. ISSN: 0027-8424. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1418794112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418794112). URL: <http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1418794112>

Presentations

Week 10: Group 1 & 2 presenters	November 21
Week 11: Group 3 & 4 presenters	November 28
Week 12: Group 5 presenters	December 5