

## Public Policy 202

### American Political Institutions and Processes

Department of Public Policy  
UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs

#### Winter 2014

Monday and Wednesday 9:00 a.m.-10:20 a.m.

Public Affairs Building Room 2355

Discussion Section, Wednesday 1:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m., Room 4357

Discussion Section, Thursday 5:00 p.m. – 5:50 p.m., Room 4357

Professor Mark A. Peterson  
6315 Public Affairs Building  
Phone: 310-794-4270  
E-Mail: [markap@ucla.edu](mailto:markap@ucla.edu)  
Office Hours: Tuesday, 4:00-6:00pm (tentative)

Emily Scheines  
6313 Public Affairs Building  
Phone: XXXXXX  
E-Mail: [emily.scheines@gmail.com](mailto:emily.scheines@gmail.com)  
Office Hours: XXXXXX

#### Course Description

A rigorous graduate education in public policy requires fulfilling three intellectual tasks: developing the *analytical skills* needed to make optimal choices given stated policy objectives, available information, and resource constraints, which can be applied in numerous policy domains and institutional settings; acquiring additional *substantive expertise* in those topical areas where one is likely to be working after graduation; and nurturing a *strategic understanding of how to work effectively and assume managerial or leadership roles in the social, political, and institutional context* of public action (or private action taken with claims made to the public interest). Naturally, much of your training in the Master of Public Policy program—including the first quarter with its devotion to microeconomic and statistics—focuses on the first two activities, emphasizing in particular the development of your technical proficiency in performing advanced policy analysis.

If all institutional arrangements created equivalent opportunities for or posed similar constraints on analysis; if there were rarely a distinction between what is analytically desirable and what is actually doable in the political world; if achieving desired outcomes did not require successful social engagement and collective action; if we could ignore all of the ambiguities and tensions created by the democratic process and competing, even deeply antagonistic, social values; and if all problems in the public and nonprofit sectors lent themselves

indisputably to purely technical solutions; then perhaps to be successful in your careers—to have real impact in the ways in which you wish to improve the world—you would not need more than the analytical skills and substantive expertise that you are acquiring while in the MPP program. It takes little imagination, however, to notice that the political, institutional, and social context of public policy making can have tremendous influence on what one can accomplish in the public and nonprofit sectors, and on the types of entrepreneurial strategies that will be most effective for providing leadership and reaching your goals and those of the organizations in which you will work and lead. Even the best policy analysis rarely produces options that translate directly into actual public policy. To fulfill your goals—to *become a leader of social and policy change*—you have to become an intuitive and patient strategic player as well as a capable policy analyst.

This course on American Political Institutions and Processes, as well as Public Policy 206, The Political Economy of Policy Design and Implementation, and Public Policy 211, Normative Issues in Policy Analysis, are devoted to these strategic contextual issues. Public Policy 209, Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, lies at the intersection of developing functional managerial skills and knowing how to use them in the highly political environment—internally and externally—of public and private agencies.

Required of all students pursuing an MPP, the objective of Public Policy 202 is to expose students to

a variety of constitutionally conceived policy-making settings in which policy options are framed, debated, and evaluated, and public decisions are made, from legislatures to the courts to the ballot box. We also consider in broad terms the opportunities for influencing policy outcomes, including “inside” lobbying and “outside” mobilization of the public. Here, taking a relatively systemic (one might say “macro”) approach, we exploit a broad swath of the mainstream political science literature and specific empirical cases to investigate the look and meaning of political institutions, and in turn examine how they and relationships among them shape *policy adoption* (including rejection). Public Policy 206, with a specific focus on more individual-level micro-economic models of incentives, choices, and strategic action by various participants embedded in the institutions, examines *policy implementation*, as well as the design and performance of agencies and oversight of them by executives, legislatures, and courts. Because policy enactment and implementation are inseparable, and related political dynamics shape both, these courses at times draw attention to the same institutions and imperatives, but from different perspectives and levels of analysis. Together they provide you with the kind of historically and institutionally grounded “macro” and incentive-based “micro” perspectives on politics and policy making that give you the necessary tools for maneuvering more effectively in careers that, in one way or another, engage, wrestle with, and furnish leadership in the complex institutional fabric of the public sector.

Public Policy 209 takes you into the bowels of bureaucratic organization, a particularly important institution for MPP students. It expands upon the conceptual foundations of Public Policy 202 and 206, brings to life the practical issues you are likely to encounter in the organizations in which you will serve, and begins developing the skills—such as negotiation—necessary for you to work effectively in any organizational setting. Public Policy 211 broadens the context of analysis, delving into the fundamental normative orientations that often divide society, animate ideological differences, and drive much of the policy debate played out both inside and outside of government.

In American Political Institutions we begin by reviewing the assumptions and principles that motivated the formation of the American republic and the crafting of its Constitution, and their implications.

We then turn to the general political setting of policy making. Starting with Deborah Stone’s influential work, we take up the differences between the attributes of the “polity” in which policy is actually made and the “economic model” of rational individual decision making that orients much policy analysis, assessing the ramifications for the impact of policy analysis and its utility. An original and inclusive analysis of the policy-making system follows using John Kingdon’s acclaimed book on agendas, alternatives, and public policies. We also look at how federalism influences the approaches to policy making pursued by legislators and governors in the states, which are nestled between national and local-level government and often in competition with one another.

Next we turn to a close and specific examination of conventional instruments of policy making, focusing on both legislating and executive-led policy making. Alternative forms of policy making are equally important, however, and the course considers two particularly significant variants: policy-relevant decision making by the courts and direct policy making by the public through ballot initiatives.

We conclude the course with some attention to the mechanisms for influencing policy debate and adoption, with particular attention to the contexts for lobbying and mobilizing of the public.

Our rapid and intensive trip through political institutions and the complexity of policy making is intended to furnish you with a sophisticated and even unconventional understanding of the policy-making process as a whole—one that underlines both the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for you.

Throughout the quarter, the motivating question is a most practical one: what are the implications for how policy is made, policy analysis is used, management is performed, and effective leaders behave? Put more personally, what are the implications for how you will be able to execute your duties in a governmental agency or a nonprofit organization, direct a successful community action movement, work effectively in a commercial firm whose business is directly influenced by these issues, and, overall, lead? Each week, with each reading, I want you to think of yourself explicitly in one of those roles and keep asking yourself the essential question: what am I learning about the circumstances and conditions that shape how I can perform in my

position, serve my political values, and fulfill my policy objectives?

## Assignments

Grades for the course will be based on the following activities, the details of which will be explained in subsequent hand-outs:

- ◆ **Class Participation (15%):** Given the importance of full and effective oral communication in a graduate course—and even more so in the world of policy making—part of the course grade will be based on each student’s individual participation in both the lecture sessions and discussion sections. Attendance, of course, is a predicate for participation. “Participation” includes such things as demonstrating preparation and familiarity with the course readings, offering valuable insights, speaking clearly about complex subjects, synthesizing relevant information, answering questions effectively, posing pertinent questions, as well as *listening* to other members of the class and building effectively upon their contributions. *Students must be prepared at all times to be called upon during class.*
- ◆ **Political Strategy Memorandum (10%): Due Monday, January 13<sup>th</sup>:** A 900-word strategy memo to a policy maker that summarizes in brief the overall theme of Deborah Stone’s book, and then summarizes and uses three core issues from the book about goals, problems, and solutions, identifying their implications for politically supporting a policy position and providing responses to the anticipated opposing positions of other policy makers. A separate handout will provide more detailed instructions.
- ◆ **Take-Home Midterm Project (30%) – Due Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>:** A take-home, open-book midterm examination in response to a set of questions, with choice. The questions and more specific instructions will be distributed a week or two prior to the due date.
- ◆ **Final Paper Project (45%) – Due to Daniel Oyenoki, Public Policy Reception Desk, 3:00 p.m., Friday, March 21<sup>st</sup>.** The project will be described in a separate handout distributed later in the quarter.

## Grading Guidelines

Grading for the course will follow the general parameters guiding any top-flight graduate program. An "A" grade will *really* mean superior attainment *in the context of graduate education at one of the nation’s top programs*: Reading and written assignments are thoroughly fulfilled; the course materials are comprehended conceptually and used accurately, synthetically, and in appropriate and insightful ways; written and oral presentations are well organized, clear, cogent, articulate, and sophisticated, well-embedded in the course materials, thoroughly referenced where appropriate, and with due attention to format, style, grammar, and spelling. Although I do not grade on a curve, and all students could theoretically (and to my delight!) receive an "A" (or any other grade) if they performed at that level, past experience suggests that relatively few students, especially in a course of this size, are likely to fulfill the criteria for an "A" grade. Students who perform "adequately" at the graduate level along these dimensions will receive a "B" for their work (even “adequate” work will make extensive and appropriately comprehensive and accurate use of the course materials). Increasingly better than adequate work produces grades of "B+" and "A-." Generally I anticipate that the admissions process has yielded students capable of receiving at least a "B" grade, but experience has also taught me that for a variety of reasons some students may perform below that level in any given course. I grade according to what is justified by the quality of work that I can actually read, see, and judge, and that includes reporting grades in the “C” range, if warranted.

## Academic Integrity

In a statement to students on academic integrity, the UCLA Office of the Dean of Students explains that “UCLA is a community of scholars....[F]aculty, staff, and students alike are responsible for maintaining standards of academic honesty.” The Dean of Students makes clear that plagiarism, multiple submissions unauthorized by the respective professors, and all other all other forms of cheating and academic dishonesty result in formal

disciplinary proceedings usually involving **suspension** or **dismissal** from the program. The Department of Public Policy has a “zero-tolerance” policy and is required by the University to report to the Office of the Dean of Students cases of suspected violations of academic integrity. **MPP students have been caught, investigated, and severely punished by the Office of the Dean of Students.** Future careers are put at risk. Be absolutely certain that you understand what constitutes violations of academic integrity. Ignorance is neither an excuse nor an effective defense. **Plagiarism**, for example, is described by the Office of the Dean of Students as “Presenting another’s words or ideas as if they were one’s own,” including “submitting as your own...part of or an entire work produced verbatim by someone else” and “paraphrasing ideas, data or writing without properly acknowledging the source.” All assignments in PP 202 require you to use the assigned readings and cases, as well as lectures—any specific terms, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, or sections used verbatim from these sources must be formally quoted and cited, including page numbers/dates. Any ideas or concepts derived from these sources must be formally cited. These rules hold true for any work produced by someone else that you use in a course assignment. But also know that we on the faculty are always available to help you avoid mistakes. **Please do not hesitate at any time to ask questions. Bottom line: ASK, ASK, ASK!**

More information can be found at: <http://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/studentconduct.htm>

## Books for Purchase

The **books** listed below are **required reading** and are available for purchase at the **LuValle Bookstore**.

- Scott H. Ainsworth. *Analyzing Interest Groups: Group Influence on People and Policies*. W.W. Norton, 2002.
- R. Douglas Arnold. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. Yale University Press, 1992.
- Jeb Barnes, *Overruled? Legislative Overrides, Pluralism, and Contemporary Court-Congress Relations*. Stanford University Press, 2004. (**Note: because this book is only in hardcover and is very expensive, instead of having you buy it I have included it in the course reader**).
- Glenn Beamer. *Creative Politics: Taxes and Public Goods in a Federal System*. University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- John W. Kingdon. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. HarperCollins, 1995.
- Andrew Rudalevige. *Managing the President’s Program: Presidential Leadership and Legislative Policy Formulation*. Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Larry J. Sabato, Bruce A. Larson, and Howard R. Ernst, eds., *Dangerous Democracy? The Battle over Ballot Initiatives in America*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.
- Deborah A. Stone. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. W.W. Norton, 2011. (Note: the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition from 2001 will also probably be fine, but the examples and illustrations will obviously be more dated.)

## Harvard Kennedy School Cases

We are using three formal cases from the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) case program. Because the HKS case program is largely transitioning the purchase of case access to the Harvard Business Publishing website, and that transition is incomplete, I have received permission to post two of the cases free on our course web page (marked below). The third must be purchased for \$3.95 from the Harvard Business Publishing website at:

<http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cb/access/16711714> (marked below), where you will first have to register.

- “Language and the Melting Pot: Florida’s 1988 ‘Official English’ Referendum.”  
Kennedy School Case C16-90-990.0 and Sequel C16-90-990.1 *Free on course web page*
- ““No Prison in East L.A.!” Birth of a Grassroots Movement.”  
Kennedy School Case C14-00-1541.0 and Sequel 1541.1 *Free on course web page*
- “Against All Odds: The Campaign in Congress for Japanese American Redress.”  
Kennedy School Case C16-90-1006.0 *Purchase at Harvard Business Publishing link*

## Custom Course Reader

Additional required readings for the course, including some of the cases, are in a customized course reader available at **Copymat**, 10919 Weyburn Avenue (between Westwood Blvd and Broxton Ave; open 9-5 Monday-Friday; phone: 310-824-5276). These items are identified with a “©” on the schedule of reading assignments.

## Readings Also on Reserve or Alternatively Available

To the best of my ability and the availability of library resources, **the reading assignments for the course from books are also available at the graduate reserve desk in the C. E. Young Research Library** (excluding the Kennedy School Cases). The *CQ Almanacs* used for some cases can be found in many libraries, and the newspaper stories can be obtained from Lexus-Nexus. Journal articles are likely to be available electronically on the web or through the library. Although it would be far less convenient, it is thus possible to complete almost all the reading assignments without purchasing the books or the course reader.

## Format of Class Sessions

Class sessions will typically have approximately the following format:

### Monday Sessions:

**9:00** Introductory business,

and **opportunity for students to ask clarification questions about the week’s readings**

**9:15** Group discussion of week’s topic and assigned readings

**10:20** End

### Wednesday Sessions:

**9:00** Group discussion of the week’s case

**9:45** “Set-Up” Lecture introducing the next week’s topic

**10:20** End

**Discussion Sections** (To be determined)

---

## Schedule of Topics and Reading Assignments

### Part I: Founding Assumptions and Principles

**Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup>: Introduction**

**Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>: A Republic Established**

#### **Readings:**

© *Declaration of Independence*

© *The Constitution of the United States* (including the *Bill of Rights* and *Amendments*)

© Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison. *The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States*. New York: Modern Library, 1947.  
Nos. 10, 14, 37, 47, 49, 51, and 70

© Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Part I, Chapter 3, Social State of the Anglo-Americans, pp. 45-53

Part I, Chapter 4, On the Principle of the Sovereignty of the People in America, pp. 53-55

Part I, Chapter 5, Section – General Ideas about Administration, pp. 75-79; and Section – On the Political Effects of Administrative Decentralization, pp. 82-93

Part I, Chapter 6, On the Judicial Power in the United States, pp. 93-99

Part II, Chapter 5, On the Use that the Americans Make of Association in Civil Life, pp. 489-492

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 1, The Constitution; and Chapter 12, Civil Liberties

## Part II: The Setting of Politics and Policy Making

### Monday, January 13<sup>th</sup>: Policy in a Political World – I

➔ *Due: Political Strategy Memorandum – at the beginning of class.*

#### Readings:

Deborah A. Stone. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011. Introduction, Chapters 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, Conclusion (if you are using the 1997 edition, read the Introduction, Chapters 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, Conclusion).

© “Memo Writing.” The Electronic Hallway, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington, 2003.

### Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>: Policy in a Political World – II

#### Case:

© **Welfare Reform:** R. Kent Weaver. *Ending Welfare as We Know It*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2000. Chapter 6, “The Role of Policy Research,” pp. 135-168.

### Monday, January 20<sup>th</sup>: NO CLASS: Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

### Wednesday, January 22<sup>rd</sup>: Windows for Policy Making – I and II

#### Reading:

John W. Kingdon. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 14, Public Policy

#### Case:

© **Minnesota Public School Choice Program:** Nancy C. Roberts and Paula J. King. *Transforming Public Policy: Dynamics of Policy Entrepreneurship and Innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996. Chapter 3, “The Actions Behind the Headlines,” pp. 67-91.

### Monday, January 27<sup>th</sup>: Federalism – I

#### Readings:

Glenn Beamer. *Creative Politics: Taxes and Public Goods in a Federal System*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Chapters 1-5, and 8, and select one of the two “case application” chapters to read – Chapter 6 (Education) or Chapter 7 (Health Care).

Deborah A. Stone. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011. Chapter 15, Powers

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 2, Federalism

### Wednesday, January 29<sup>th</sup>: Federalism – II

#### Case:

© **No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 and Local/State Responses:**

Kathryn A. McDermott and Laura S. Jensen. “Dubious Sovereignty: Federal Conditions of Aid and the No Child Left Behind Act.” *Peabody Journal of Education* 80(2): 39-56.

Michael Dobbs, “Federal Rules for Teachers Relaxed; Rural Schools Will Get a Break,” *Washington Post*, March 16, 2004, p. A-03.

Noreen Gillespie, “Conn. Sues ‘No Child Left Behind’ Law,” Associated Press, August 22, 2005.

“States Defy Rules of Federal No Child Left Behind Law,” *St. Petersburg Times*, September 5, 2005.

### Part III: Conventional Policy Making

#### Monday, February 3<sup>rd</sup>: Legislative Policy Making – I

##### Readings:

R. Douglas Arnold. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992. Chapters 1 to 8, and 10; pp. 3-223, 265-276.

© Barbara Sinclair. “Parties and Leadership in the House.” In Paul J. Quirk and Sarah A. Binder, eds. *Institutions of American Democracy: The Legislative Branch*, pp. 224-254. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 3, Congress

#### Wednesday, February 5<sup>th</sup>: Legislative Policy Making – II

##### Case:

© **The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act (MMA) of 2003:**

Thomas R. Oliver, Philip R. Lee, and Helen L. Lipton, “A Political History of Medicare and Prescription Drug Coverage,” *The Milbank Quarterly* 82 (June 2004): 283-354.

Excerpts Only: pp. 283-285, 289-290, 309-354.

#### Monday, February 10<sup>th</sup>: Executive-Led Policy Making – I

##### Readings:

© Mark A. Peterson. “The President and Congress.” In Michael Nelson, ed., *The Presidency and the Political System*, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed, pp. 475-504. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2000.

Andrew Rudalevige. *Managing the President’s Program: Presidential Leadership and Legislative Policy Formulation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002. Chapters 1 to 8, pp. 1-164.

© Joel D. Aberbach and Mark A. Peterson. “Control and Accountability: Dilemmas of the Executive Branch.” In Joel D. Aberbach and Mark A. Peterson, eds., *Institutions of American Democracy: The Executive Branch*, pp. 525-553. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 4, The President

#### Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>: Executive-Led Policy Making – II

##### Case:

© **President Obama and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009:**

Unless otherwise indicated, from *CQ Weekly*, Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 2009:

##### Background:

Bettelheim, “The Shape of the Office,” January 5, pp. 20-23, 2.

“Popular President Keeps His Caucus in Line, But the Stress Shows” and

“An Even Wider Line Between the Parties,” both in: *2009 CQ Almanac*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 2009, pp. B3-B7; and B12-B17.

##### The Stimulus Plan:

Clark and Schatz, “The Devil’s in the Stimulus Plan Details,” January 12, pp. 77-78.

Clark, “Democrats Roll Out Stimulus Plan,” January 19, pp. 126-128.

Krawzak and Epstein, “Three House Panels Move Stimulus Bill,” January 26, pp. 186-188.

Schatz and Rubin, “House Democrats Pass Stimulus,” February 2, pp. 254-256.

Massimo Calabresi, “Can Obama Regain Control of Congress’s Stimulus Bill?” *Time*, February 5, 2009, [www.time.com](http://www.time.com), accessed November 23, 2010.

Joseph J. Schatz, “Senate Scales Back Its Stimulus,” February 9, pp. 306-308.

Schatz and Clarke, “Congress Clears Stimulus Package,” February 16, pp. 352-356.

## Part IV: Alternative Forms of Policy Making

Monday, February 17<sup>th</sup>: **NO CLASS: Presidents' Day**

Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>: Courts as Policy Makers – I and II

➔ *Due: Take-Home Midterm Project – due at the beginning of class.*

### Readings:

Deborah A. Stone. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1997. Chapter 14, Rights.

© R. Shep Melnick. *Between the Lines: Interpreting Welfare Rights*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1994. Chapters 1, “Statutory Interpretation in American Politics,” pp. 3-22.

© Jeb Barnes, *Overruled? Legislative Overrides, Pluralism, and Contemporary Court-Congress Relations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. Whole book.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 5, The Judiciary

### Case:

© **Tobacco Control Policy**: “Peter D. Jacobson and Kenneth E. Warner, “Litigation and Public Health Policy Making: The Case of Tobacco Control,” *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 24 (August 1999): 769-804.

Monday, February 24<sup>th</sup>: Ballot Initiatives – I

### Readings:

Larry J. Sabato, Bruce A. Larson, and Howard R. Ernst, eds., *Dangerous Democracy? The Battle over Ballot Initiatives in America*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

Chapters **XXXX**, and Epilogue, pp. **XXXXXX**.

Wednesday, February 26<sup>th</sup>: Ballot Initiatives – II

**Case: (NEED TO ESTABLISH HOW TO ACQUIRE):**

**“Language and the Melting Pot: Florida's 1988 ‘Official English’ Referendum.”**

Kennedy School Case C16-90-990.0 and Sequel C16-90-990.1

## Part V: Influencing Policy Making

Monday, March 3<sup>rd</sup>: Taking Collective Action – I

### Readings:

Deborah A. Stone. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011. Chapter 9, Interests.

Scott H. Ainsworth. *Analyzing Interest Groups: Group Influence on People and Policies*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002.

Part I, “Groups and Individuals,” pp. 3-95, and Chapter 10, “Conclusion,” pp. 206-223.

© Jack L. Walker, Jr. *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Chapter 10, “The Three Modes of Political Mobilization,” pp. 185-196.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 11, Interest Groups

**Wednesday, March 5<sup>th</sup>: Taking Collective Action – II**

Case (**NEED TO ESTABLISH HOW TO ACQUIRE**):

**“No Prison in East L.A.!” Birth of a Grassroots Movement.”**

Kennedy School Case C14-00-1541.0 and Sequel 1541.1.

**Monday, March 10<sup>th</sup>: Lobbying and Mobilizing – I**

**Readings:**

Scott H. Ainsworth. *Analyzing Interest Groups: Group Influence on People and Policies*. New York, W.W. Norton, 2002.

Part II, “Groups and Government,” pp. 99-205.

© Lawrence R. Jacobs and Robert Y. Shapiro. *Politicians Don’t Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness*. Chicago University Press, 2000.

Chapters 1 and 2 (sections on “The Political Strategy of Orchestrated Public Appeals” and “Connecting Politics, Media Coverage, and Public Opinion”), pp. 3-26, 44-55, and 64-67.

© Homero Gil de Zúñiga, et al. “Digital Democracy: Reimagining Pathways to Political Participation.” *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 7(1) (2010): 36-51.

© K. Hazel Kwon, Yoonjae Nam, and Derek Lackaff. “Wireless Protesters Move Around: Informational and Coordinative Use of Information and Communication Technologies for Protest Politics.” *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 8(4) (2011): 383-398.

**Basic Review:** *American Government* (CliffsQuickReview) – Chapter 7, Public Opinion; Chapter 8, The Mass Media

**Wednesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>: Lobbying and Mobilizing – II**

Case (Purchase from Harvard Business Publishing at:

<http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cb/access/16711714>):

**“Against All Odds: The Campaign in Congress for Japanese American Redress.”**

Kennedy School Case C16-90-1006.0

**Friday, March 21<sup>st</sup>: Final Paper Project Due – By 3:00 p.m. to Daniel Oyenoki, Public Policy Reception Desk**