

**Lingnan University**  
**Department of Political Science**  
POL3208 Public Policy: Values and Processes  
Course Schedule and Reading List  
Term 1, 2019-20

Instructor: Li Pang-kwong (李彭廣), Ph.D.  
Office: Room 315, 3/F, Dorothy Y L Wong Building  
Office Hour: Wednesday: 13:30-15:20  
Friday: 13:30-15:20  
Telephone: 2616-7186  
Email: LIPK@LN.edu.hk

**Course Description:** This course is a basic introductory course on the public policy-making process and the values underpinning it. It will first touch on the reasons of market failures and the use of public policy. Then, the following topics on policy-making will be covered: stages of public policy-making and policy network, the politics of policy-making and budgeting, and bureaucratic neutrality and political accountability.

**Aims:** The course aims to equip students with:

1. a basic knowledge of the functions and goals of public policy, structures and processes of public policy-making; and
2. an understanding of the dynamics and actors involved in the policy-making process.

**Learning Outcomes:** After completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. understand the logic and reasons of government intervention;
2. comprehend the dynamics and complexity of public policy-making; and
3. critically assess the values and ethics underpinning public policy.

**Assessments:** Students will be assessed in the following three ways:

1. tutorial performance (25%);
2. individual/group term paper (15%); and
3. written examination (60%).

## References

- Araral, Eduardo, Jr, Scott Fritzen, Michael Howlett, M. Ramesh and Xun Wu, eds. 2013. *Routledge Handbook of Public Policy*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, James E. 2015. *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*. 8th ed. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Asmerom, Haile K. and Elisa P. Reis, eds. 1996. *Democratization and Bureaucratic Neutrality*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Dubnick, Melvin J. and H. George Frederickson, eds. 2011. *Accountable Governance: Problems and Promises*. New York & London: M. E. Sharpe. (E-book available at Lingnan)

- Dunleavy, Patrick. 1991. *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Farazmand, Ali, ed. 1997. *Modern Systems of Government: Exploring the Role of Bureaucrats and Politicians*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Fischer, Frank, Gerald J. Miller, and Mara S. Sidney, eds. 2007. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Frederickson, H. George, Kevin B. Smith, Christopher W. Larimer, and Michael J. Licari. 2016. *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Howlett, Michael, M. Ramesh and Anthony Perl. 2009. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. 3rd ed. Don Mills, Ontario & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- John, Peter. 2012. *Analyzing Public Policy*. 2nd ed. Abingdon, Oxon & New York: Routledge.
- Kingdon, John W. 2011. *Agendas, Alternatives, and public Policies*. Updated 2nd ed. With new foreword by James A. Thurber. Boston: Longman.
- Lane, Jan-Erik. 2000. *The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE.
- Lindblom, Charles E and Edward J. Woodhouse. 1993. *The Policy-Making Process*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Moran, Michael, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, eds. 2006. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paul, Samuel. 1991. *Strengthening Public Service Accountability: A Conceptual Framework*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Peters, B. Guy. 2018. *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. 7th ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Rich, Andrew. 2004. *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schuck, Peter H. 2014. *Why Government Fails So Often: And How It Can Do Better*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, Ian. 2005. *Public Administration in Hong Kong: Regime Change and Its Impact on the Public Sector*. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish.
- Smith, Kevin B. and Christopher W. Larimer. 2017. *The Public Policy Theory Primer*. 3rd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Stewart, Joseph, Jr., David M. Hedge, and James P. Lester. 2008. *Public Policy: An Evolution Approach*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Street, Julia. 2010. *Accountability in Public Policy Partnership*. Basingstoke, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weimer, David L. and Aidan R. Vining. 2017. *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. 6th ed. New York: Routledge. (Lingnan has the 5th ed.)

## Indicative Schedule and Readings

### 6 September 2019

Housekeeping week

### 13 & 20 September 2019

1. The Study of Public Policy and Administration
  - The growth of government and administration
  - Demarcation of public sector
  - “Market” versus “state”
  - Study of public policy

\*Anderson, *Public Policymaking*, chap. 1.  
Fischer, Miller and Sidney, eds., *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, chaps. 1-3.  
Howlett, Ramesh and Perl, *Studying Public Policy*, chaps. 1-2.  
John, *Analyzing Public Policy*, chap. 1.  
Lane, *Public Sector*, chap. 1.  
Moran, Rein and Goodin, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, chaps. 1-3, 31.  
\*Peters, *Politics of Bureaucracy*, chap. 1.  
Schuck, *Why Government Fails So Often*.  
Smith and Larimer, *The Public Policy Theory Primer*, chap. 1.  
\*Weimer and Vining, *Policy Analysis*, chaps. 4-9.

### 27 September, and 4 & 11 October 2019

2. Public Policy Cycle
  - Setting of agenda
  - Formulation of policy proposals
  - Making policy decision
  - Implementation and evaluation
  - Policy change

\*Anderson, *Public Policymaking*, chaps. 3-7.  
Fischer, Miller and Sidney, eds., *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, chaps. 4-8.  
\*Howlett, Ramesh and Perl, *Studying Public Policy*, chaps. 3-9.  
John, *Analyzing Public Policy*, chap. 2.  
\*Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, chaps. 2-9.  
Lane, *Public Sector*, chap. 4.  
Mintrom, Michael, and Phillipa Norman. 2009. “Policy Entrepreneurship and Policy Change.” *Policy Studies Journal* 37, 4: 649-667.  
Moran, Rein and Goodin, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, chaps. 10-18.  
O’Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 2000. “Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10: 263-288.  
Scott, *Public Administration in Hong Kong*, chaps. 6-8  
\*Smith and Larimer, *Public Policy Theory Primer*, chaps. 3-8.  
Stewart et al., *Public Policy*, chaps. 5-9.  
Walsh, James I. 2006. “Policy Failure and Policy Change: British Security Policy after the Cold War.” *Comparative Political Studies* 39, 4: 490-518.  
Weimer and Vining, *Policy Analysis*, chaps. 10-13.

## **18 & 25 October 2019**

### 3. The Politics of Policy-Making

- Policy networks and community
- Politicians and bureaucrats
- Business corporations and interest groups
- Experts and think tanks

\*Anderson, *Public Policymaking*, chap. 2.

Andreas Dür, Dirk De Bièvre. 2007. "The Question of Interest Group Influence." *Journal of Public Policy* 27, 1 (May 1): 1-12.

Carlsson, Lars. 2000. "Policy Networks as Collective Action." *Policy Studies Journal* 28, 3: 502-20.

\*Chan, Cheuk Wah. 2002. *The Politics of Banking in Hong Kong*. Ph.D. Thesis. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Farazmand, *Modern Systems of Government*, chaps. 1-2, 10-11.

Fischer, Miller and Sidney, eds., *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, chaps. 9-15.

John, *Analyzing Public Policy*, chaps. 3-4.

\*Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, chaps. 2-3.

Krick, Eva. 2015. "Negotiated Expertise in Policy-Making: How Governments Use Hybrid Advisory Committees." *Science and Public Policy* 42: 487-500.

\*Lindblom and Woodhouse, *Policy-Making Process*, chaps. 4-8.

Moran, Rein and Goodin, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, chaps. 20, 25-29.

Nicholson-Crotty, Sean. 2005. "Bureaucratic Competition in the Policy Process." *Policy Studies Journal* 33, 3: 341-61.

Peters, *Politics of Bureaucracy*, chaps. 5-6.

Rich, *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise*.

## **1, 8 & 15 November 2019**

### 4. Bureaucracy, Bureaucrats and Resources Allocation

- Theories of bureaucracy
- Organizational structure
- The politics of budgeting

\*Anderson, *Public Policy-Making*, chap. 5.

\*Dunleavy, *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice*, chaps. 6-8.

\*Frederickson et al., *Public Administration Theory Primer*, chap. 8.

Lane, *Public Sector*, chaps. 2, 10-12.

Marsh, David and M. J. Smith. 2000. "Bureaucrats, Politicians and Reform in Whitehall: Analysing the Bureau-Shaping Model." *British Journal of Political Science* 30, 3: 461-82.

Peters, *Politics of Bureaucracy*, chaps. 3, 4 & 7.

## 22 & 29 November 2019

### 5. Accountability of Public Officials

Bureaucratic neutrality

Responsibility and Accountability

Asmerom and Reis, *Democratization and Bureaucratic Neutrality*, chaps. 2-4, 14.

\*Bovens, Mark. 2010. "Two Concepts of Accountability: Accountability as a Virtue and as a Mechanism." *West European Politics* 33, 5: 946-967.

Dubnick and Frederickson, *Accountable Governance*, chaps. 1, 10, 16 & 17.

\*Frederickson et al., *Public Administration Theory Primer*, chap. 2.

Hood, Christopher. 1995. "Control over Bureaucracy: Cultural Theory and Institutional Variety." *Journal of Public Policy* 15:207-230.

Moncrieffe, Joy Marie. 1998. "Reconceptualizing Political Accountability." *International Political Science Review* 19, 4: 387-406.

\*Olsen, Johan P. 2015. "Democratic Order, Autonomy, and Accountability." *Governance* 28, 4: 425-440.

\*Overeem, Patrick. 2005. "The Value of the Dichotomy: Politics, Administration, and the Political Neutrality of Administrators." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 27, 2: 311-29.

Paul, *Strengthening Public Service Accountability*

Peters, *Politics of Bureaucracy*, chap. 8.

Schmitter, Philippe C. 2004. "The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability." *Journal of Democracy* 15, 4: 47-60.

\*Street, *Accountability in Public Policy Partnership*, chaps 1-3.

\*West, William F. 2005. "Neutral Competence and Political Responsiveness: An Uneasy Relationship." *Policy Studies Journal* 33, 2: 147-60.

### **Important Notes:**

1. Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.

2. Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is "the presentation of another person's work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student's own work". Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.

3. Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.

4. To enhance students' understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course "Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness" is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.

## Rubric for Assessments

Assessments (% of total)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Pass	Failure
<b>Presentation</b>  (12%)	Excellent understanding of key concepts, excellent analysis, and fluent presentation  80-100 marks	Good understanding of key concepts, good analysis, and good presentation  65-79 marks	Adequate understanding of key concepts, fair analysis, and clear presentation  50-64 marks	Barely adequate understanding of key concepts, fair analysis, and less clear presentation  40-49 marks	Poor understanding of key concepts, poor analysis, and poor presentation  0-39 marks
<b>Comments</b>  (5%)	Nearly all inadequacies of the Presentation identified with excellent supplementary  80-100 marks	Many inadequacies of the Presentation identified with good supplementary  65-79 marks	A few inadequacies of the Presentation identified with fair supplementary  50-64 marks	Only a couple of inadequacies of the Presentation identified with poor supplementary  40-49 marks	Nearly no inadequacies of the Presentation identified with poor supplementary  0-39 marks
<b>Participation</b>  (8%)	Active participation in group discussion  80-100 marks	Satisfactory participation in group discussion  65-79 marks	Unsatisfactory participation in group discussion  50-64 marks	Poor participation in group discussion  40-49 marks	Nearly no participation in group discussion  0-39 marks
<b>Term Paper</b>  (15%)	Comprehensive knowledge, sophisticated arguments, excellent presentation and extensive bibliography  80-100 marks	Adequate knowledge, well developed arguments, good presentation and appropriate bibliography  65-79 marks	Reasonable knowledge, attempt at argument, adequate presentation and a bibliography  50-64 marks	Limited knowledge, poor argument, satisfactory presentation and a bibliography  40-49 marks	Incomplete knowledge, faulty argument, poor presentation and poor bibliography  0-39 marks
<b>Written Examination</b>  (60%)	Nearly all issues identified in each question attempted and excellent answers provided  80-100 marks	Many issues identified in each question attempted and good answers provided  65-79 marks	A few issues identified in each question attempted and fair answers provided  50-64 marks	Only a couple of issues identified in each question attempted and fair answers provided  40-49 marks	Nearly no issues identified in each question attempted and poor answers provided  0-39 marks