

POLS 342 POLITICS AND BUREAUCRACY

Spring 2022

Instructor: Jonghoon Lee
Email: ljhoon@tamu.edu

Time: MWF 8:35 to 9:25 AM
Place: ALLN 1016

Course Pages:

1. <https://canvas.tamu.edu/courses/159417>

Office Hours: Wednesday 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM at Allen 3103, or by appointment.

Course Description: Public bureaucracy in the context of a political environment; the role of experts, the use of political power, and problems of bureaucratic accountability and responsibility.

Prerequisites: POLS 206 or approval of department head.

Course Objectives: Governments provide public policies through interactions between politicians and bureaucrats. This course examines how bureaucracy provides public policies, and how politics affect public policy provisions. The relationships between politics and bureaucracy have been studied in many academic disciplines, including political science, public administration, economics, sociology, and history. While this course will be primarily based on texts written in political science, we will also incorporate useful insights from scholars who made an exceptional contribution to understanding bureaucracy and politics. At the end of this course, students will be expected to analyze the causes and consequences of specific policy implementations.

Course Learning Environment: I want every student to feel comfortable speaking up in this class. We may think of politics and bureaucracy to be distant from our personal life experiences, but they are not. Hence, I ask that everyone be respectful of the different opinions and ideas of our colleagues.

Course Learning Outcomes: At the conclusion of this course, students should be able to:

- Recognize how public policy provisions shape everyone's daily life.
- Explain fundamental concepts in the literature on public administration and public policy.
- Demonstrate why specific public policies were implemented and evaluate how such policies improve public welfare.

Grading Policy: Two Summary Papers (30%), Participation (20%), Final Essay (35%), Final Paper Meetings (15%).

- Summary Papers (30% total, 15% each): Each student will write two summary papers throughout the course, beginning in Week 4. Students should submit the hard copy of the paper in a class by the Wednesday of the week they choose to summarize. Students will write on background and research question (1 paragraph, 1 point), theoretical argument (about 1-2 paragraphs, 3 points), research design and empirical strategy (about 1-2 paragraphs, 3 points), results (about 1-2 paragraphs, 2 points), and discussion and extension (about 1-2 paragraphs, 6 points). A good summary should explain how the authors formulated a research question and theory and what they did to test their ideas. For discussion and extension, students can incorporate findings from other readings. A good extension should involve asking a question that the answer to it will either further strengthen or weaken the author's finding. The paper format is double-spaced, 12pt, Times New Roman, margins 1 inch, and 3-5 pages (excluding references).

- Participation (20%): We will use Weeks 1, 2, and 3 as “practice weeks” to familiarize ourselves with how individual participation will be graded in the coming weeks. Students are highly encouraged to use these three weeks to test their participation and check in with the instructor. Beginning in Week 4, a maximum of four points will be given per week. The highest participation score in each week will be counted. At the end of the semester, the two lowest weekly participation scores will be dropped. In other words, the five highest grades out of eight weekly participations will be counted in the final grades (20 at maximum). Students with an excused absence will submit their comments or discussion questions (2-3 sentences per article) before Friday noon each week via email.

Participation will be graded using a three-point scale each week. Not providing any questions or comments (1); providing comments or questions that lack a full understanding of the readings and/or that restate what’s already been written in the articles (3); providing comments or questions based on critical reviews on the theory, empirical design, or results of the article(s) and/or showing a thorough understanding of the reading (4). The best comments or questions will point out what’s not fully answered or unrecognized in the article(s) but is still important to the validity of the author’s argument, research designs, or findings.

- Final Paper (35%): Students have two options to complete their own final paper: (1) choosing one theory among what we have learned through this course and explaining a real-life case about how public policy is provided in relationships between bureaucracy and politics, and (2) writing your own theoretical essay that aims to answer one research question with your own ideas. Also, it can be based on a new question extended from the class discussions.

(1) Students will choose one real-life case to explain the theoretical reasons for such policy provisions. Students will select one or more theories that have been dealt with through this course, summarize the theory using their own words and use them to explain the chosen cases. The grading will be based on finding an interesting case that provides a puzzle (7), selecting good theories and summarizing them by using own words (5), applying the chosen theory to explain the case of interests, and accounting for how such a public policy is provided in the relationship between bureaucracy and politics (12), testing the case with the argument (6), and summarizing the paper and describing what we know better after reading your paper (5).

(2) Students will provide their own answers (which can be based on the existing theories) to the question and test their answers using *a case study*. Students will select one or more empirical cases, study the case(s), and use them to answer their research question. The grading will be based on finding an interesting research question based on the readings we’ve done (7), coming up with the theoretical arguments and testable hypotheses (12), selecting a proper case(s) for answering the question and explaining why it is (5), testing the case(s) with the argument (6), and summarizing the paper and describing what we know better after reading your paper (5).

The due is 12/8, 10 pm. The paper format is double-spaced, 12pt, Times New Roman, margins 1 inch, 7-10 pages are recommended (excluding references), and the acceptable maximum page is 15. Please follow the APSA style manual for political science <https://psel.library.tamu.edu/assets/pdf/UsingAPSAFormat.pdf>.

- Final Paper Meetings (15%): Using some of the class hours at Week 9, Week 11, and Week 13, we will have group meetings to check our progress in the final paper. Before Week 9, the instructor will ask the issues or questions students are interested in for writing their final paper and assign a group of four to six people to work on a similar subject. For the first meeting, students will share the topics we’re interested in and potential research questions they have in mind with the discussion group. The core expectation for this first meeting is to explore what they want to write. Students will discuss research questions they have in mind and explain why the chosen research questions seem interesting to them based on the existing literature.

Before the second meeting (Week 11), students are expected to start writing up their research question and main argument. In this meeting, students will present their research questions and theory to the

students in the group. The expectation is to give their idea verbally, but students can use ppt, pictures, or whatever they think is efficient for presentation. Other members ask clarifying questions and raise critiques to make each other's theoretical argument more logical and concise in the next version. Depending on the group's consensus, students can exchange their drafts up to this point and comment on each other's papers.

The last final paper meeting is in Week 13, approximately three weeks before the submission date. Students will be expected to bring their empirical case(s) that they think are appropriate for testing the argument. Case selection requires strategy, and the instructor will give a lecture on it in Week 12. After giving a brief introduction to the case, students will present substantive and analytical reasons why they chose their particular case. Depending on the group's consensus, students can exchange their drafts up to this point and comment on each other's papers.

The meetings are designed to improve the quality of the paper by providing at least three chances to revise your paper and reduce students' pressure to complete the project at the end of the semester. It will be a precious opportunity to receive feedback from your peers. Please always be respectful of other people's papers and thoughts. Participating in each meeting accounts for 5% of the total grade.

- The overall class grade will be the following:

A: 89.5 +
B: < 89.5 - 79.5
C: < 79.5 - 69.5
D: < 69.5 - 59.5
F: < 59.5

Grading Disputes: If a student wishes to dispute a graded assignment, the student can send the instructor a one-page memo within one week of receiving the graded assignment. The memo should respond to the feedback on the assignment from the instructor. The instructor will carefully review the assignment and its grade, given that the memo provides a reason to do so. After regrading, students must accept the reviewed grade, even if the grade is lower than the original assignment.

Late Work Policy: Late work is defined as submitting the assignments after the established deadline. Work submitted by a student as makeup work for an excused absence is not considered late work and is exempted from the late work policy (Student Rule 7).

- Submitted summary papers are considered late work if they are not submitted before the end of the Wednesday class of the week that has the reading that a student chooses to summarize.
- Final papers submitted after 12/8, 10 pm will be considered late work.
- On any late work, 10% of the grade will be deducted.

Attendance Policy: The university views class attendance and participation as an individual student responsibility. Students are expected to attend class and to complete all assignments. To be considered for an excused absence the student must notify the instructor in writing (e-mail is acceptable) prior to the day of absence. In cases where advanced notification is not possible, the student must provide notification by the end of the second business day after the last date of the absence. This notification must include an explanation of why notice could not be sent.

The student is responsible for providing documentation substantiating the reason for the absence, including reasons stated in Section 7.2. This documentation must be provided within three business days of the last date of the absence unless otherwise stated in this rule. An instructor may confirm a student's absence

documentation and excuse a student from attending class for the reasons stated in Section 7.2 or other reasons deemed appropriate by the student's instructor. An instructor may choose to defer confirmation of a student's absence documentation, including cases when documentation is not available. Upon deferral, the dean or dean's designee of the student's college with the support of the dean or dean's designee of the college offering the course may provide a statement (email is acceptable) that the deans or designee have verified the absence as excused.

Please refer to Student Rule 7 in its entirety for information about excused absences, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

Learning Resources: Students can make an appointment with one of the University Writing Center's trained consultants, who earn certification from the College Reading and Learning Association (<https://writingcenter.tamu.edu/>). They can help students with any kind of writing or speaking project. Types of appointments include in-person meetings, online by email, and web conferencing. For general information, please refer to <https://writingcenter.tamu.edu/Students/Writing-Speaking-Guides?viewmode=0>.

Course Outline:

All required readings will be provided by the instructor via Canvas. ** indicates the week in which students' participation is graded.

Week 1: What is Bureaucracy?

- 8.26: Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society*, ed. by Guenther Roth & Claus Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Selections.
- Suggested further readings
 - Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy*. New York: Basic Books. Ch. 1-2.
 - Peters, B. Guy. "Public Administration and Governing" in *The politics of bureaucracy: An introduction to comparative public administration*. Routledge, 2018.

Week 2: Introduction to Politics and Bureaucracy

- 8.29: Finer, Herman. "Administrative responsibility in democratic government." *Public administration review* 1, no. 4 (1941): 335-350.
- 8.31: Friedlich, C. J. "Public policy and the nature of administrative responsibility." *Public policy* 1 (1940): 1-20.
- 9.2: Meier, Kenneth J., Mallory Compton, John Polga-Hecimovich, Miyeon Song, and Cameron Wimpy. "Bureaucracy and the failure of politics: Challenges to democratic governance." *Administration & Society* 51, no. 10 (2019): 1576-1605.
- Suggested further readings
 - Wilson, Woodrow. 1887. "The study of public administration." *Political Science Quarterly* 2(2): 197-222.

Week 3: Development of American Bureaucracy

- 9.5: Labor Day, no class.
- 9.7: Carpenter, Daniel P. "State building through reputation building: Coalitions of esteem and program innovation in the national postal system, 1883-1913." *Studies in American Political Development* 14, no. 2 (2000): 121-155.
- 9.9: Nelson, Michael. "A short, ironic history of American national bureaucracy." *The Journal of Politics* 44, no. 3 (1982): 747-778.

Week 4: Information and Governance**

- 9.12: March, James G., and Martha S. Feldman. "Information in organizations as signal and symbol." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (1981): 171-186.
- 9.14 & 16: no classes (Instructor should attend the APSA conference).
- Suggested further readings
 - Simon, Herbert A. "Decision-making and administrative organization." *Public Administration Review* 4, no. 1 (1944): 16-30.

- Simon, Herbert A. “Bounded rationality and organizational learning.” *Organization science* 2, no. 1 (1991): 125-134.
- Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. “A garbage can model of organizational choice.” *Administrative science quarterly* (1972): 1-25.

Week 5: Principals, Agents, and Political Control**

- 9.19: Wood, B. Dan, and Richard W. Waterman. “The dynamics of political control of the bureaucracy.” *American Political Science Review* 85, no. 3 (1991): 801-828.
- 9.21: McCubbins, Mathew D., and Thomas Schwartz. “Congressional oversight overlooked: Police patrols versus fire alarms.” *American journal of political science* (1984): 165-179.
- 9.23: Epstein, David, and Sharyn O’halloran. “Administrative procedures, information, and agency discretion.” *American Journal of Political Science* (1994): 697-722.

Week 6: Financial Resources and Bureaucrats**

- 9.26: Arapis, Theodore, and Cynthia Bowling. “From maximizing to minimizing: A national study of state bureaucrats and their budget preferences.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 30, no. 1 (2020): 144-160.
- 9.28: Carpenter, Daniel P. “Adaptive signal processing, hierarchy, and budgetary control in federal regulation.” *American Political Science Review* 90, no. 2 (1996): 283-302.
- 9.30: Jonghoon Lee. “How do Zealots Work with Their Principals? A Theory of Budgetary Collaboration in Public Administration.” Working Paper.
- Suggested further readings
 - Dolan, Julie. “The budget-minimizing bureaucrat? Empirical evidence from the senior executive service.” *Public Administration Review* 62, no. 1 (2002): 42-50.

Week 7: Bureaucratic Reputation and Autonomy**

- 10.3: Carpenter, Daniel P. “Groups, the media, agency waiting costs, and FDA drug approval.” *American Journal of Political Science* (2002): 490-505.
- 10.5: Moffitt, Susan L. “Promoting agency reputation through public advice: Advisory committee use in the FDA.” *The Journal of Politics* 72, no. 3 (2010): 880-893.
- 10.7: Teodoro, Manuel P., and Seung-Ho An. “Citizen-based brand equity: A model and experimental evaluation.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 28, no. 3 (2018): 321-338.
- Suggested further readings
 - Carpenter, Daniel P. “State building through reputation building: Coalitions of esteem and program innovation in the national postal system, 1883–1913.” *Studies in American Political Development* 14, no. 2 (2000): 121-155.
 - Lee, Danbee, and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. “Measuring bureaucratic reputation: Scale development and validation.” *Governance* 32, no. 1 (2019): 177-192.

Week 8: Professionalism in Public Administration**

- 10.10: Fall Break.

- 10.12: Coyle McCabe, Barbara, Branco Ponomarev, and Fabian Estrada. "Professional cities: Accredited agencies, government structure, and rational choice." *Public Administration Review* 78, no. 2 (2018): 295-304.
- 10.14: Teodoro, Manuel P. "When professionals lead: Executive management, normative isomorphism, and policy implementation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24, no. 4 (2014): 983-1004.
- Suggested further readings
 - Wilensky, Harold L. "The professionalization of everyone?." *American journal of sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 137-158.

Week 9: Appointment and the Loyalty-Competence Tradeoff, **1st Final Paper Meeting**

- 10.17: 1st Final Paper Meeting
- 10.19: Bertelli, Anthony, and Sven E. Feldmann. "Strategic appointments." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17, no. 1 (2007): 19-38.
- 10.21: Doherty, Kathleen M., David E. Lewis, and Scott Limbocker. "Executive control and turnover in the senior executive service." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 29, no. 2 (2019): 159-174.
- Suggested further readings
 - O'Leary, Rosemary. "Guerrilla employees: Should managers nurture, tolerate, or terminate them?." *Public Administration Review* 70, no. 1 (2010): 8-19.
 - Krause, George A., David E. Lewis, and James W. Douglas. "Political appointments, civil service systems, and bureaucratic competence: Organizational balancing and executive branch revenue forecasts in the American states." *American Journal of Political Science* 50, no. 3 (2006): 770-787.

Week 10: Ambition & Mobility**

- 10.24: Gailmard, Sean, and John W. Patty. "Slackers and zealots: Civil service, policy discretion, and bureaucratic expertise." *American Journal of Political Science* 51, no. 4 (2007): 873-889.
- 10.26: Connolly, Jennifer M. "The impact of local politics on the principal-agent relationship between council and manager in municipal government." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 27, no. 2 (2017): 253-268.
- 10.28: Teodoro, Manuel P. *Bureaucratic ambition: Careers, motives, and the innovative administrator*. JHU Press, 2011. Selection.

Week 11: Street-level Bureaucracy, **2nd Final Paper Meeting**

- 10.31: 2nd Final Paper Meeting
- 11.2: Brehm, John, and Scott Gates. "Donut shops and speed traps: Evaluating models of supervision on police behavior." *American Journal of Political Science* (1993): 555-581.
- 11.4: May, Peter J., and Søren C. Winter. "Politicians, managers, and street-level bureaucrats: Influences on policy implementation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19, no. 3 (2009): 453-476.
- Suggested further readings

- Lipsky, Michael. *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation, 2010.

Week 12: Judicial Politics and Corruption

- 11.7: Ramseyer, J. Mark. “Why are Japanese judges so conservative in politically charged cases?.” *American Political Science Review* 95, no. 2 (2001): 331-344.
- 11.9: Snead, Warren. “The Supreme Court as an Agent of Policy Drift: The Case of the NLRA.” *American Political Science Review* (2022): 1-14.
- 11.11: Jonghoon Lee. “The Establishment of an Anti-corruption Agency: An Electoral Incentive of Incumbents to Enact a Self-Restraint Reform.” Working Paper

Week 13: 3rd Final Paper Meeting

- 11.14: 3rd Final Paper Meeting
- 11.16 & 18: no classes (Instructor should attend the APPAM conference).

Week 14: Representative Bureaucracy (1)**

- 11.21: Roberts, Alasdair. “Bearing the white man’s burden: American empire and the origin of public administration.” *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance* 3, no. 3 (2020): 185-196.
- 11.23: Reading day.
- 11.25: Thanksgiving.

Week 15: Representative Bureaucracy (2)**

- 11.28: Zhang, Youlang. “Representative bureaucracy, gender congruence, and student performance in China.” *International Public Management Journal* 22, no. 2 (2019): 321-342.
- 11.30: Wilkins, Vicky M., and Brian N. Williams. “Black or blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy.” *Public Administration Review* 68, no. 4 (2008): 654-664.
- 12.2: Nicholson-Crotty, Sean, Jill Nicholson-Crotty, and Sergio Fernandez. “Will more black cops matter? Officer race and police-involved homicides of black citizens.” *Public Administration Review* 77, no. 2 (2017): 206-216.
- Suggested further readings
 - Meier, Kenneth J., and Jill Nicholson-Crotty. “Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: The case of sexual assault.” *Public Administration Review* 66, no. 6 (2006): 850-860.

Week 16: Final Paper Due

- No classes.
- Final paper dues on 12/8 at 10 pm.

The University Policies

- Makeup Work Policy

Students will be excused from attending class on the day of a graded activity or when attendance contributes to a student's grade, for the reasons stated in Student Rule 7, or other reason deemed appropriate by the instructor.

Please refer to Student Rule 7 in its entirety for information about makeup work, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

Absences related to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 may necessitate a period of more than 30 days for make-up work, and the timeframe for make-up work should be agreed upon by the student and instructor" (Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.1).

"The instructor is under no obligation to provide an opportunity for the student to make up work missed because of an unexcused absence" (Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.2).

Students who request an excused absence are expected to uphold the Aggie Honor Code and Student Conduct Code. (See Student Rule 24.)

- Academic Integrity Statement and Policy

"An Aggie does not lie, cheat or steal, or tolerate those who do."

"Texas A&M University students are responsible for authenticating all work submitted to an instructor. If asked, students must be able to produce proof that the item submitted is indeed the work of that student. Students must keep appropriate records at all times. The inability to authenticate one's work, should the instructor request it, may be sufficient grounds to initiate an academic misconduct case" (Section 20.1.2.3, Student Rule 20).

You can learn more about the Aggie Honor System Office Rules and Procedures, academic integrity, and your rights and responsibilities at aggiehonor.tamu.edu.

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy

Texas A&M University is committed to providing equitable access to learning opportunities for all students. If you experience barriers to your education due to a disability or think you may have a disability, please contact the Disability Resources office on your campus (resources listed below) Disabilities may include, but are not limited to attentional, learning, mental health, sensory, physical, or chronic health conditions. All students are encouraged to discuss their disability related needs with Disability Resources and their instructors as soon as possible.

Disability Resources is located in the Student Services Building or at (979) 845-1637 or visit disability.tamu.edu.

- Title IX and Statement on Limits to Confidentiality

Texas A&M University is committed to fostering a learning environment that is safe and productive for all. University policies and federal and state laws prohibit gender-based discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

With the exception of some medical and mental health providers, all university employees (including full and part-time faculty, staff, paid graduate assistants, student workers, etc.) are Mandatory Reporters and must report to the Title IX Office if the employee experiences, observes, or becomes aware of an incident that meets the following conditions (see University Rule 08.01.01.M1):

- The incident is reasonably believed to be discrimination or harassment.
- The incident is alleged to have been committed by or against a person who, at the time of the incident, was (1) a student enrolled at the University or (2) an employee of the University.

Mandatory Reporters must file a report regardless of how the information comes to their attention – including but not limited to face-to-face conversations, a written class assignment or paper, class discussion, email, text, or social media post. Although Mandatory Reporters must file a report, in most instances, a person who is subjected to the alleged conduct will be able to control how the report is handled, including whether or not to pursue a formal investigation. The University's goal is to make sure you are aware of the range of options available to you and to ensure access to the resources you need.

Students wishing to discuss concerns in a confidential setting are encouraged to make an appointment with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS).

Students can learn more about filing a report, accessing supportive resources, and navigating the Title IX investigation and resolution process on the University's Title IX webpage.

- Statement on Mental Health and Wellness

Texas A&M University recognizes that mental health and wellness are critical factors that influence a student's academic success and overall wellbeing. Students are encouraged to engage in healthy self-care by utilizing available resources and services on your campus.

Students who need someone to talk to can contact Counseling Psychological Services (CAPS) or call the TAMU Helpline (979-845-2700) from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. weekdays and 24 hours on weekends. 24-hour emergency help is also available through the National Suicide Prevention Hotline (800-273-8255) or at suicidepreventionlifeline.org.

- Statement on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

FERPA is a federal law designed to protect the privacy of educational records by limiting access to these records, to establish the right of students to inspect and review their educational records and to provide guidelines for the correction of inaccurate and misleading data through informal and formal hearings. Currently enrolled students wishing to withhold any or all directory information items may do so by going to howdy.tamu.edu Links to an external site. and clicking on the "Directory Hold Information" link in the Student Records channel on the MyRecord tab. The complete FERPA Notice to Students Links to an external site. and the student records policy is available on the Office of the Registrar webpage.

Items that can never be identified as public information are a student's social security number, citizenship, gender, grades, GPR or class schedule. All efforts will be made in this class to protect your privacy and to ensure confidential treatment of information associated with or generated by your participation in the class.

Directory items include name, UIN, local address, permanent address, email address, local telephone number, permanent telephone number, dates of attendance, program of study (college, major, campus), classification, previous institutions attended, degrees honors and awards received, participation in officially

recognized activities and sports, medical residence location and medical residence specialization.