

Public Policy and Public Administration

Core Course, Public Policy Track

Doctoral Program in Political Science**AY 2023-24**

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|
| Lecturers: | Agnes Batory & Evelyne Hübscher | |
| Time | Fall: Thursday, 8:50-10:30 am | |
| Room: | A102 | |
| Credits: | | 4 (Fall and Winter) |
| Requirements: | Participation | 15% |
| | Session presentation | 10% |
| | Session presentation and moderation | 20% |
| | Peer review | 15% |
| | Final paper (4000 words) | 40% |

Course objectives

The course introduces the concepts, theories and debates at the core of public policy as a field of scholarly inquiry. The course is designed to prepare the students for their dissertation research, and therefore provides for a broad discussion of public policy analysis that draws on insights and theories from political science, international relations, economics, law and sociology.

The main objective of this course is to develop an advanced understanding of major debates in contemporary public policy, theoretical approaches to the study of public policy as well as diverse methodological opportunities of researching various aspects of public policy-making. The concern is to identify and analyze (a), major strands and traditions of public policy scholarship; (b) core concepts in policy analysis; (c) major methodological perspectives, debates and logics of research inquiry used for academic research on public policy; and (d) explanatory capacity of existing theoretical tools.

Learning outcomes

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- identify the major theoretical debates in contemporary policy studies;
- contrast and compare existing research on public policy, discuss theoretical traditions and frameworks and critically engage with their arguments;
- interpret and judge different methodological strategies used in public policy research, and evaluate their core assumptions as well as their heuristic and explanatory potentials;
- evaluate the relevance of existing frameworks and approaches for their own work;
- have an understanding of the major challenges and requirements of doing advanced research professionally in an academic or practical context.

Course readings and seminar format

Students are expected to read all core readings (normally three pieces of literature per week), which are available on the course e-learning site. In addition, the syllabus contains further readings which are recommended for the session. Depending on class size, students may be assigned one recommended reading per session to feed into the discussion.

The format of the seminars may vary but are generally discussion-based and therefore depend on participants' ability and willingness to make informed contributions. A number of seminars will be moderated by students (see below under requirements).

Course structure

The course consists of 24 topics, evenly divided across the Fall and Winter semesters. The seminars are led by one of the lecturers or students (see course requirements).

The topics of the seminars are divided into four themes:

- Public policy as a field of scholarly endeavor and profession
- Understanding policy change and the policy cycle
- Different approaches to policy analysis
- Academic practice: doing research as your profession (this theme will appear as 'excursions' interjected throughout the course)

Overview of sessions

FALL TERM

| | | |
|----|----|--|
| 1 | EH | Introduction: why are we here? |
| 2 | AB | Dissertation Workshop |
| 3 | EH | Public Policy as a discipline (?), subject and profession |
| 4 | AB | Rational and Public Choice |
| 5 | EH | Public policy and experimental methods |
| 6 | AB | Evidence-based policy-making: does research influence policy? |
| 7 | EH | Institutionalism /New Institutionalism |
| 8 | AB | Interpretative/ Critical approaches to public policy |
| 9 | EH | The policy cycle approach to public policy studies |
| 10 | AB | Problem formulation and agenda-setting I: The Garbage Can model and Multiple streams |
| 11 | EH | <i>Academic Practice Workshop. Writing Peer reviews</i> |
| 12 | AB | Problem formulation and agenda-setting II: The Advocacy Coalition framework |

WINTER TERM

| | | |
|----|----|--|
| 13 | EH | <i>Topic to be decided (distribution of topics for session chairing)</i> |
| 14 | AB | Policy tools and policy design |

| | | |
|----|----|--|
| 15 | EH | Policy Implementation |
| 16 | AB | Target Compliance |
| 17 | EH | Evaluation |
| 18 | AB | Policy Transfer, Diffusion, and Translation |
| 19 | EH | <i>Topic to be decided</i> |
| 20 | AB | Policy Studies beyond the Nation State (MLG) |
| 21 | EH | <i>Topic to be decided</i> |
| 22 | AB | <i>Academic Practice Excursus: A guide to publishing your work</i> |
| 23 | EH | <i>Academic Practice Excursus: Navigating the Job Market</i> |
| 24 | AB | Conclusion |

Course Requirements

1. Seminar participation (15%)

Students are expected to attend each seminar and regularly participate in discussions. Participation is graded as follows: attendance (but no participation) will merit a C+; good faith efforts at participation lead to the B/B+ range; valuable contributions are in the B+/A range. We expect attendance at seminar discussions throughout the semester. An absence must be reported in advance.

2. Session presentation and session moderation (30%)

Students are asked to take the lead during two sessions. The short version (scheduled during the Fall semester) takes the format of a 15-minute presentation, followed by questions for discussion. Presenters are asked to send their outline (slides or notes) to the lecturer of the given seminar at least two working days in advance. The grade will be based on the extent to which added value to the readings is provided in a clear and coherent manner that stimulates discussion. The presentation will be scheduled during the fall term.

The second, more comprehensive 'presentation' (scheduled during the Winter semester) is a seminar session that is fully run by a participant. The format this session will take is of the student's choosing. The grade will be based both on the ability to meet predefined learning objectives for the session and the quality and clarity of content delivery. The moderation of the session will be scheduled during the winter term.

3. Peer reviews (15%)

Students will be asked to review scholarly articles in the field of public policy. Reviews provide for substantiated critiques and take a position towards the scholarly contribution of the assessed article. The first of the peer reviews will be on a paper chosen by the course lecturers. This review will not be graded and discussed during the academic practice session on peer-review. The review should result in a recommendation to publish/not to publish in a journal pre-determined by the lecturer and outline the major strengths and weaknesses of the paper. The second review will be done on an article of the students' choice and field of interest and will be graded. Exact deadline to be announced!

4. Final paper (40%)

The final paper is a scholarly piece on a subject of your choice. It embeds the research question in a larger academic context, defines a framework of analysis, is empirically rich and follows standard models of research design/ inquiry. Students are strongly encouraged to pick one theory or model

discussed during the course to inform their analysis. Final papers are 4,000 words of length (all inclusive, +/- 10% permissible; overlong or too short papers will be marked down). Students are expected to inform the instructors on the topic of the paper no later than one month before the submission. The final paper is due at the end of the winter term (late March/early April, tba).

Please note that late papers will be marked down by 0.1 points of a letter grade per day.

Please also note that failing any requirement will mean a fail grade for the entire course.

I. Introduction to Policy Studies and Policy Analysis

| | |
|---------|--|
| 1 EH | <p>Introduction: Why Are We Here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are we, what are our backgrounds? • PhD research: topics, questions, proposed contributions, relation to public policy • The notion of “public policy” in our contexts • The structure of the course, requirements, organization <p>Required readings: Upload your research proposal (the one you applied to CEU with or a new one-page summary) to the e-learning site. Read the proposals of your peers before the class. Think about commonalities and differences, especially in relation to ‘public policy’.</p> |
| 2 AB | <p>Dissertation workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes a dissertation a ‘public policy’ dissertation? • How do public policy researchers position themselves vis-à-vis other disciplines? <p>Required readings: Before the seminar, you should take look at a few dissertations written with the Doctoral School’s public policy track and be prepared to talk about your own project.</p> |
| 3 EH | <p>Public Policy as a Discipline, Subject and Profession</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public policy as a discipline: evolution, conceptual field, research agenda • Public policy as a profession – a preliminary discussion. <p>Required readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adams, William C., Donna Lind Infeld, Laura F. Minnichelli, and Michael W. Ruddell. 2014. Policy Journal Trends and Tensions: JPAM and PSJ. <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 42: S118-S137. • Cairney, P. (2015): How Can Policy Theory Have an Impact on Policy Making? The Role of Theory-led Academic Practitioner Discussions, in: <i>Teaching Public Administration</i> 33(1), p. 22-39. • Ayres, Sarah and Alex Marsh. 2013. Reflections on contemporary debates in policy studies, <i>Policy & Politics</i>, 41:4, October 2013, pp. 643-663. • DeLeon, P., 2006. ‘The Historical Roots of the Field’, in M. Moran, M. Rein and R. E Goodin (eds) <i>Oxford Handbook of Public Policy</i>, OUP, 2006 [320.6 MOR] <p>Recommended readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildavsky, Aaron. 2018 (re-issued by B. Guy Peters), “The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis” (preface and introductory chapter). • Dodds, Anneliese 2013. Why compare public policies? <i>In Comparative Public Policy</i>. Houndmills, Basington: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 5-20. • Handley, Donna. 2005. The Best of Both Worlds: A Former Practitioner Transitions to Life as a Full-Time Academic, <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(5): 624-627. |

| | |
|---------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cairney, Paul. 2012. <i>Understanding public policy: theories and issues</i>. Chapter 1 and 2. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. |
| 4 AB | <p>Evidence-based Policy-Making: Does Research Influence Policy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does social science in general and policy studies in particular matter for the ‘real world’? How and to what extent does scientific evidence influence policy-making? • EBPM as movement, paradigm or project • What is the role of ‘experts’ in the policy-making process? What is the relationship between academia and government? <p>Required readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oliver, Kathryn and Paul Cairney. 2019. The Dos and Don’ts of Influencing Policy: A Systematic Review of Advice to Academics, in: <i>Palgrave Communications</i> 5(21). • Pawson R, Wong G, Owen L. Known Knowns, Known Unknowns, Unknown Unknowns: The Predicament of Evidence-Based Policy. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>. 2011;32(4):518-546. doi:10.1177/1098214011403831 • Rubin O, Errett NA, Upshur R, Baekkeskov E. The challenges facing evidence-based decision making in the initial response to COVID-19. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</i>. 2021;49(7):790-796. doi:10.1177/1403494821997227 <p>Recommended readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head, Brian W. 2016. “Toward More ‘Evidence-Informed’ Policy Making?”. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 76(3): 472-484. • Décieux, J. P. P. (2020). How much evidence is in evidence-based policymaking: a case study of an expert group of the European Commission, <i>Evidence & Policy</i>, 16(1), 45-63. • Frey, Kathrin and Thomas Widmer. 2011. Revising Swiss Policies: The Influence of Efficiency Analyses. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i> 32(4): 494-517. • Brian W. Head, ‘Three Lenses of Evidence-Based Policy’, <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i> 67 (2008): 1, pp 1-11. • Head, Brian W. 2010. Reconsidering Evidence Based Policy: Key Issues and Challenges. <i>Policy and Society</i> 29:77-94. • Mark Goodwin, ‘Political Science? Does Scientific Training Predict UK MPs Voting Behaviour?’ <i>Parliamentary Affairs</i> April 1, 2015 68: 371-392 • Boswell, John. 2018. “What Makes Evidence-Based Policy Making such a Useful Myth? The Case of NICE Guidance on Bariatric Surgery in the United Kingdom”, <i>Governance</i> 31: 199-214. |
| 5 EH | <p>Public Policy and Experimental Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why experiments? • To what extent does the evidence-informed policymaking ‘movement’ overlaps with the experimental ‘crowd’? • Limits of experimental methods in public policy-making <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Esther Duflo. 2020. “Field Experiments and the Practice of Policy”, <i>American Economic Review</i> 110(7), p. 1952-1973. |

| | |
|---------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gueron. 2016. "The Politics and Practice of Social Experiments: Seeds of a Revolution", in: • Ewert (2020): Moving beyond the obsession with nudging individual behavior: Towards a broader understating of Behavioural Public Policy, in: <i>Public Policy and Administration</i>, 35(3), p. 337-360. • Hangartner et al. 2021. "Monitoring Hiring Discrimination through Online Recruitment Platforms", <i>Nature</i> 589, p. 572-576 (please also have a look at the appendix of the paper) <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dolan and Galizzi. 2014. "Getting Policy-makers to Listen to Field Experiments", <i>Oxford Review of Economic Policy</i>. 30(4), p. 725-752 • Sanders et al. (2018). "Behavioural Science and Policy: Where are we now and where are we going, in: <i>Behavioural Public Policy</i>, 2(2), p. 144-167. • Hansen and Tummers. 2020. "A Systematic Review of Field Experiments in Public Administration", <i>Public Administration Review</i>. 80(6), p. 921-931. • Hangartner et al. 2021. "Empathy based counter speech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment", in: <i>PNAS</i> 118(50) |
| 6 AB | <p>Rational Choice & Public Choice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the contributions of rational choice/public choice theory to academic and applied policy analysis? • What are its legacies? <p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allison, Graham T. 1969. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis", in: <i>American Political Science Review</i> 63(3): 689-718. • Rational Choice and Politics: An Introduction to the Research Program and Methodology of Public Choice The Oxford Handbook of Public Choice, Volume 1 Oxford Academic (oup.com) • Ostrom, Elinor. 1986. "An Agenda for the Study of Institutions", in: <i>Public Choice</i> 48:3-25. <p>Recommended readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunleavy, Patrick. 1985. Bureaucrats, Budget and the Growth of the State: Reconstructing and Instrumental Model", in: <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 15(3): 299-328. • Henderson, David R. 2013. Public Choice and Two of Its Founders: An Appreciation. In <i>Public Choice, Past and Present The Legacy of James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock</i>, edited by Dwight R. Lee. New York. Springer NY. CEU electronic resource. • Forsyth, Tim and Craig Johnson. 2014. "Elinor Ostrom's Legacy: Governing the Commons and the Rational Choice Controversy", in: <i>Development and Change</i> 45(5):1093-1110. • Baden, John. 2013. Public Choice in the Big Sky. In "<i>Public Choice, Past and Present The Legacy of James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock</i>", edited by Dwight R. Lee. New York. Springer NY. CEU electronic resource. • Downs, Anthony. 1994. <i>Inside bureaucracy</i>. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press. Chapter IX. How Specific Types of Officials Behave, pp. 92-111. • Weingast, B. R. 1996. Political institutions: Rational choice perspectives. In <i>A new handbook of political science</i>, 167, pp. 161-191. |

| | |
|---------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snidal, D., & Tamm, H. 2018. Rational choice: From principal—agent to orchestration theory. In <i>International Organization and Global Governance</i>, pp. 135-145. Routledge. |
| 7 EH | <p>Institutionalism & New Institutionalism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political institutions in the policy process: How do we identify and define political institutions? • What type of political institutions exist? • Classic and new institutionalism • The three (four) main schools of new institutionalism <p>Required readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hall, Peter and Rosemary Taylor. 1996. Political science and the three new institutionalisms. <i>Political Studies</i> 44: 936-957. • Immergut, Ellen. 1990. Institutions, Veto Points and Policy Results. A comparative analysis of Health Care. <i>Journal of Public Policy</i> 10:4, 391-416. • Steinmo, Sven. 1989. "Political Institutions and Tax Policy in the United States, Sweden and Britain", in: <i>World Politics</i> 41(4):500-535. • Gerschewski (), "Explanations of Institutional Change: Reflecting on a 'Missing Diagonale'", in: <i>American Political Science Review</i> 115(1), p. 218-233. • Lewis, Orion A. and Sven Steinmo. 2012. How Institutions Evolve: Evolutionary Theory and Institutional Change. <i>Polity</i> 44(3): 314-339. <p>Recommended readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immergut, Ellen. 1998. "The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism", in: <i>Politics and Society</i> 26(1): 5-34. • Morrison, James Ashley. 2012. "Before Hegemony: Adam Smith, American Independence, and the Origins of the First Era of Globalization", in: <i>International Organizations</i> 66(3): 395-428. • Schmidt, Vivian. 2008. Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse. <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, 2008. 11:303–26. • Lustick, Ian. 2011. "Taking Evolution Seriously: Historical Institutionalism and Evolutionary Theory. <i>Polity</i> 43(2): 180-2019. • (Lowndes, Vivien & Mark Roberts. 2013. Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism in Political Science. Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. London: Palgrave Macmillan. PP 1-45.) |
| 8 AB | <p>Critical/Interpretive Policy Studies: Trends in Social Sciences and Public Policy Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the ontological and epistemological foundations of this intellectual approach? • What is the standing of the approach in today's academic and applied policy analysis? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vivian Schmidt. 2011. Speaking of change: why discourse is key to the dynamics of policy transformation. <i>Critical Policy Studies</i>. Vol. 5, No. 2, 106–126. • Bacchi, Carol Lee. Women, policy and politics: the construction of policy problems. Chapter 1. Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage, 1999. • Wilkinson, Katy. 2011. "Organized Chaos: An Interpretative Approach to Evidence-Based Policy Making in Defra" <i>Political Studies</i> 59: 959-977. <p>Recommended readings:</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fischer, Frank and Herbert Gottweis. 2012. "Introduction: The Argumentative Turn Revisited", In <i>The argumentative turn revisited: public policy as communicative practice</i> / edited by Frank Fischer and Herbert Gottweis. Durham: Duke University Press, 2012. PP 1-27. • Schmidt, Vivien. 2013. Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. <i>Political Studies</i>, 61: 2-22. • Schram, Sanford F. 2012. "The Deep Semiotic Structure of Deservingness: Discourse and Identity in Welfare Policy", In <i>The argumentative turn revisited: public policy as communicative practice</i> / edited by Frank Fischer and Herbert Gottweis. Durham: Duke University Press, pp 236-268. • Wood, Matthew. 2015. Puzzling and powering in policy paradigm shifts: politicization, depoliticization and social learning. <i>Critical Policy Studies</i>. Vol. 9, No. 1, 2–21. |
|--|---|

II. Understanding Policy Change and the Policy Cycle

| | |
|----------|--|
| 9 EH | <p>The Stages Approach to the Policy Approach: the Policy Cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of "policy cycle": is it a reliable tool for understanding public policy change? • What avenues of inquiry does it offer, what are the limits? • What are the normative components of this approach? • Can it be combined with other theories of policy change? <p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter DeLeon. 1999. 'The Stages Approach to the Policy Process: What has it Done? Where is Going? In Paul A. Sabatier (ed) <i>Theories of the Policy Process</i>, Westview Press. • Sophia Everett, 2003. The Policy Cycle: Democratic Process or Rational Paradigm Revisited? , <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>, 62 (2): 65-70. • Howlett, Michael and Allan McConnell and Anthony Perl. 2016. "Weaving the Fabric of Public Policies: Comparing and Integrating Contemporary Frameworks for the Study of Policy Processes", in: <i>Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis</i> 18(3): 273-289. • Burton, Paul. 2006. "Modernising the Policy Process: Making Policy Research More Significant?" in: <i>Policy Studies</i> 27(3): 173-1995. <p>Recommended readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Sabatier. 2007. "The Need for Better Theories", in Sabatier (ed.), <i>Theories of the Policy Process</i>. 2007 edition. Chapter 1 • Bridgman, Peter and Glyn Davis. 2003. "What Use is a Policy Cycle? Plenty, if the Aim is Clear", in: <i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i> 62(3): 98-102. • Werner Jann and Kai Wegrich, 2007. 'Theories of the Policy Cycle' in Frank Fischer, Gerald J Miller and Mara S Sidney, <i>Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods</i>, CRC Press, 2007. • Petridou, Evangelia. 2014. "Theories of the Policy Process: Contemporary Scholarship and Future Directions", in: <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 42(S1): S12-S32. |
| 10 AB | <p>Problem Formulation and Agenda-Setting I: Multiple Streams, Punctuated Equilibrium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Streams: chance versus rationality; chaos versus order |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy entrepreneurs and ‘windows of opportunity’ • Organisational change and garbage can decision making • Punctuated equilibrium: incremental and radical policy change as a function of agendas <p>Required Readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nikolaos Zahariadis. 2019. ‘The Multiple Streams framework: Structure, limitations, prospects’, in Sabatier (eds), <i>Theories of the Policy Process</i>. ed. 2019. • Béland, Daniel and Michael Howlett. 2016. “The Role and Impact of the Multiple Streams Approach in Comparative Policy Analysis”, in: <i>Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis</i> 18(3): 221-227 • Baumgartner, Frank R., and Jones Bryan D. "Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems." <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 53.4 (1991): 1044-074 <p>Recommended readings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. “A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 17. 1972. 1-25. • John, Peter and Shaun Bevan. 2012. “What Are Policy Punctuations? Large Changes in the Legislative Agenda of the UK Government, 1911-2008.”, in: <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 40(1): 89-107. • Kingdon, J. 1995. <i>Agendas, alternatives and public policies</i>, London: Longman, 1995. Chapter: 1, 5, 6, 8 • Cairney, Paul and Michael D. Jones. 2016. “Kingdon’s Multiple Streams Approach: What Is the Empirical Impact of this Universal Theory?”, in: <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 44(1): 37-58. • Howlett, Michael et al. 2015. “Streams and stages: Reconciling Kingdon and Policy Process Theory”, in: <i>European Journal of Political Research</i> 54: 419-434. • Koski, Chris and Samuel Workman. 2018. “Drawing Practical Lessons from Punctuated Equilibrium Theory”, in: <i>Policy & Politics</i> 46(2): 293-308. • Lam, Wai Fung and Kwan Nok Chan. 2015. “How Authoritarianism Intensifies Punctuated Equilibrium: The Dynamics of Policy Attention in Hong Kong”, in: <i>Governance</i> 28(4): 549-570. • Sager, Fritz and Eva Thomann. 2017. “Multiple Streams in Member State Implementation: Politics, Problem Construction and Policy Paths in Swiss Asylum Policy”, in: <i>Journal of Public Policy</i> 37(3): 287-314. |
| 11 EH | <p><i>Academic Practice Excursus 1: Writing peer-reviews for public policy journals</i></p> <p><i>Paper to be reviewed will be uploaded to e-learning prior to the session.</i></p> |
| 12 AB | <p>Problem Formulation and Agenda-Setting II: The Advocacy Coalition Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy coalitions, iron triangles, issue networks, policy (epistemic communities): what are the conceptual boundaries? • How do advocacy coalitions change? • Conceptualising the networks: seeing policy change through the prism of networks <p>Required Readings:</p> |

- Sabatier, Paul A., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 2014. "The Advocacy Coalition Framework. Foundation. Evolution" In *Theories of the policy process*, 3rd edition, edited by Paul A. Sabatier, Christopher M. Weible. 183-224.
- Weible, C. M., & Ingold, K. (2018). Why advocacy coalitions matter and practical insights about them, *Policy & Politics*, 46(2), 325-343. <https://bristoluniversitypressdigital.com/view/journals/pp/46/2/article-p325.xml>
- Daniel Kuebler.2001. Understanding Policy Change with the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Application to Swiss Drug Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(4), 623-641.
- Li, W. and Weible, C.M. (2021), China's Policy Processes and the Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Policy Stud J*, 49: 703-730. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12369>

Recommended readings:

- Ingold, Karin et al. 2017. "Drivers for Policy Agreement in Nascent Subsystems: An Application of the Advocacy Coalition Framework to Fracking Policy in Switzerland and the UK", in: *The Policy Studies Journal* 45(3): 442-463.
- Matti, S., Sandstrom, A., The Rationale Determining Advocacy Coalitions: Examining Coordination Networks and Corresponding Beliefs, *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol 39:3, 2011, pp 385-410
- Christopher M. Weible, Paul A. Sabatier, Kelly McQueen, 'Themes and Variations: Taking Stock of the Advocacy Coalition Framework', *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1), 2009.
- Howlett, Michael et al. 2016. "Moving Policy Theory Forward: Connecting Multiple Stream and Advocacy Coalition Frameworks to Policy Cycle Models of Analysis", in: *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 76(1): 65-79.
- John, Peter. 2003. "Is There Life After Policy Streams, Advocacy Coalitions, and Punctuations: Using Evolutionary Theory to Explain Policy Change?" in: *The Policy Studies Journal* 31(4): 481-498.
- Pierce, Jonathan J. et al. 2017. "There and Back Again: A Tale of the Advocacy Coalition Framework", in: *Policy Studies Journal* 45(S1): S13-S46.