

**University of Edinburgh**  
**School of Social & Political Science**  
**Politics and International Relations**  
**2018 – 2019**

**Public Policy – Agenda-Setting**  
**PLIT10100**  
**Semester 1, Year 3**

**Key Information**

<b>Course Organiser</b>	Dr. Shaun Bevan Email: shaun.bevan@ed.ac.uk Room No. 2.13B (Entrance through 2.13A) Chrystal MacMillan Building, 15A George Square Guidance & Feedback Hours: Thursdays 11:00-13:00
<b>Location</b>	Semester 1 Fridays 14.00 – 16.00 Lister Learning and Teaching Centre, Room 4.2
<b>Course Secretary</b>	Alex Dysart Email: Alex.Dysart@ed.ac.uk Undergraduate Teaching Office
<b>Assessment Deadlines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reaction Paper: 12 noon Thursday 18 October 2018</li><li>• Research Paper: 12 noon Thursday 6 December 2018</li></ul>

**Aims and Objectives**

Agenda-setting as the name suggests focuses on how and why some issues receive political attention when others do not. This is central both to understanding policy change and political competition. Studies of agenda-setting continue to make progress building on early discussions of conflict expansion, the power of keeping items off the agenda, path dependence, bounded rationality and the importance of policy windows just to name a few. Newer comparative studies have also focused on the dynamic nature of political agendas more and more in recent years. These studies not only look at what is and what is not on the agenda, but how the agenda changes after long periods of stability.

The purpose of this course is to introduce students to the agenda-setting literature as it relates to public policy as a bridge into quantitative methods training. To accomplish this classic and new works in the field of agenda-setting will be discussed and students will use the knowledge gained in the class to analyze policies that interest them through a final essay. The course will make use of demonstrations and data from the Comparative Agendas Project Database (currently in beta: <http://beta.comparativeagendas.com/>). It will also explain the intuition of a variety of statistical techniques covered in the course readings including linear regression, time series analysis and stochastic process methods.

No prior statistical training is necessary in order to be successful in this course which is intended as a bridge between students' substantive training and their understanding of quantitative political research using a variety of easily accessible comparative datasets.

Students will be expected to use graphical and/or tabular statistical evidence in their essays to help make their arguments through either a quantitative or qualitative research design.

## Contents

Key Information.....	1
Aims and Objectives .....	1
Learning Outcomes .....	4
Teaching Methods.....	4
Assessment.....	4
<i>Participation (10%).....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Reaction paper (30%).....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Research paper (60%) .....</i>	<i>5</i>
Communications and Feedback .....	6
Readings and Resource List .....	6
Recommended Resources: .....	6
Lecture Summary .....	8
Course Lectures and Readings .....	9
Week 1: An Introduction to Policy Agendas.....	9
Week 2: Agenda-Setting Foundations .....	10
Week 3: The Garbage Can.....	11
Week 4: Time Series and Graphical Analyses .....	12
Week 5: Punctuated Equilibrium.....	13
Week 6: Fads, Path Dependence, Power Laws and Threshold Models .....	14
Week 7: A Model of Choice .....	15
Week 8: Heresthetics and Venue-Shopping.....	16
Week 9: Party Effects .....	17
<b>Week 10: New and New-Old Directions in Agenda-Setting .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Week 11: Writing Week and Office Drop-In Session .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Appendix 1 – General Information.....	20
Students with Disabilities .....	20
Learning Resources for Undergraduates .....	20
Discussing Sensitive Topics .....	21
Attendance Monitoring.....	21
External Examiner.....	21
Appendix 2 - Course Work Submission and Penalties.....	21
Penalties that can be applied to your work and how to avoid them.....	21
ELMA: Submission and Return of Coursework .....	22
Extensions:.....	22
Plagiarism Guidance for Students: Avoiding Plagiarism.....	23
Data Protection Guidance for Students .....	23

## Learning Outcomes

- Become familiar with the Comparative Agendas Project coding system and data through the Project website's documentation and resources (e.g. Trend Analysis Tool, Codebooks) as a gateway between substantive knowledge and statistical skills.
- Gain an understanding of theories of power, elitism and decision-making that drive agenda-setting processes and relate these to contemporary and historical examples.
- Develop an ability to assess complex and interrelated systems that form the policy-making process.
- Learn how to present and development testable hypotheses by matching theory to data and method.
- Communicate a detailed and reasoned argument through the use of the scientific method and supporting data based on qualitative and/or quantitative methods.

## Teaching Methods

This course adopts a seminar format with concepts introduced through supporting materials such as PowerPoint and elaborated on through in class discussions, activities and demonstrations. Each two-hour session per week will involve some lecturing, but the majority of the time is intended for open discussion between all members of the course. It is therefore essential that all students have read the required readings before each class and come ready to contribute with comments and questions.

## Assessment

Students will be assessed by:

Assessment	Word count limit <b>Do not exceed the word limit or penalties will be applied</b>	Weighting	Submission date (all coursework is due at 12 noon on the date of submission)	Return of feedback
Participation	NA	10%	Ongoing	End of semester
Reaction Paper	1500 words max (excluding bibliography/ footnotes/ appendixes)*	30%	18/10/18	08/11/18
Research paper	3000 words max (excluding bibliography/ footnotes/ appendixes)*	60%	6/12/18	09/01/19

**Note:** All coursework is submitted electronically through ELMA. Please read the School Policies and Coursework Submission Procedures which you will find [here](#).

### **Participation (10%)**

The study of agenda-setting is still very much a developing concept and in order to understand it discussion as well as observation is needed. As such in **class participation will count for 10%** of the overall mark for this seminar

Students will be assessed based on **preparedness (including submission of their topics)** and their contribution to the **discussion** by offering, answering and discussing questions.

### **Written Coursework (90%)**

All written coursework should follow the Harvard style of referencing.

See: <http://www.docs.is.ed.ac.uk/docs/Libraries/PDF/SEcitingreferencesHarvard.pdf>

### **Reaction paper (30%)**

Students will be expected to write one, **1,500 word reaction** paper. This can be written in reaction to one or more readings in any week or weeks. These papers should engage the literature rather than summarizing it by offering critiques, possible solutions and ways to expand on the work. It is recommended that students use these papers to help develop their final papers by discussing their chosen topic alongside their reaction. I will offer comments aimed at improving the overall quality of the argumentation used. Citations beyond the course's readings, while welcome, are unnecessary. The purpose of these papers is to start you thinking critically about agenda-setting. Papers will be judged based on the strength of their arguments. **The paper will count for 30% of the overall mark for the class.**

### **Research paper (60%)**

The final assessment for this course will be a **3,000 word research paper**. Papers should be on a public policy topic and data source approved by me.

Essays will make use of one or more public policy datasets to conduct at a minimum a detailed graphical analysis of the chosen subject. Other more advanced methods including correlations, linear regressions and beyond are welcomed and encouraged, but are not necessary. Papers should follow the general format for research papers. Namely:

- Introduction – Research question / Motivation
- Argument – Literature, theory, expectations and/or hypotheses.
- Data – Description of your data and chosen sources (e.g. why research France, what concept are you measuring with laws?, etc.)
- Analyses – Figures, tables, content analyses and discussion.
- Conclusion – Summarize briefly, discuss implications, possible future work and any shortcomings of your work.
  
- References – Not included in not count
- Appendixes as needed – Not included in the word count

### **Assessment Criteria**

Participation will be assessed according to the following criteria:

- Participation, including participation in discussion, evidence of having read the week's readings, and handing in a final paper topic.
- Quality of Contribution, including showing a level of critical thinking and understanding, as well as collegial and productive responses to other people's remarks.

Written work will be assessed by a combination of the following criteria.

- a. Demonstrates a logical and effective pattern of argument.
- b. Shows a grasp of the relevant concepts.
- c. Supports the argument with relevant, accurate and effective forms of evidence.
- d. Demonstrate reflexivity and critical thinking in relation to arguments and evidence.
- e. Makes use of correct referencing and quoting; spelling, grammar and style; layout and visual presentation.

Please refer to the assessment and submission procedure information on our webpages which you will find in appendix 2

### **Communications and Feedback**

You are strongly encouraged to use email for routine communication. All students are provided with email addresses on the university system, if you are not sure of your address, which is based on your matric number, check your EUCLID database entry using the Student Portal.

This is the ONLY email address I will use to communicate with you. Please note that I will NOT use 'private' email addresses such as yahoo or hotmail; it is therefore essential that you check your university email regularly, preferably each day.

### **Readings and Resource List**

All students should read the Required Readings for every week. These Readings are necessary to create a thorough understanding of the topic. Further readings listed for each topic are intended to allow students to explore and consolidate their knowledge of particular themes.

Required readings can also be obtained electronically via LEARN. If you have any difficulty getting hold of any of the readings please let me know

### **Recommended Resources:**

There is no set textbook for this course.

Websites:

Comparative Agendas Project ([www.comparativeagendas.net](http://www.comparativeagendas.net))

Danish Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.agendasetting.dk/>)

EU Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.policyagendas.eu/>)

French Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.agendas-france.fr/index.php?lang=en>)

Italian Policy Agendas Project (<http://italianpolicyagendas.weebly.com/>)

Pennsylvania Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.cla.temple.edu/papolicy/>)

Spanish Policy Agendas Project (<http://www.ub.edu/spanishpolicyagendas/>)

UK Policy Agendas Project ([www.policyagendas.org.uk](http://www.policyagendas.org.uk))  
US Policy Agendas Project ([www.comparativeagendas.net/us](http://www.comparativeagendas.net/us))

Texts:

Each of the required texts for this course are available through Learn. However, in addition to these texts several books provide further insight into the subject of agenda-setting. Students particularly interested in the subject moving forward are encouraged to read these texts.

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 2009 [1993]. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2d. ed. New York: HarperCollins.

John, Peter, Anthony Bertelli, Will Jennings and Shaun Bevan. 2013. *Policy Agendas in British Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, Bryan D., and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2005. *The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schattschneider, E. E. 1975 [1960]. *The Semi-Sovereign People*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

## Lecture Summary

Week	Day	Date	Lecture
1	Friday	21 September	An Introduction to Policy Agendas
2	Friday	28 September	Agenda-Setting Foundations
3	Friday	5 October	The Garbage Can
4	Friday	12 October	Introducing Time Series and Graphical Analyses
5	Friday	19 October	Punctuated Equilibrium
6	Friday	26 October	Fads, Path Dependence, Power Laws and Threshold Model
7	Friday	2 November	A Model of Choice
8	Friday	9 November	Heresthetics and Venue-shopping
9	Friday	16 November	Party Effects
10	Friday	23 November	New and New-Old Directions in Agenda-Setting
11	Writing Week & Office Drop-in Session		



## Course Lectures and Readings

### Week 1: An Introduction to Policy Agendas

This seminar will introduce the Comparative Agendas Project (CAP) through core texts outlining the focus and the value of the CAP and an interactive overview of the Comparative Agendas Project Database website that contains all publicly released data from the research network. Students should be prepared to ask questions and suggest policy areas of interest to them to discuss in class.

Students are encouraged to experiment with the CAP website (<http://www.comparativeagendas.net/>) and the trend analysis tool (<http://www.comparativeagendas.net/tool>) prior to class.

#### Required Reading:

Bevan, Shaun. 2017. "Gone Fishing: The Creation of the Comparative Agendas Project Master Codebook." Forthcoming Book Chapter in the Comparative Agendas Project Book, Oxford University Press.

#### Further Reading:

John, Peter. 2006. "The policy agendas project: a review." *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(7) 975-986.

See the following series of articles in order for an ongoing debate about the CAP and associated research:

Dowding, Keith, Andrew Hindmoor and Aaron Martin. 2015. "The Comparative Policy Agendas Project: theory, measurement and findings." *Journal of Public Policy*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000124>

Jones, Bryan D. 2015. "The Comparative Policy Agendas Projects as measurement systems: response to Dowding, Hindmoor and Martin." *Journal of Public Policy*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000161>

Adams, James. 2015. "On the relationship between (parties' and voters') issue attention and their issue positions: response to Dowding, Hindmoor and Martin." *Journal of Public Policy*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X1500015X>

Dowding, Keith, Andrew Hindmoor and Aaron Martin. 2015. "Attention, content and measurement: rejoinder to Adams and Jones." *Journal of Public Policy*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000173>

## Week 2: Agenda-Setting Foundations

The question of how attention is structured given the complexities of power and who wields it marks the birth of agenda-setting. This week's course focuses on the efforts to build a model of attention noting where it originates, how it functions and importantly why it fades. We will particularly focus on the value and the shortcomings of these early efforts.

### Required Reading:

- Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1962. The Two Faces of Power. *American Political Science Review* 56: 947–52.
- Downs, Anthony. 1972. Up and Down with Ecology: The Issue Attention Cycle. *Public Interest* 28: 38–50.
- Peters, B. Guy, and Brian W. Hogwood. 1985. In Search of the Issue-Attention Cycle. *Journal of Politics* 47: 239–53.

### Further Reading:

- Cobb, Roger W., and Charles D. Elder. 1983 [1972]. Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building. 2d ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cobb, Roger W., Jeannie Keith-Ross, and Marc Howard Ross. 1976. Agenda Building as a Comparative Political Process. *American Political Science Review* 70: 126–38.
- Crenson, Matthew A. 1971. The Unpolitics of Air Pollution. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. The Concept of Power. *Behavioral Science* 2: 201–15.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1961. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1966. Further Reflections on "The Elitist Theory of Democracy." *American Political Science Review*, 60: 296-305.
- Gaventa, John. 1980. Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1963. Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Riker, William H. 1964. Some Ambiguities in the Notion of Power. *American Political Science Review*, 58: 341–9.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1975 [1960]. The Semi-Sovereign People. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Truman, David B. 1951. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Walker, Jack L., Jr. 1966. A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy. *American Political Science Review* 60: 285–95, 391–92.
- Walker, Jack L., Jr. 1977. Setting the Agenda in the U.S. Senate: A Theory of Problem Selection. *British Journal of Political Science*, 7: 423-45.

### **Week 3: The Garbage Can**

The Garbage Can model of political attention marks a key turning point in understanding the content of political agendas. The model introduces and discusses the various streams of information and power that exist in the policy-making process. While often criticized for having a lack of empirically testable implications, we will challenge ourselves to develop testable hypotheses in class based on the Garbage Can Model.

#### **Required Reading:**

Cohen, Michael, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. A Garbage Can Theory of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17: 1–25.  
Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2d. ed. New York: HarperCollins. (Chapters 4 and 8)

#### **Further Reading:**

Cyert, Richard M., and James G. March. 1992. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Blackwell.  
March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. 1993. *Organizations*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Blackwell.  
Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March. 1986. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

## **Week 4: Time Series and Graphical Analyses**

The majority of the questions and theories in this course are dynamic, in other words changing over time. Time series analyses from essential graphical analyses to multiple regressions and beyond have been used in much of the work in order to address questions of change. This class will focus on the underlying logic of time series data and analyses. While some math is unavoidable, its main focus will be on providing you with the tools for your own graphical analyses and how to properly interpret them.

### **Required Reading:**

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2008. "Time Series Analysis: The Basics."  
<http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/D3310114.nsf/home/Time+Series+Analyses:+The+Basics>

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2001. "Interpreting Time Series Data."  
[http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/cfa19371d1bfab40ca256f2a000feb10/\\$FILE/ATTQPLS5/Time%20Series\\_Final.pdf](http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/cfa19371d1bfab40ca256f2a000feb10/$FILE/ATTQPLS5/Time%20Series_Final.pdf)

Spurious Correlations: <http://tylervigen.com/discover>

### **Further Reading:**

De Boef, Suzanna, and Luke Keele. 2008. "Taking time seriously." *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1): 184-200.

Wlezien's Time Series Short Course Notes, see:  
[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ib45pslnzumw5z0/AABrRNXD\\_1zZKKydzJIPZxYDa?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ib45pslnzumw5z0/AABrRNXD_1zZKKydzJIPZxYDa?dl=0)

## Week 5: Punctuated Equilibrium

For decades the common theory of policy-making was and in many ways still is incrementalism, where most if not all policy changes occur through a long process of progressive change marked by institutional friction and uncertainty. However, a few, but quite significant policy changes are made across political systems with amazing speed. Punctuated equilibrium theory, a concept borrowed from evolutionary theory reconciles these two opposing facts into a single theory of policy-making.

### Required Reading:

#### **Read this First:**

True, James L., Bryan D. Jones, and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2007. Punctuated Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in American Policymaking. In Paul Sabatier, ed., *Theories of the Policy Process* 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 155–188.

#### **Then:**

Baumgartner, Frank R., Christian Breunig, Christoffer Green-Pedersen, Bryan D. Jones, Peter B. Mortensen, Michiel Neytemans, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2009. Punctuated Equilibrium in Comparative Perspective. *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (3): 602–19.

Jones, Bryan D., Frank R. Baumgartner, Christian Breunig, Christopher Wlezien, Stuart Soroka, Martial Foucault, Abel François, Christoffer Green-Pedersen, Peter John, Chris Koski, Peter B. Mortensen, Frédéric Varone, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2009. A General Empirical Law for Public Budgets: A Comparative Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 53, 4 (October): 855–73.

### Further Reading:

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 2009 [1993]. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (either edition is ok)

Baumgartner, Frank R., Marcello Carammia, Derek A. Epp, Ben Noble, Beatriz Rey, and Tefvik Murat Yildirim. 2017. "Budgetary Change in Authoritarian and Democratic Regimes." *Journal of European Public Policy* 24, no. 6: 792-808.

Eldredge, Niles, and Stephen J. Gould. 1985 [1972]. Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism. In Niles Eldredge, *Time Frames: The Evolution of Punctuated Equilibrium*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Appendix, pp. 193-223. [Originally published in Thomas J. M. Schopf, ed., *Models in Paleobiology*. San Francisco: Freeman, Cooper, pp. 82-115]

## Week 6: Fads, Path Dependence, Power Laws and Threshold Models

In this seminar we take a brief step back to focus on key theories concerning the nature of attention in business, marketing and patterns in political outcomes to explain common patterns in human behaviour. Power laws, information cascades, path dependence and threshold models mark common, but not easily understood processes that often have major effects on political agendas. Particular attention will be paid to how these processes can be integrated into existing agenda-setting theories.

### Required Reading:

- Bikhchandani, Sushil, David Hirshleifer, and Ivo Welch. 1992. A Theory of Fads, Fashion, Custom, and Cultural Change as Informational Cascades. *Journal of Political Economy* 100: 992–1026.
- David, Paul A. 1985. Clio and the Economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review* 75: 332–37.
- Gabaix, Xavier. 1999. Zipf's Law and the Growth of Cities. *American Economic Review* 89, 2 (May): 129–132.
- Lohmann, Susanne. 1994. The Dynamics of Informational Cascades: The Monday Demonstrations in Leipzig, East Germany, 1989–1991. *World Politics* 47: 42–101.

### Further Reading:

- Arthur, W. Brian. 1989. Competing Technologies, Increasing Returns, and Lock-in by Historical Events. *Economic Journal*, 99 (394): 116-131.
- Arthur, W. Brian. 1994. *Increasing Returns and Path Dependence in the Economy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Barabasi, Albert-Laszlo. 2005. *Linked*. New York: Penguin.
- Barabasi, Albert-Laszlo. 2005. "The Origin of Bursts and Heavy Tails in Human Dynamics." *Nature*, 435 (12 May): 207-211.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1978. "Threshold Models of Collective Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 1420-43.
- Merton, Robert K. 1968. The Matthew Effect in Science. *Science*, 159: 56-63.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review*, 94: 251-67.

## **Week 7: A Model of Choice**

Rational choice theory is a dominant approach to many political questions that in many ways falls short when it comes to explaining many political phenomena. This week we focus on the work of Nobel Prize Winner Herbert Simon and the introduction and expansion of bounded rationality within agenda-setting research. Marked by a cognitively and practically limited ability to use information, bounded rationality provides a fundamental key to understanding decision-making.

### **Required Reading:**

- Jones, Bryan D. 1994. A Change of Mind or a Change of Focus? A Theory of Choice Reversals in Politics. 1994. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 4: 141–77.
- Jones, Bryan D. 2003. Bounded Rationality in Political Science: Lessons from Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13: 395–410.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1985. Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review*, 79: 293–304.

### **Further Reading:**

- Jones, Bryan D. 1994. *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, Bryan D. 2001. *Politics and the Architecture of Choice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1997. *Administrative Behavior*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Free Press.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1983. *Reason in Human Affairs*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1996. *The Sciences of the Artificial*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: MIT Press

## **Week 8: Heresthetics and Venue-Shopping**

Sometimes agenda-setting is about changing the state of play. Heresthetics marks the process and ability for key actors to manipulate people and institutions to achieve their desired outcomes by changing processes and communication. Venue-shopping marks the movement of decisions and policy-making to other actors either to push or to kill policy change, such as the movement of a key decision from a ministry to the parliament.

### **Required Reading:**

- Guiraudon, Virginie. 2000. "European Integration and Migration Policy: Vertical Policy-Making as Venue Shopping." *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38 (2): 251–71.
- Princen, Sebastiaan. 2007. Agenda-setting in the European Union: a Theoretical Exploration and Agenda for Research. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14(1): 21-38.
- Riker, William H. 1984. "The Heresthetics of Constitution-Making: The Presidency in 1787, with Comments on Determinism and Rational Choice." *American Political Science Review*, 78 (1): 1–16.

### **Further Reading:**

#### ***Heresthetics***

- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Riker, William H. 1988. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.
- Riker, William H. 1996. *The Strategy of Rhetoric*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

#### ***Venue-shopping***

- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1991. Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems. *Journal of Politics*, 53, 4: 1044–74.
- Cairney, Paul. 2007. Using Devolution to Set the Agenda? Venue Shift and the Smoking Ban in Scotland. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9: 73–89.
- Pralle, Sarah. 2006. *Branching Out and Digging In: Environmental Advocacy and Agenda Setting*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Pralle, Sarah. 2003. "Venue Shopping, Political Strategy, and Policy Change: A Case Study of Canadian Forest Advocacy." *Journal of Public Policy*, 23:233–260.
- Pralle, Sarah. 2006. "Timing and Sequence in Agenda Setting and Policy Change: A Comparative Study of Lawn Pesticide Policy in the US and Canada." *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13:987–1005.



## **Week 9: Party Effects**

Much of political science focuses on how much political parties matter. Much of agenda-setting finds how little they affect. This week addresses these seemingly contradictory findings by discussing how and when political parties affect attention and why, even from the standpoint of democratic representation, they often should not.

### **Required Reading:**

- Bevan, Shaun and Zachary Greene. 2016. "Looking for the Party? Partisan Effects on Issue Attention in UK Acts of Parliament." *European Political Science Review*, 8(1): 49-72.
- Green-Pedersen, C., and P. B. Mortensen. 2010. Who Sets the Agenda and Who Responds to it in the Danish Parliament? A New Model of Issue Competition and Agenda-Setting. *European Journal of Political Research*, 49 (2): 257–281.
- Walgrave, Stefaan and Michiel Nuytemans. 2009. Friction and Party Manifesto Change in 25 Countries. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(1):190-206.

### **Further Reading:**

- Bevan, Shaun, Peter John and Will Jennings. 2011. "Keeping Party Programmes on Track: The Transmission of the Policy Agendas of Executive Speeches to Legislative Outputs in the United Kingdom." *European Political Science Review*, 3(3): 395-417.
- John, Peter, Shaun Bevan and Will Jennings. 2014. "Party Politics and the Policy Agenda: The Case of the United Kingdom" in Christoffer Green-Pedersen and Stefaan Walgrave (eds.) *Agenda Setting, Policies, and Political Systems: A Comparative Approach*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

## **Week 10: New and New-Old Directions in Agenda-Setting**

Agenda-setting remains a relatively young and developing subfield of political science. Despite laying claim to one of the few theoretical laws in social science research, the accuracy and direction of previous research is constantly developing. This seminar focuses on recent work that questions and pushes the boundaries of the research discussed in the previous weeks.

### **Required Reading:**

- Baumgartner, Frank R., Bryan D. Jones, and John Wilkerson. 2011. Comparative Studies of Policy Dynamics. *Comparative Political Studies*, 44 (8): 947–972.
- Jennings, Will, Shaun Bevan, Arco Timmermans, Gerard Breeman, Sylvain Brouard, Laura Chaques, Christoffer Green-Pedersen, Peter John, Anna Palau and Peter B. Mortensen. 2011. "Effects of the Core Functions of Government on the Diversity of Executive Agendas." *Comparative Political Studies*, 44(8): 1001-1030.
- John, Peter and Shaun Bevan. 2012. "What Are Policy Punctuations? Large Changes in the Legislative Agenda of the UK Government, 1911-2008." *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1): 89-108.

### **Further Reading:**

- Green-Pedersen, Christoffer and Stefaan Walgrave (eds.) 2014. *Agenda Setting, Policies, and Political Systems: A Comparative Approach*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner F. R. 2012. From There to Here: Punctuated Equilibrium to the General Punctuation Thesis to a Theory of Government Information Processing. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1): 1-20.
- Special issues  
*Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(7), 2006.  
*Comparative Political Studies*, 44 (8), 2011.  
*Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1), 2012.

## **Week 11: Writing Week and Office Drop-In Session**

Given the short amount of time before the exam period, the final week of this course will provide you with time to work on your final research papers. I will be available to meet in my office from 10am to 4pm on the 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> of November to discuss your research papers.

## Appendix 1 – General Information

### Students with Disabilities

The School welcomes disabled students with disabilities (including those with specific learning difficulties such as dyslexia) and is working to make all its courses as accessible as possible. If you have a disability special needs which means that you may require adjustments to be made to ensure access to lectures, tutorials or exams, or any other aspect of your studies, you can discuss these with your Student Support Officer or Personal Tutor who will advise on the appropriate procedures.

You can also contact the Student Disability Service, based on the University of Edinburgh, Third Floor, Main Library, You can find their details as well as information on all of the support they can offer at: <http://www.ed.ac.uk/student-disability-service>

### Learning Resources for Undergraduates

The Study Development Team at the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) provides resources and workshops aimed at helping all students to enhance their learning skills and develop effective study techniques. Resources and workshops cover a range of topics, such as managing your own learning, reading, note-making, essay and report writing, exam preparation and exam techniques.

The study development resources are housed on 'LearnBetter' (undergraduate), part of Learn, the University's virtual learning environment. Follow the link from the IAD Study Development web page to enrol: [www.ed.ac.uk/iad/undergraduates](http://www.ed.ac.uk/iad/undergraduates)

Workshops are interactive: they will give you the chance to take part in activities, have discussions, exchange strategies, share ideas and ask questions. They are 90 minutes long and held on Wednesday afternoons at 1.30pm or 3.30pm. The schedule is available from the IAD Undergraduate web page (see above).

Workshops are open to all undergraduates but you need to book in advance, using the MyEd booking system. Each workshop opens for booking two weeks before the date of the workshop itself. If you book and then cannot attend, please cancel in advance through MyEd so that another student can have your place. (To be fair to all students, anyone who persistently books on workshops and fails to attend may be barred from signing up for future events).

Study Development Advisors are also available for an individual consultation if you have specific questions about your own approach to studying, working more effectively, strategies for improving your learning and your academic work. Please note, however, that Study Development Advisors are not subject specialists so they cannot comment on the content of your work. They also do not check or proof read students' work.

Students can book a study skills consultation <https://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/undergraduate/services/quick-consultations>

Academic English support can also be accessed at <https://www.ed.ac.uk/english-language-teaching>

## Discussing Sensitive Topics

The discipline of politics addresses a number of topics that some might find sensitive or, in some cases, distressing. You should read this Course Guide carefully and if there are any topics that you may feel distressed by you should seek advice from the course convenor and/or your Personal Tutor.

For more general issues you may consider seeking the advice of the Student Counselling Service, <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/student-counselling>

## Attendance Monitoring

In accordance with the University general degree regulations you are expected to attend all teaching and assessment events associated with all courses that you are enrolled on. The College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences undertakes routine monitoring of attendance at tutorials and seminars for all students enrolled on courses delivered by Schools within our College. We undertake monitoring of attendance and engagement to enable us to identify where individual students may be experiencing difficulties and to ensure that timely and appropriate intervention can be delivered to provide support and guidance. We also undertake monitoring for sponsored students specifically to meet our obligations to the UKVI. If you miss one or more of your tutorials and/or seminars you may be contacted by your local Student Support Team and be asked to provide an explanation for your absence.

All data is gathered and stored in line with the University policies and guidance on data handling and you can view the privacy statement at:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/student-systems/use-of-data/policies-and-regulations/privacy-statement>

## External Examiner

The External Examiner for the politics Honours programme is Matthew Goodwin

## Appendix 2 - Course Work Submission and Penalties

### Penalties that can be applied to your work and how to avoid them.

Below is a list of penalties that can be applied to your course work and these are listed below. Students **must** read the full description on each of these at:

[http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/undergrad/current\\_students/teaching\\_and\\_learning/assessment\\_and\\_regulations/coursework\\_penalties](http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/undergrad/current_students/teaching_and_learning/assessment_and_regulations/coursework_penalties)

Make sure you are aware of each of these penalties and know how to avoid them. Students are responsible for taking the time to read guidance and for ensuring their coursework submissions comply with guidance.

- **Lateness Penalty**

If you miss the submission deadline for any piece of assessed work **5 marks will be deducted for each calendar day that work is late, up to a maximum of seven calendar days (35 marks)**. Thereafter, a mark of zero will be recorded. There is no grace period for lateness and penalties begin to apply immediately following the deadline.

- **Word Count Penalty**

Your course handbook will specify the word length of your assessments. All coursework submitted by students must state the word count on the front page. All courses in the School have a standard penalty for going over the word length; if you are taking courses from other Schools, check with them what their penalties are.

If you go over the word length, you will receive a 5 mark penalty. These 5 marks will be deducted, regardless of how much you have exceeded the word count (whether it is by 5 words or by 500!). In exceptional circumstances, a Course Organizer may decide that, instead of a 5 marks penalty, any text beyond the word limit will be excluded from the assignment and be marked only on the text up to the word limit.

In most cases, appendices and bibliography are not included in the word count whilst in-text references, tables, charts, graphs and footnotes are counted. Make sure you know what is and what is not included in the word count

You will not be penalised for submitting work below the word limit. However, you should note that shorter essays are unlikely to achieve the required depth and that this will be reflected in your mark.

### **ELMA: Submission and Return of Coursework**

Coursework is submitted online using our electronic submission system, ELMA. You will not be required to submit a paper copy of your work.

Marked coursework, grades and feedback will be returned to you via ELMA. You will not receive a paper copy of your marked course work or feedback.

For details of how to submit your course work to ELMA, please see our webpages [here](#).

Please note that all submissions to ELMA should be formatted as a Word document (doc or.docx.).

Any submission that is not in word format will be converted by the Undergraduate Teaching Office into word where possible. By submitting in any format other than word, you are accepting this process and the possibility that errors may occur during conversion. The UTO will do everything possible to ensure the integrity of any document converted but to avoid issue, please submit in Word format as requested.

### **Extensions:**

If you have good reason for not meeting a coursework deadline, you may request an extension. Before you request an extension, make sure you have read all the guidance on our [webpages](#) and take note of the key points below. You will also be able to access the online extension request form through our [webpages](#).

- Extensions are granted for 7 calendar days.
- If you miss the deadline for requesting an extension for a valid reason, you should submit your coursework as soon as you are able, and apply for

Special Circumstances to disregard penalties for late submission. You should also contact your Student Support Officer or Personal Tutor and make them aware of your situation.

- If you have a valid reason and require an extension of more than 7 calendar days, you should submit your coursework as soon as you are able, and apply for Special Circumstances to disregard penalties for late submission. You should also contact your Student Support Officer or Personal Tutor and make them aware of your situation.
- If you have a Learning Profile from the Disability Service allowing you potential for flexibility over deadlines, you must still make an extension request for this to be taken into account.

### **Plagiarism Guidance for Students: Avoiding Plagiarism**

Material you submit for assessment, such as your essays, must be your own work. You can, and should, draw upon published work, ideas from lectures and class discussions, and (if appropriate) even upon discussions with other students, but you must always make clear that you are doing so. **Passing off anyone else's work** (including another student's work or material from the Web or a published author) **as your own is plagiarism** and will be punished severely.

When you upload your work to ELMA you will be asked to check a box to confirm the work is your own. All submissions will be run through 'Turnitin', our plagiarism detection software. Turnitin compares every essay against a constantly-updated database, which highlights all plagiarised work. Assessed work that contains plagiarised material will be awarded a mark of zero, and serious cases of plagiarism will also be reported to the College Academic Misconduct officer. In either case, the actions taken will be noted permanently on the student's record. **For further details on plagiarism see the Academic Services' website:**

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/arts-humanities-soc-sci/taught-students/student-conduct/academic-misconduct>

### **Data Protection Guidance for Students**

In most circumstances, students are responsible for ensuring that their work with information about living, identifiable individuals complies with the requirements of the Data Protection Act. The document, *Personal Data Processed by Students*, provides an explanation of why this is the case. It can be found, with advice on data protection compliance and ethical best practice in the handling of information about living, identifiable individuals, on the Records Management section of the University website at:

<https://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/guidance/data-protection/dpforstudents>