MA (Laurea Magistrale) in Scienze delle amministrazioni ed organizzazioni complesse
Curriculum: Public Management (LM 63)
Teaching unit on
Reforming the State Through Governance (cfu 6)
Academic year 2014-2015
Autumn Semester

Programme of the Unit
The course intends to provide the analytical tools for understanding the new modes of governance yield by the reforms of the public sector undertaken in OECD countries in the last three decades. In particular, it intends to spell out the theoretical, empirical and normative questions that the passage 'from government to governance' raises in relation to three diverse aspects of the political process: (a) decision making, (b) policy making and (c) policy implementation. The goals of the course are: (i) to allow students to gain a critical perspective on public sector reforms since the late 1980s; (ii) to sharpen the understanding of crucial features of the political process in multilevel polities; (iii) to devise better and more effective policy tools and mechanisms of implementation.

The course will develop a theoretical perspective that views social problems and political change as the outcome of complex forms of interaction a plurality of variegated collective and individual agents having distinct values, beliefs and needs. To avoid the generation of perverse side-effects and lower the risk of policy failure, public intervention needs to pay attention to the material and symbolic elements that help shape social behavioral patterns. To promote effective change, public policy needs to involve and stimulate the voluntary compliance of all agents whose interests are affected by the process and favor the selective evolution of positive behavioral responses. Thus, public intervention has to combine monetary and non-monetary incentives and set the ground for the evolution of self-enforcing social conventions.

Unit leader: **Antonino Palumbo**

CFU: **6**

Course year: **first**

Attendance: **non compulsory**
Although attendance is not compulsory, the unit adopts a 'fast stream evaluation track' for those who will be attending both lectures and seminars for (no less than) 60% of the time.

(1) Standard Evaluation:
For those who cannot attend teaching, the evaluation with consist in the standard oral exam required by university regulation. The exam will be based on a 'detailed' and 'lengthy' discussion of the three texts listed below:
- Chhotray, V. and Stoker, G. (2009). *Governance Theory and Practice. A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Palumbo, A. *Situating Governance*. ECPR Press (forthcoming).
- Torfing, J., Peters, B.G., Pierre, J. and Sorensen, E. (2012). *Interactive Governance. Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford University Press.

(2) Fast Stream Evaluation track:

(a) Two written essays: the first of 3000 words will give a maximum of 7 points; the second of 5000 words will give a maximum of 13 points (any essay handed in after the deadline will be penalised by 1 point per day).
(b) Presentation and discussion of scientific articles at seminars: together with attendance, seminar activities will give a maximum of 10 points; each student will be asked to give two presentations on a freely chosen topic for each part of the course.

NOTE
• Essays questions will be those used to introduce the weekly topics (see reading list below); As for the seminar presentations, the first essay must be on one of the topics discussed in the first part of the course, whereas the second essay has to be concerned with those discussed in the second part.
• Suspected cases of plagiarism will be assessed with a further oral examination. Those found out to have willingly used other people's works, ideas or opinions without proper acknowledgment will be referred to the university proceedings on the matter. In case of uncertainty upon what constitute plagiarism, students are invited to consult the course leader.

Final evaluation marks will range from 18/30 (pass) to 30/30 *cum laude* (A*); for fast stream students, the final mark will be the total sum of the scores received for each single assessment.

Teaching timetable: October to December. Monday 12:00-14:00 (room 4), Tuesday 12:00-14:00 (room 4), Wednesday 12:00-14:00 (room 4).
Individual tutorials need to be agreed with the course leader by email: antonino.palumbo@unipa.it

EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE COURSE

Knowledge and understanding
Students will be expected to develop an interdisciplinary perspective on policy analysis; one that can combine concepts and methodologies derived from the main disciplines composing the social sciences: politics, sociology and economics. They will be required to develop the analytical kills needed to arrive at a full understanding of the problems public intervention is supposed to solve, as well as those affecting the political process itself, and think policy making and implementation as self-reflexive activities.

Students will be specifically asked to think about the various and complex factors contributing to the generation of specific social problems and the reactions that policy intervention could generate. They will also asked to apply their interdisciplinary knowledge to choose policy tools and mechanisms of implementation that could minimize negative reactions and perverse side-effects.
To this end, they will be encouraged to anticipate the dilemmas, conflicts and trade-offs public intervention needs to tackle in practice, and to embed in it mechanisms and procedures that could help to improve the responsiveness of the political process.

Applying knowledge and understanding
Students will be encouraged to employ hypothetical and real life case-studies and develop their learning abilities by blending virtual simulations and specific empirical enquiries in distinct policy areas. In this regard, they will be asked to familiarizes themselves with a number of recent techniques developed to consult, involve and motivate the social and institutional actors whose compliance is sought by policy makers: focus groups, deliberative survey, citizens juries, peer-review, etc..

Making judgements

Students should be able to reflect on the methods used by assessing the viability of distinct policy tools selected to promote empowerment, accountability, communication and learning, of organizations operating in a complex and dynamic environment. They also need to be able to appreciate the relevance that moral, symbolic and non-monetary values have for motivating institutions and individuals to comply willingly with the policy requirements set.

Communication
Students will be asked to present and discuss the relevant literature as well as the result of their case studies in dedicated seminars.

Learning skills
Students will need to acquire the ability to follow their research tasks competently and autonomously, to develop their own specific interests and to carry out fieldwork activity in policy areas of their own choice.

Schedule & table of content

Starting week
Introduction to the course: goals, programme and assessment criteria; assessment of individual abilities and background, suggestion of background reading to fill up individual gaps.

2nd week

Lecture topic: Democratic decision making I: values & principles
Questions for the first essay: What is democracy? What are its origins, features and lines of evolution? What is the reason for modelling democracy? Are the models employed heuristic or normative tools? How can we assess the legitimacy of democratic decision making? Can democratic theory contribute to policy analysis?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Browne, C. (2006), "Democratic Paradigms and the Horizons of Democratization",** *Contretemps* **6, January, pp. 43-58.**
- **Hutchings, K. (1998), "Modelling democracy",** *Global Society* **12, 2, pp. 159-75.**

Further bibliographic references

3rd week

Lecture topic: Democratic decision making II: procedures & goals
Questions for the first essay: What is a procedural model of democracy? What are its main analytical features? What are the similarities and/or differences between the procedural models proposed by Dahl, Kelsen and Schumpeter? What does a substantive model of democracy look like? Are aggregative models of democracy substantive? What are the main analytical aspects of aggregative models?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Elster, J. (1989), "The Market and the Forum. Three Varieties of Political Theory". In** *Foundations of Social Choice Theory***. J. Elster and A. Hylland (eds.). CUP Cambridge, pp. 103-32.**
- **Cudd, A. E. (2002), "Preference, Rationality, and Democratic Theory". In** *The Blackwell Guide to Social and Political Philosophy***. Simon (ed.) Blackwell, pp. 106-35.**

Further bibliographic references

4th week

Lecture topic: Democratic decision making III: evaluation & accountability
Questions for the first essay: what is democratic experimentalism? How are value and principles, procedures and substantive goals combined in democratic experiments? Is it possible to evaluate democratic choices? What criteria of evaluations are available? Is evaluation necessary to have accountability? Can we establish effective mechanism of accountability?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Przeworski, A. (2009), "Self-Government in Our Times",** *Annual Review of Political Science* **12, pp. 71-92.**
- **Sabel, C.F. and Zeitlin, J. (2008), "Learning from Difference: the New Architecture of Experimentalist Governance in the European Union",** *European Law Journal* **14, 3, pp. 271-327.**

Further bibliographic references

1st essay deadline: Sunday 9th of November 24:00

5th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Making I: technocratic approaches
Questions for the second essay: Is policy making a technical or political activity? What sort of expertise does this activity require, who possess it and how can it be acquired? What reasons are often used to justify delegation of policy making power to insulated institutions? How is it possible to reduce the agency costs yield by delegation?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Griggs, S. (2007), "Rational Choice in Public Policy: The Theory in Critical Perspective". In Handbook of Public Policy Analysis. F. Fischer et al (eds.). CRC Press, pp. 193-85.**
- **Majone, G. (2001), "Nonmajoritarian institutions and the limits of democratic governance: a political transaction-cost approach",** *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* **157, 1, pp. 57-78.**

Further bibliographic references

6th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Making II: participatory approaches
Questions for the second essay: Can policy making be carried out by citizens? What are the features which make modern democracy unlike ancient democracy? Is popular participation in policy making a matter of equality or efficiency? How participatory theory attempt to resolve problem of size and competence?

Texts for seminar's discussion:

- **Fischer, F. (1993), "Citizen Participation and the Democratization of Policy Expertise: From Theoretical Inquiry to Practical Cases",** *Policy Sciences* **26, 3, pp. 165-87.**
- **Eriksson, K. (2012), "Self-Service Society: Participative Politics and New Forms of Governance",** *Public Administration***, pp. 2-14**

Further bibliographic references

7th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Making III: deliberative approaches
Questions for the second essay: Do deliberative democratic solutions be applied to policy making? If so, is their aim to improve the input-side or the output-side of the democratic legitimacy of policy making? Can policy networks be both deliberative and democratic? Is the Open Method of Coordination an apt example of deliberative policy making?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Bressers H. Th. A. and O'toole, L. J. Jr. (1998), The Selection of Policy Instruments: A Network-Based Perspective",** *Journal of Public Policy* **18, 3, pp. 213-39.**
- **Torgerson D. (2007), "Policy Discourse as Dialogue: Emergent Publics and the Reflexive Turn",** *Critical Policy Analysis* **1, 1, pp. 1-17.**

Further bibliographic references

8th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Implementation I: top-down legalism
Questions for the second essay: How government views the question of policy implementation? What are the main analytical features of traditional top-down form of implementation? Is implementation a political or technical matter? What sort of expertise does it require, who possess it and how can it be acquired? What are the reasons used to justify top-down forms of implementation and what their shortcomings?

Texts for seminar's discussion:
- **Pülzl, H. and Treib, O. (2007), "Implementing Public Policy". In** *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis***. Fischer et al (ed.). CRC Press, pp. 89-135.**
- **Lane, Jan-Erik (1987), "Implementation, accountability and trust",** *European Journal of Political Research* **15, pp. 527-546.**

Further bibliographic references

9th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Implementation II: bottom-up managerialism
Questions for the second essay: Is government failure due to implementation issues always, sometimes or never? What does explain bureaucratic inefficiencies according to the public choice approach? Can government failure be solved by market-based managerial solutions? What is the New Public Management and how does it approach implementation questions? How charters of services standards able to improve quality and performance?

Texts for seminar's discussion:

- **Vanberg, V. (2000), "Globalization, Democracy, and Citizens' Sovereignty: Can Competition Among Governments Enhance Democracy?",** *Constitutional Political Economy***, 11, pp. 87-112.**
- **Somin, I. (2011), "Foot Voting, Political Ignorance, and Constitutional Design",** *Social Philosophy & Policy* **28, pp. 202-27.**

Further bibliographic references

10th week

Lecture topic: New Modes of Governance and Policy Implementation III: bottom-up radicalism
Questions for the second essay: Does stakeholder democracy require prosumers? Are Public-Private Partnerships a means to empower citizens? Is a self-service polity a radical form of political organisation? Do current forms of democratic experimentation show that such a radically democratic form of polity can be engendered?

Texts for seminar's discussion:

- **O'toole, L. J. Jr. (2004), "The Theory–Practice Issue in Policy Implementation Research",** *Public Administration* **82, 2, pp. 309-29.**
- **Mischen, P. A. and Sinclair, T. A. P. (2007), "Making Implementation More Democratic through Action Implementation Research",** *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* **19, pp. 145-64.**

Further bibliographic references

Closing week

Final activities: feedback session

2nd essay deadline: Sunday 21st of December 24:00