T01P13 / Transnational Policy Process

Topic : T01 / POLICY PROCESS THEORIES

Chair : Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)

Second Chair : Cecilia Osorio Gonnet (Universidad de Chile)

Third Chair : Laura Rahm (European University Institute)

Fourth Chair : Raul Pacheco-Vega (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Mexico)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Policy Process is related to the "interactions that occur over time between public policies and surrounding actors, events, contexts, and outcomes" (Weible 2018, 2). In the 21st century, policymaking processes have increasingly become transnational (Stone, Moloney 2019). However, mainstream policy process theories have traditionally focused on domestic policy change, with a few exceptions, in particular from the field of policy transfer. With the growth of agents, such as international development agencies and multi-stakeholder partnerships fueling transfers across governance levels, policy sectors, agents actors, and networks, this area expanded vertiginously in the past years (Dolowitz, Marsh 2000; Hadjiisky, Pal Walker, 2017; Porto de Oliveira 2021).

The study of "transnational policy processes", however, is related to a broader phenomenon than policy transfers. It encompasses different forms of global (Stone, Moloney 2019), international (Petiteville, Smith 2006) and foreign (Morin, Paquin 2018) policy processes and practices. As examples we can take the processes of internationalization of domestic best practices (e.g., Mexican Oportunidades), the localization of global policies (e.g., the Sendai Framework), the development of bottom-up civil society led policy instruments, the implementation of projects by international organizations (e.g., the World Bank), the circulation of knowledge and ideas (e.g., far-right strategies of political campaign), the coordination of national responses to crises (e.g., the WHO role in Covid-19), the evaluation of peacekeeping operations, setting global agendas (such as the SDGs or the Paris Agreement), etc. These are only a few of the current examples of public policy processes involving a transnational dimension.

The Panel seeks to advance scholarship on the transnational dimensions of policy process, transcending the policy transfer literature. We expect to provide answers to the following questions: How can transnational policy process be defined? Which theories and concepts are useful in analyzing transnational dimensions in policy making? What are the conceptual challenges in capturing multilevel, multinational, multi-actor processes? Which methodological approaches can be applied to assess policy processes beyond the nation state? Which empirical evidence (from Global South or North) can be used in such studies? Are ideas of the public sphere, citizenship/community or political identity altered and shaped by the transnational policy?

References:

Dolowitz, David P., and David Marsh. "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making." Governance 13, no. 1 (January 2000): 5–23.

Hadjiisky, Magdaléna, Leslie A. Pal, e Christopher Walker. Public Policy Transfer: Micro-Dynamics and Macro-Effects. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017.

Morin, Jean-Frédéric, e Jonathan Paquin. Foreign Policy Analysis: A Toolbox. 1st edition. New York, NY: Palgrave, 2018.

Petiteville, Franck, e Andy Smith. "Analyser les politiques publiques internationales". Revue française de science politique 56, nº 3 (2006): 357.

Porto de Oliveira, Osmany, ed. Handbook of Policy Transfer, Diffusion and Circulation. Handbooks of Research on Public Policy. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2021.

Stone, Diane, and Kim Moloney, eds. The Oxford Handbook of Global Policy and Transnational Administration. First Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Weible, Christopher. "Introduction: The Scope and Focus of Policy Process Research and Theory." In

Theories of the Policy Process, edited by Christopher Weible and Paul Sabatier, 4th ed., 1–13. New York, USA: Routledge, 2018.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Policy Process is related to the "interactions that occur over time between public policies and surrounding actors, events, contexts, and outcomes" (Weible 2018, 2). In the 21st century, policymaking processes have increasingly become transnational (Stone, Moloney 2019). The study of "transnational policy processes" is related to a broader phenomenon than policy transfers. It encompasses different forms of global (Stone, Moloney 2019), international (Petiteville, Smith 2006) and foreign (Morin, Paquin 2018) policy processes. As examples we can take the processes of internationalization of domestic best practices (e.g., Bogotá ciclovía, Participatory Budgeting from Porto Alegre, Mexican Oportunidades), the localization of global policies (e.g., the New Urban Agenda, Sendai Framework, Addis Ababa Action Agenda), the development of bottom-up civil society led policy instruments (e.g. Family Farming Policies in Latin America), the implementation of projects by international organizations (e.g., the World Bank, the Interamerican Development Bank, European Union), the functioning of multi-stakeholder partnerships and Global Programmes (e.g. on Cybercrime, or Ending Child Marriage), the international (un)coordination for responses to crises (e.g., the WHO role in Covid-19, foreign aid assistance for the War on Ukraine), the evaluation of peacekeeping operations, setting global agendas (such as the SDGs or the Paris Agreement), etc. These are only a few of the current examples of public policy processes involving a transnational dimension.

The panel continues a discussion that will take place at the Conference On Policy Process Research to be held in Denver and we expect to compile a special issue from papers submitted to the panel.

? We invite papers which explore the panel's overarching questions from a theoretical, methodological, and empirical perspective.

? We welcome innovative and interdisciplinary papers from a range of different disciplines including political science, sociology, international relations, political geography, political demography to understand the transnational policy processes.

? To be selected, the papers will need to focus on the transnational dimensions of policy process.

- The panel will have Diane Stone (European University Institute) and Leslie Pal (Hamad Bin Khalifa University).

T01P13 / Transnational Policy Process

Chair : Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)
Second Chair : Cecilia Osorio Gonnet (Universidad de Chile)
Third Chair : Laura Rahm (European University Institute)
Fourth Chair : Raul Pacheco-Vega (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Mexico)

Session 1 International organizations and the transnational policy process

Tuesday, June 27th 13:30 to 15:30 (KHE121)

Discussants

Leslie Pal (Hamad Bin Khalifa University)

Cecilia Osorio Gonnet (Universidad de Chile)

The OECD and Brazil: Cooperation, Policy Transfer and Resistance

Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)

The relationships between the OECD and Brazil date back to the early 1990's, until in 2017 a formal request for accession was sent to the Paris-based organization. We review the past thirty years of cooperation, marked by distinct rhythms, more or less intense depending on the attitude and preferences of the different Brazilian governments. We shall address three questions: how has the relation between Brazil and the OECD evolved? What are the conditions that were required in order for Brazil to start the accession? Which forces facilitated and constrained such process? Turning to the dimensions of the engagement of Brazil with the OECD, the paper focuses on foreign policy and international cooperation, policy transfer and political resistance. Using data from official documents, specialized literature and media, I process-trace the trajectory of the Brazilian engagement with the OECD and evaluate the relationship.

Cultural Multipositionality, a Resource for Transnational Public Policy Processes?

Mireille Manga (IRIC, University of Yaoundé II)

Recent developments in global public policy and transfer studies (Stone & Moloney, 2019; Oliveira, 2021; Hadjiisky, Pal and Walker, 2017; Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000) have helped to advance the reflection on the micro and micro-macro-interactions embedded in public policies. However, the foreign policy perspective on the micro-macro strategic sociocultural roles played by global social actors such as diasporas in the transnational policymaking process has received little attention. This paper would like to contribute to covering such a gap by analyzing the strategic national-structural and cultural role of diasporas in micro-development programs in Cameroon through the concept of cultural multipositionality. Multipositionality retrieves policy interactions from national-bounded and global areas of cultural knowledge production and delivery (see Stone, 2004 ; Stone & Moloney, 2019 ; Fischer, 2009 ; see also Manga Edimo, 2021) to insert the symbolic and strategic resources of diasporas in transnational policy processes. Diasporas' participation in local funding, co-construction and implementation of development policies are crucial in the analysis and understanding of domestic policy transfer. While in migration studies, multipositionality highlights migrants' mobility between physical locations and shifting social (and cultural) positions (Chung, 2017; Gupta-Wright, 2019), foreign policy studies explain the strategic macro-micro relations between diasporas and their home nation-states. Unlike international transfer studies that regarded transnational policy transactions by separating bottom and top-level transfer activities, this paper shows the multiscalar, interdependent levels of transnational policy processes (see Manga Edimo, 2021) through diasporas' multipositionality. Diasporas operate as sociocultural, economic, and human agencies that suggest ideas, co-construct their feasibility, and negotiate public projects and programs transfer in their regions of origin. They also co-lead and implement local development programs, thanks to their foreign experiences, innovative cultural knowledge, vital cultural and political ties with home countries and political

agents (Manga Edimo, 2011; Bordes-Benayoun & Schnapper, 2006) and concrete local and domestic needs. Therefore, they are a practical epistemological approach to multipositionality and transnationality in policy studies operated by looking at "in-between" nation-states' borders (Bhabba, 2013; Peggy, 2001).

References:

Bhabha, H. (2013). In between cultures. New Perspectives Quarterly, 30(4), 107-109.

Bordes-Benayoun, C., & Schnapper, D. (2006). Diasporas et nations. Odile Jacob.

Chung, H. (2017). Rural migrants in villages-in-the-city in Guangzhou, China: Multi-positionality and negotiated living strategies. Urban Studies, 55(10), 2245-2260.

De Oliveira, O. P. (Ed.). (2021). Handbook of policy transfer, diffusion and circulation. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Dolowitz, D. P., & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy?making. Governance, 13(1), 5-23.

Edimo, M. M. (2021). Expertise on the Anglophone crisis in Cameroon: A hybrid cultural boundary approach. International Review of Public Policy, 3(3.3).

Fischer, F. (2009). Democracy and expertise: Reorienting policy inquiry. OUP Oxford.

Gupta-Wright, M. (2019). Multi-positionality and 'Inbetweenness': Reflections on Ethnographic Fieldwork in Southern Eastern Malawi. In The Politics of Conducting Research in Africa (pp. 53-73). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. (pp. 53-73). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Hadjiisky, M., Pal, L. A., & Walker, C. (Eds.). (2017). Public policy transfer: Micro-dynamics and macro-effects. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Manga Edimo, R. M. (2011). La citoyenneté virtuelle des immigrés camerounais de France : Technologies de l'information et de la communication et participation politique (Doctoral dissertation, Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Yaoundé II).

Moloney, K., & Stone, D. (2019). Beyond the state: Global policy and transnational administration. International Review of Public Policy, 1(1: 1), 104-118.

Levitt, P. (2001). The transnational villagers. Univ of California Press.

The Social Origins of Informal Cooperation

Charles Roger (Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals)

This paper explores the drivers behind the growth of informal IOs in the global political arena. In recent years, several different approaches have been advanced to understand this shift, including functionalist, power-based, and domestic politics-oriented explanations. So far, though, constructivist accounts have largely been absent from this discourse. Some scholars working in this theoretical vein have begun to conceptualize informal cooperation as a distinct international practice and asserted that ideas can matter for questions about the legal design of IOs. But it remains unclear exactly whether and how the practice of informality has spread and what causal mechanism explain the patterns we see. In this paper, I argue that states have learned to use informality, developing a repertoire of relevant knowledge and skills, and that that this learning frequently occurs through joint membership and regular interactions within organization between more and less experienced users of informal IOs. After presenting the theoretical framework, I offer qualitative evidence in line with this theory, illustrating the main mechanisms I identify. In the final section, I then test the generalizability of this theory through a quantitative analysis of membership in informal IOs.

Human rights bureaucrats in the transnational policy process: from norm diffusion to bureaucratic values in Brazil

Michelle Morais de Sa e Silva (The University of Oklahoma)

Bridging disciplinary silos is often a challenge for academics. Interdisciplinary dialogue among international relations, public policy, and specialized fields such as human rights has not been different. This paper proposes to embrace that challenge by drawing from the nascent literature on the transnational policy process; the established literature on human rights norms and the spiral model of the norm life cycle; and insights from public administration on bureaucratic values. Those will inform the analysis of the stance and work of "human rights bureaucrats" in Brazil. Based on this case, the article will propose an analytical framework on the transnational "norm-bureaucrat-policy" model, which identifies bureaucrats as nodal agents for both the norm life cycle and the transnational policy process. The paper will highlight the

relevance of addressing the policy process as embedded in transnational dynamics while constituted by the agency of individuals such as bureaucrats.

Case selection was purposive, rather than random. Brazil has a history of significant engagement with the international human rights system and of multiple practices of policy transfer and circulation, hence allowing the researcher to observe and analyze Brazil's engagement with both the transnational policy process and international human rights norms.

The paper is based on data from a research project on human rights bureaucrats in Brazil, which involved a mixed-methods design. Data collection began with a 45-question survey distributed electronically to former and current federal officials in Brazil. It used a snowball sample due to difficulties of reaching a random representative sample—employee personal data cannot be disclosed by Brazilian authorities. A total of 342 participants responded the survey. In the second phase, survey respondents were invited to a follow-up interview. A total of 129 respondents participated in in-depth interviews of 1.5 hour. Although the data does not originate from a statistically representative sample, data collected from a group of 342 participants from various federal careers working across numerous federal institutions has led to findings that can better situate bureaucrats within norm diffusion and the transnational policy process.

T01P13 / Transnational Policy Process

Chair : Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)
Second Chair : Cecilia Osorio Gonnet (Universidad de Chile)
Third Chair : Laura Rahm (European University Institute)
Fourth Chair : Raul Pacheco-Vega (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Mexico)

Session 2Global Public Policies and transnational policy processes

Wednesday, June 28th 08:00 to 10:00 (KHE121)

Discussants

Diane Stone (European University Institute)

Raul Pacheco-Vega (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Mexico)

Blackholes of Law and Accountability? The Law in Global Policy and Transnational Administration

Kim Moloney (Hamad Bin Khalifa University)

Tim Legrand (University of Adelaide)

This paper will establish that while the law does interact with global governance actors, its presence varies. This extends to the actors for whom this Special Issue is focused: corporations, transnational public-private partnerships, transgovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, citizen activists, and charitable foundations. Via a comparative case study of each actor category within transnational administration and its policy creation, we will place actors on a continuum between state-like legal frameworks (e.g., NGOs, some foundations, transgovernmental networks) to transnational legal frameworks often separated from state-created judicial apparatus (transnational public-private partnerships – Kimberley Process, certain global associations – FIFA, and multinational corporations who bypass state courts and public viewing via mediation), the implications for policy and its accountability will be established. Our analytical framework will engage questions of judicial publicness (e.g., proceedings open, run by state actor or non-state actor), its basis of law (e.g., de jure or de facto authority along with soft law versus hard law), variance in remedies if a transnational actor is found guilty, any due process challenges, and questions of timeliness. Although our paper will discuss its own case studies, this introduction to the SI will include any other relevant case studies within the articles by its authors. This introductory set-up allows us to make an important contribution, frame the SI, and to reflect on any accountability or transparency challenges common to the SI and its articles within our new transnational administrative and global policy order.

Transnational policy transfer and Social Network Analysis: An emerging methodology

Christopher Walker (Australia and New Zealand School of Government)

This paper explores the use of Social Network Analysis (SNA) as a methodology in the analysis and critique of policy transfer. Social Network Analysis (SNA) is a methodology that centres networks as the main structure of social systems, foregrounding relationships between actors (or 'nodes') that can be individuals, organisations, collectives or other entities (Knoke & Yang, 2008; Krackhardt, 1987; Wellman, 1983). The scale of networks can vary, ranging from small groups of people to international networks. Proponents of this theory study the relationships (or 'links') between actors, analysing the positions of actors within the network (Kilduff & Krackhardt, 2008; Scott, 2013; Victor et al., 2016). SNA has been applied in a diversity of fields. Significant work has examined political networks and there exist numerous studies analysing the network features of various policy domains (Ingold et al., 2021; Knoke, 1996; Victor et al., 2016). This includes, for example the analysis of networks of organisations, cities and nations responding to climate change (Brown et al., 2016; Kammerer & Namhata, 2018; Lee & van de Meene, 2012); public health policy (Contandriopoulos et al., 2017; Gautier et al., 2020), criminology (Bright et al., 2019; 2011; Morselli, 2009;

Natarajan, 2006) and human rights (Lazer, 2012; Murdie, 2014). This paper aims to provide a review of the literature where SNA has been utilised to explore cases of transnational policy transfer. In doing this the aim is to draw out the benefits and the challenges such an approach brings to understanding transnational and domestic policy transfer.

One of the strengths of SNA is that it can be used to study the flow of information and knowledge through a social network, information particularly pertinent in policy transfer studies (Walker and Moulis, 2022). The creation of sociograms provide visual maps of connections which provide further insight into the patterns of interaction and the dynamics côte clusters that interact and share information. Sophisticated SNA analysis provides quantitative scores of network density, degree centrality, betweenness and other measurements which reveal further understandings of how actors may be engaged in policy transfer (Borgatti et al., 2018; Knoke & Yang, 2008). This paper highlights a relatively new and burgeoning field of methodological analysis that provides greater quantitative insight into the understanding of policy transfer. As Pal and Spence (2020, p. 7) note, SNA methodologies combined with qualitative approaches can 'make an advance in the analysis of global policy networks, and get better purchase on policy transfer through these networks'.

This paper reveals that not only does policy transfer remain an enduring field of analysis that seeks to capture the dynamic nature of transnational policy work, the methodological analysis of how we might understand policy transfer is also expanding and drawing new insights into this dynamic process. This review makes clear the wide-ranging applicability of SNA as a methodology in both qualitative and quantitative policy transfer studies. The author hopes that by carrying out this review readers may glean new ideas for how SNA might be used in future investigations into the transnational dimensions of policy-making.

Evaluation: The "Achilles' Heel" of Global Programmes

Laura Rahm (European University Institute)

Global Programmes play important roles in the transnational policy process: they promote knowledge transfer and policy change across diverse jurisdictions; they pool resources and expertise across countries, agents, and sectors to address the pressing issues of our time. Despite their rapid rise and growing number, these global partnerships have been chronically understudied, particularly with regards to their efficacy. This communication speaks to the panel's overarching question on the transnational policy process by providing novel empirical insights into the function and efficacy of global programmes. How are global programmes monitored and evaluated? How effective are they in reaching their goals? To illuminate these questions, this communication uses the UN-led Global Programme to End Child Marriage, the Joint Programme to Eliminate Female Genital Mutilation, and the Global Programme on Addressing Gender-biased Sex Selection and related harmful practices as case studies. It draws from expert interviews, programme files and impact evaluations, as well as secondary demographic data, to inform about the advances and challenges in assessing global policy interventions to eliminate harmful practices. It finds that the weakest point, the "Achilles' heel" of global programmes is linked to the attribution problem, the inability to causally connect (global) policy to (demographic) outcomes. This presentation points to the latest efforts including Bayesian modeling and enhanced monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of complex behavior and social norms change interventions to overcome existing challenges.

Translating agroecology in West Africa: actors' dynamics in policy framing and implementation

Carolina Milhorance (CIRAD)

The multilevel and cross-border nature of environmental challenges has been object of a large body of scholarship. Governance mechanisms have arisen in an ad hoc and fragmented manner, in response to the emergence of environmental issues on the political agenda (Alger & Dauvergne, 2020; Dunoff, 2008). The global effects of environmental degradation have been increasingly addressed through a sense of urgency, whereas reflecting context-sensitive and territorialized processes. In this sense, the internationalization and transformation of norms and ideas into domestic policies and instruments is a key subject. By drawing on the notion of translation, this article seeks to elucidate the role of local agency in the transnational policy process (Stone, 2012; Hassenteufel & Zeigermann, 2021; Milhorance & Hassenteufel, forthcoming). It analyses the consequences of knowledge framing, with narratives and counternarratives shifting understandings and meanings across time, and the implementation processes.

This article presents a comparative case study conducted in West Africa. It addresses the emergence of organic agriculture and agroecology strategies in international arenas and the dynamics of translation in Senegal, Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire. Despite its global reach, the meaning and territorialization of

agroecology in Latin America, Europe, and Africa varies drastically. This is an evolving, plastic notion, subject to interpretation struggles (Giraldo and Rosset). It can be conceptualized as a "territory in dispute", in which political actors struggle in both the material (access to resources, land, water, inputs) and immaterial (discourses, narratives, ideologies) arenas. The study draws on qualitative in-depth research both in these countries and in international organizations. It addresses the interaction of state and non-state actors in the international circulation, institutionalization, and implementation processes.

T01P13 / Transnational Policy Process

Chair : Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)

Second Chair : Cecilia Osorio Gonnet (Universidad de Chile)

Third Chair : Laura Rahm (European University Institute)

Fourth Chair : Raul Pacheco-Vega (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Mexico)

Session 3Transnational Policy Transfer in Diverse Policy Spaces

Wednesday, June 28th 15:50 to 17:50 (KHE121)

Discussants

Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)

Laura Rahm (European University Institute)

(Virtual) The National Recovery and Resilience plans: towards a next generation of fiscal coordination?

Matilde Ceron (European University Institute)

The timely and ambitious EU response to Covid-19 challenges the thus far poor track record of economic crisis management. Next Generation EU (NGEU), with as its main component the Recovery and Resilience facility (RRF), reflects unprecedented solidarity through common financing paired with an innovative governance framework for one of the original sins of the EMU architecture – economic coordination. We examine whether the RRF is an effective mechanism for the transnational coordination of fiscal policies between EU member states and whether policy change reflects within member states domestic fiscal policy agendas. Based on theories of monetary integration combined with the literature on emergency politics, we test whether functional pressures trump national governmental priorities in the formulation phase of the recovery plans. To assess the extent to which the national recovery plans reflect policy change, we focus on the key priorities of the NGEU: digital, green and socially inclusive recovery. Using automated text analysis, we assess the saliency of green, digital and social priorities in (i) the recovery plans, (ii) the policy agenda of member state governments and (iii) the investment and reform agenda advocated by the European Commission through the 2019 Country Specific Recommendations. We provide preliminary evidence at the stage of the formulation of the plans as effective tools for economic policy coordination by testing policy change against national government priorities. This paper contributes to the assessment of how pandemic recovery instruments innovate the EMU architecture within a period of polycrisis and ongoing debate on reforming the EU fiscal framework.

The transnational governance of sovereign debt management

Filippo Silano (Universität Hamburg)

Since the late 1980s, due to increasing levels of outstanding debt, developed and developing countries have been undergoing an extensive overhaul in the management of government debt. Introducing reforms leading to the agencification and marketization of such dimension of statecraft, the state has been respectively enhancing its credibility towards global capital markets, and its efficiency in accessing funding. Targeting such policy domains, the wave of reforms is hence set in the broader phenomenon of state's financialization.

Stemming from such socio-economic developments, this article identifies the actors designing and steering the process of modernization of government debt management. Although scholars have focused on the implementation of reforms at the national level, the literature lacks of systematic analyses describing how transnational standards shaping modern public finance emerge. Filling such gap, this study provides an account of the actors, at the micro and macro level, formulating and advocating the implementation of

government debt management best practices in national jurisdictions.

Methodologically, the article draws on case studies, professionals' career data, and social network analysis aiming at identifying the most influential actors in the policy cycle, and how these carry out effective advocacy.

At the macro level, the study depicts a transnational network of multilateral financial institutions (e.g., the World Bank), international think tanks (e.g., the OECD), and private consultancies steering the state towards greater compliance with the principle of 'market discipline'. By the same token, the micro level analysis detects a global epistemic community guiding the government through the effective implementation of reforms.

The study contributes to the literature in the political economy of sovereign debt management, and, inductively, in transnational governance, by providing a case study on how global policy communities transfer technocratic recommendations across jurisdictions. Additionally, showing how international actors turn government debt management into a transnational policy domain, the study discusses the potential implications for democratic accountability.

Is it possible to analyze the Transnational Policy Process from AFC and IRT?

Henrique Oliveira (Universidade Salvador - Unifacs)

The ACF (Advocacy Coalition Framework) does not explicitly address international influence on the policy process, as highlighted by Henkins-Smith, Northstead, Weible and Ingold (2017). However, the public policy analysis must consider the external context within the current international environment marked by significant interdependence between nations and geopolitical disputes (Porto de Oliveira e Pal, 2018). Likewise, the transnational policy transfer studies lack conceptual innovations to analyze global coalitions (Porto de Oliveira e Pal, 2018).

Since 1950, the role of public power over people's lives sedimentation has occurred nationally and internationally in the direction of greater interdependence among countries. The expansion of the guarantee of rights via public policies and the creation of international organizations are examples of this.

Permanent international organizations replaced Ad hoc agreements and treaties with looser links and lower attendance costs. However, specific organizations were already a trend, especially on issues intrinsic to the international environment, such as transport, trade, and communication. Under Woodrow Wilson's aspiration, the League of Nations outlines an attempt to build a generic international organization to give predictability to the relations between states to provide peace within a bureaucratic routine of diplomacy. After the League of Nations implosion due to attacks, especially by the fascist governments, the UN emerged in the post-war period. The organization is also the primary vector for the decolonization of former colonies resulting from the dynastic imperialist order of the West itself. Concomitant to this process, countries at home, especially the Western bloc (the USA and Europe), were advancing with public policies to expand civil, political, and social rights.

Coalitions and ideas were disputed in these arenas, domestically and abroad, to the extent that protocols and objectives discussed in international relations were absorbed in the decision-making processes of public policies. On the other hand, Countries with diplomatic prominence began to guide these agendas through international institutions based on domestic issues. Domestic public issues become global problems, and global problems occupy domestic public agendas. Why wouldn't it be interesting to bring a dialogue between these pieces of literature if their themes are intertwined?

To specify the discussion: How do coalitions intertwine from the international to the domestic and from the domestic to the international?

So far, it is possible to identify epistemology convergence between the cognitive current of the Ernst Haas International Regime Theory (IRT) and the ACF. Both assume that actors have limited rationality and that a share of beliefs guides their actions over time. Those actors who share beliefs can become a coalition and coordinate the actions. According to Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993), if advocacy coalitions are starting points for the political subsystem, epistemic communities are also the fundamental unit analysis for the international regime in Haas's (1993) perspective. Therefore, changes in the actor's belief system may represent substantial policy and regime transformations. ACF would apply to IRT by systematizing the coalition's attributes. Furthermore, in a reverse way, IRT can contribute to understanding how international actors and their beliefs deal with the local advocacy coalitions.

Understanding differences in family policy development: under the magnifying glass of policy transfer

Martin Gurín (Universität Bremen)

In the last decades, family policy has been the subject of both large-scale challenges and reforms. The ideas of marketization, free choice, social investment, work-family balance and equal distribution of family-related tasks between women and men have proven influential across welfare states, even in those which have traditionally supported different or contradictory arrangements (Hemerijck, 2015). However, differences, often substantial, in the adaptation of these ideas and their related solutions among the welfare states can be observed (Lewis et al., 2008). These relate, for example, to the degree of state activism in updating family policy, on the one hand, to different policy instruments introduced, on the other. These differences are yet to be explained.

It is often argued that these family policy changes and different trajectories of change cannot be explained purely by political and socio-economic developments which occur within nation-states. They are to a large degree also shaped by international influences and relations which occur between nation-states. Exchanges between nation-states have therefore gained attention for having moved welfare policy research past the "methodological nationalism" (Obinger et al., 2013) that has characterized much of it up to the recent past.

Therefore, we ask ourselves: *in how far the concept of policy transfer helps us understand the differences in family policy developments among welfare states*. We take two welfare states under the magnifying glass of policy transfer: The Czech Republic and South Korea. Not only that these countries often happen to be outside the mainstream research, but both of them substantially differ in the trajectories of family policy developments - with Korea updating family policies more actively and comprehensively than its Central European counterpart.

The concrete investigation is done by tracking policy change (in the period 2000-2022) in the various subtypes of explicit family policy. An "integrated approach" analysing both transfers (child benefit, paternity and parental leave) as well as services (childcare and long-term care) is applied. To investigate whether policy transfers have taken place, we trace references to and overlaps with other countries and organizations in documents (for example, strategic policy documents, reform commissions, policy statements). Interviews and information inquiries were also conducted with representatives in ministries directly responsible for designing concrete policy reforms, and academic experts in the field. Here, policy transfers were clarified and domestic political alignments and cultural contexts were further investigated.

Our examination of the nature of change in policy goals finds that developments in both countries share profound similarities – the promotion of work/family balance, free choice and gender equality. This seems to be attributable to the role of international organizations in disseminating these social policy paradigms. The Czech Republic, however, lags behind Korea in family policy reforms and fundamentally differs in the introduced family policy instruments. This seems to be related to differences in transferring policies, in which Korea actively searched for the best solutions across welfare states of various family policy regimes, whereas the Czech Republic found inspiration in "close" welfare states' policies only, having difficulties in transferring foreign paradigms and instruments.