International Dimensions and Dynamics of Policy-Making

Dr. Bimbo OGUNBANJO
Department of Government
Lagos State University
School of Basic and Advanced Studies
     Lagos, Nigeria

Summary:

 The days when policy researchers could count upon domestic politics and society to contribute sufficient data for a satisfactory analysis are now a memory. Whether policy researchers are prepared to enter another analytical universe or not, the accelerating flow of ideas, information, goods and money across national borders has affected the nature of policy problems, reshaped the attempts to engage these problems and thus reoriented the way in which explanations of policy-making can be productively pursued. The big questions that animate policy studies may not have changed, but the available data and the concepts needed to analyze them have been shifting. This paper will seek to connect these emerging global dynamics to long recognized drivers of policy-making and present a conceptual framework that can help in understanding the resulting interactions. Enhancing the linkage between theoretical frameworks that have informed international relations and public policy concepts promises a better understanding of policy-making in a volatile universe. This paper will consider the value of applying a network perspective on understanding global influences through four stages of consideration. Initially it will examine the concept of globalization and briefly assess the implications that it raises for studying policy-making. Next, the paper will turn to the literature on policy communities and policy networks to highlight tools that can be used in assessing global influences on policy subsystems. Then, it will consider the concept of policy paradigms and contemplate the role that ideational influences play in modulating global impacts on policy. Finally, a fourfold typology of internationalized policy environments will be presented, in order to illuminate how particular configurations of policy communities and networks can refract the global influences on governance. In conclusion, the dynamic role of policy community mediators in trying to steer subsystem responses to global forces will briefly be considered.

Introduction

 Throughout the past few decades, one of the fields in the social sciences that has advanced the most quickly has been the study of public policy, particularly the techniques of policy analysis. Policy analysis was developed to help

people make better decisions about policies and to give them trustworthy information about important social and economic issues. Policy analysis is described by Akinbobola (2021: 35) as "an applied social science subject that uses a variety of methods of inquiry and argumentation to produce and transform information that is important to policy and may be used in political settings to address policy challenges."

It was in America that public policy analysis first gained traction. The Netherlands and Britain are two notably significant examples of countries in Europe that have adopted the specialization since then. Canada and an increasing number of other nations have also done so. Furthermore, an increasing number of academics, particularly young academics, in Europe have started to associate themselves with policy analysis. In fact, a large number of them have significantly advanced the field.

Although policy advice-giving is as old as government itself, the complexity of modern society has drastically increased the demand for information among decision-makers. Complex social and political realities are combined with high-level technical expertise in policy decisions, but creating public policy has its own set of challenges. According to some academics, policy is simply anything the government decides to do or not do. Others have provided definitions that are more detailed and concentrate on the unique traits of public policy. Public policy is described as "an officially proclaimed objective backed by a sanction, which might be a reward or a punishment" by Lowi and Ginsburg (2006: 607), for instance. As a course of action (or inaction), a public policy can take the form of "a law, a rule, a statute, an edict, a regulation or an order."

The writings of Harold Lasswell, who is regarded as the father of the policy sciences, are typically cited as the source of the policy focus. Lasswell envisioned a multidisciplinary organization that could direct the political decision-making of industrial civilizations after World War II (Abioye 2022). He demanded research into how "knowledge in and of the policy process" functions. The term "project" referred to a broad field of social science whose objective is to adapt democratic procedures to the conditions of a developing techno-industrial society. The field was expected to draw on a variety of specializations, including political science, sociology, anthropology, psychology, statistics, and mathematics, as well as occasionally even the physical and natural sciences. It was to employ both quantitative and qualitative methods.

But, the policy-analytic business mainly failed to adopt Lasswell's audacious goal and instead developed along a far more constrained course. Today's policy analysis has a management practices-focused empirical orientation rather than a focus on supporting democratic government in general (Ahmed and Vogenbeck 2020). The discipline has been formed by a more constrained methodological

framework stemming from the neopositivist/empiricist theories of knowledge that predominated the social sciences of the time, as opposed to a multidisciplinary methodological viewpoint. Due to this, there is now more emphasis on thorough quantitative analysis, the objective separation of facts and values, and the pursuit of generalizable conclusions whose validity would be independent of the specific social context from which they were obtained. In other words, the constrained framework develops into a policy science that might produce broad rules applicable to a variety of issues and situations. This has been fueled in large part by the field's development being dominated by economics and its positivist scientific approaches.

This modern approach to policy has, for the most part, been very successful. Not only does policy analysis play a significant role in the social sciences, but it is also frequently used in politics and other governmental and political organizations. Policy analysts work as researchers in government agencies at all levels of government, in think tanks for public policy, research institutes, consulting businesses, interest group associations, and nongovernmental organizations, in addition to academics. They are increasingly used in the public affairs divisions of large corporations to track and study economic and regulatory trends (Baoku 2022: 211).

But the discipline has not been without its challenges. It has frequently come under fire for failing to generate a wealth of knowledge focused on solving problems that have a direct impact on the formulation of policies, or what has been called "usable knowledge." Studies revealed that empiricist policy research was utilized far less than anticipated in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Only about a third of the administrators who got such information could name a specific use for it, according to research on the application of policy results. Ironically noting that a cost-benefit economist would struggle to explain why so much work had been put into an activity with such little result, Eniafe and Adejuwon (2021: 220-221) summarized this.

This is not to suggest that policy research has not had an impact, but it has not always provided the knowledge that was intended, namely knowledge that can be used to solve problems. The contribution has frequently served more as an enlightenment function, encouraging citizens to consider important concerns but not always finding solutions. Others have looked in new avenues as a result of these issues. They have highlighted the naturally normative and interpretive character of policy challenges by taking a closer look at the nature of social problems and its epistemological implications for a policy science. Such researchers remarked that political and social values are deeply ingrained in policy analysis and policy outcomes, necessitating the subject to be open to a variety of various types of topics and methodologies. As a result, deliberative policy analysis and policy debate have become more popular. The neopositivist or empiricist perspective that has molded

the field is contested by this viewpoint, which contends that it cannot create the kinds of information required for policymaking on its own. A stronger normative focus that integrates empirical and normative investigation is required.

The days when domestic politics and society could provide policy scholars with enough data for a satisfying analysis are now a distant memory. The accelerating flow of ideas, information, goods, and money across national borders has changed the nature of policy problems, reshaped attempts to engage these problems, and consequently reoriented the way in which explanations of policy-making can be productively pursued, whether or not policy researchers are willing to enter another analytical universe. Although the underlying issues that drive policy studies may not have changed, the information that is available and the concepts that are required to assess it have. In order to better understand the interactions that result, this paper will attempt to link recently emerging global dynamics to previously understood policy-making causes. A better understanding of policy-making in a dynamic world is promised by strengthening the connections between theoretical frameworks that have influenced international relations and public policy ideas.

There is still a knowledge gap between the conclusions reached by those who attempt to explain policy-making on its own terms and those who are more interested in examining the transnational forces that have emerged in recent years, despite the growing awareness of globalization's influence on many aspects of policymaking. While international relations experts may be more adept at determining how cross-border exchanges impact politics, they are also less likely to focus on illuminating the inner workings of a policy subsystem. Those who are interested in issues of global conflict and governance may find these sectoral views to be mundane.

Instead, in order to have a better knowledge of how exogenous factors can change the authoritative dynamics inside a domain, students of public policy may be highly driven to think about how global dynamics affect policy-making within a subsystem. The conceptual skills necessary to incorporate a global interplay of policy inputs into the functioning of a specific subsystem, however, are likely to be lacking in academics who have been trained to examine policy-making in a single government or administration or possibly to compare those efforts. So, it appears that expanding the capacity of the policy researcher to evaluate these exogenous forces from a global viewpoint is the most promising method for measuring the effects of global influences on policy subsystems. The chances of a constructive conversation between policy studies and international relations may be improved by expanding the capacity of policy researchers to more effectively analyze international interactions. Researchers working on international political issues may become increasingly interested in engaging discoveries regarding how global

dynamics affect policy subsystems as policy studies have more to say about the growing global impacts and interactions.

Concepts that have been created to analyze meso-level political linkages between the state and society will be used in this analysis of how to take into consideration global dynamics in policy studies. Identification of actor configurations and their categorization into a typology of policy communities are part of this tradition (i.e. ranging from the collaborative partnerships of corporatism to the competitive advocacy of pluralism). The literature on policy networks has more complex classifications of authority, and as the range of these relationships has grown, the term "governance network" has been proposed. Because they rely on relational measures of authority, these methods for examining cross-organizational and cross-jurisdictional policy dynamics can be particularly useful in evaluating global effects on policy-making. A next conceptual step is to evaluate these interactions on a global scale. In contrast to certain conceptual approaches, the analytical abilities that are obtained by studying policy networks and communities could be easily expanded to studying global forces affecting policy.

In four steps, the importance of using a network viewpoint to comprehend global influences will be examined in this paper. It will first look at the idea of globalization and quickly evaluate the consequences it has for researching policy-making. In order to emphasize approaches for evaluating global influences on policy subsystems, this paper will then turn to the literature on policy communities and policy networks. After that, it will reflect on the idea of policy paradigms and examine how ideational influences affect global policy impacts. To show how specific configurations of policy communities and networks might reflect the global effects on governance, a four-part typology of internationalized policy settings will next be given. The dynamic function of policy community mediators in attempting to direct subsystem responses to external stimuli will be briefly discussed in the end.

Searching for Policy Justifications

From the middle of the 20th century, the political divisions that have shaped many analyses of policy-making are less definite now than they have ever been. Due to their perceived lack of influence on the policy subsystems within a given jurisdiction, political factors and forces that were once safely excluded from study of policy must now be taken into account in ways that take into account modern reality without hopelessly clogging the scope of an investigation. Cerny (1995) argued that international forces have altered how states operate when they make policy by giving decision-makers cues that are equal to or more powerful than the domestic institutions and interests that, in the past, determined both the political calculus and the substantive evaluation of policy options. When he originally made them, his claims were startling, but they now seem obvious in the early twenty-first century. For instance, when the US surface transportation subsystem was managed

by an organized domestic group of interests and institutions, American automakers had long successfully fought changes to fuel economy rules (Perl and Dunn 2007). Following the 2008 global financial crisis, the US government increased the fuel economy criteria for cars by a significant amount. A multibillion-dollar bailout that prevented the liquidation of both General Motors and Chrysler created the opportunity for technical standards to be changed in ways that were previously unthinkable for business executives in the domestic sector. In this case, the foreign forces influencing policy changed drastically because their impact was concentrated in a global financial crisis, but many subsystems also had less dramatic international influence changes.

Even cultural traits that historically influenced the ideals that underpinned various traditions of the state in policymaking have becoming more difficult to operationalize as independent variables (Dyson 2020). State-specific views on the function of government no longer offer a clear and consistent policy orientation, from the social welfare traditions of Nordic states to the neoliberalism adopted by Anglo-American polities. Instead, virtual communities of interest disseminate concepts and values throughout global social networks at the same time that supranational organizations create overtly global values that promote policy-making convergence.

It is hardly unexpected that international relations specialists have been highlighting the global influences on policy-making for a while now. International economic and political interactions have been characterized as being driven by "interdependence," which was first recognized in the 1970s (Keohane and Nye 2007). In a concept he called the "second image-reversed," Gourevitch (2008) presented an explanation of how these international dynamics may directly effect domestic politics, which would then have an impact on foreign policies. By his "two-level games" approach on policy negotiations in the international arena, Robert Putnam (2008) shown how this dynamic extends from domestic politics into policy-making. While this focus on the functioning of formal governing arrangements across political boundaries gave rise to this attention to international policy influences, a more locally relevant line of thought in policy studies has sought to understand how societal forces can influence policy when they cross organizational boundaries. "Globalization" has become a widely used term in this broader discussion of transnational political forces to refer to economic, political, and cultural influences that cut across borders, including those of formal state structures as well as societal organizations like corporations and virtual networks. According to Held, this globalization is the stretching and deepening of social relations and institutions across space and time such that, on the one hand, daily activities are increasingly influenced by events occurring on the other side of the world and, on

the other hand, local groups' and communities' practices and decisions can have significant global repercussions (2015: 20).

The functions and practices of policy subsystems have changed as a result of this globalization. Less stable relationships between actors and less predictable actions at various stages of the policy cycle are likely to result from the expansion of the range of ideas and interests interacting within the subsystem caused by policy inputs from subnational, national, regional, and international levels (Akinbobola 2021: 222; Abioye 2022: 118-119; Baoku 2022: 302). Since the deregulation of capital flows in the 1980s and the subsequent impact of global financial considerations that have played out inside almost every policy subsystem, this expansion of global impacts can be witnessed. The majority of governments have attempted to collaborate at various levels, from informal communication and information sharing (such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) to the development of supranational currencies and reserve banks, in response to the need to engage with these global financial dynamics (e.g. the Euro and European Central Bank). Due to the rising transnationalization of the economic "fundamentals" influencing many policy contexts, these initiatives have enhanced global implications on policy subsystems.

There are few, if any, domains that have not been impacted by this erasure of political boundaries, even though the implications of globalization differ between subsystems. The globalization of conflict and terrorism has an impact on all subsystems supporting "fundamental" aspects of state sovereignty, including the military and national security. The international military operation that ended Libya's civil war in 2011 is an example of how global forces have an impact on at least two different levels. Global communications and social media, on the one hand, inspired uprisings against despotic governments all throughout the Arab world. On the other hand, countries that had not previously allied in the Middle East military action jointly adopted a side in the Libyan conflict, partially in response to local calls that the Qaddafi counteroffensive must not crush democratic ambitions and human rights (Eniafe and Adejuwon 2021: 115-117).

As governments have more or less publicly pooled their sovereignty to confront environmental, financial, trade, and other policy concerns, other policy subsystems have seen less dramatic but no less significant changes from beyond their boundaries. More porous political boundaries have allowed ideas, information, and interests that had not previously had a direct impact on the players and organizations to enter each of these various cases where global factors have altered the interaction of ideas and interests inside a policy subsystem. A different form of change that has affected the nature of policy-making in recent years is mirrored and frequently stimulated by this increasing intrusion of global influences into a policy subsystem. The laws and customs that previously separated the responsibilities of

civil society actors in a policy subsystem from those of public authorities have also evolved, with a tendency to obfuscate the line between the public and private spheres of duty. It is no longer possible to rely on the public-private interaction to follow Weberian administration principles. The rearrangement of activities and connections between the public and private sectors has forced public policy scholars to create their own conceptions and analytical tools, ushering in a post-Weberian era in which governments make decisions through governance (Kooiman 2018; Ahmed and Vogenbeck 2020: 336).

Policy studies have expanded into the more interactive and contingent deliberations taking place in governance networks in order to assess the potentials and pitfalls of policy-making that unfold beyond the bureaucracy's formal accountability for translating democratically attained decisions into policy outcomes. Researchers such as Rhodes (2006) suggested that societies were seeing a new mode of policy-making in which governance provided the capacity for "managing without government". So, scholars who study how policy communities and policy networks have altered how policy is formed are increasingly familiar with examining political dynamics that cross the border between the state and society. The abilities required to expand such analysis to understand the political implications of globalization on policy can be developed using this strategy.

It is necessary to have some strong guiding principles when analyzing how these connections are maintained because the interactions between the state and society have become more complicated as their boundaries have blurred. In 2009, Coleman and Perl developed two conceptual axes that can help people navigate the complex web of governance and globalization issues. They start by highlighting the level and patterns of relationship integration among policy players. The scope and mode of power sharing between state and civil society actors is then highlighted. Since these dimensions are interrelated, it is essential to prevent ambiguity by connecting each axis to a recognized analytical perspective in the investigation of meso-level policy-making. The policy community perspective can represent the interaction of people and organizations within a specific governance system by concentrating on participants (Coleman and Skogstad 2018; Baoku 2022). The idea of a policy network will also characterize the institutional aspect in which members of the policy community might share public authority, much like van Waarden did (2012).

The cognitive and discursive area where issues are problematized as suitable or inappropriate subjects of public discourse is described as the policy community. Unlike in the past, when such discussions focused on the benefits and drawbacks of adding a problem to the public policy agenda, which then prompted a government to begin developing and implementing a plan of action, the trend toward governance has caused policy communities to continue to be actively

involved in efforts to pursue policy options over time, albeit to varying degrees. One of two distinguishing aspects of policy communities is the degree of integration, which is governed by the border rules within those communities. According to the nature and application of the norms that define size (Jordan and Schubert 2002), openness (Hassenteufel 2017), and membership stability, boundaries might be more or less restricted (Le Gales and Thatcher 2017). These regulations also affect the volume and type of information sent (Laumann and Knoke 2017).

The degree of shared values and norms among its members is a key component of a policy community's border definition. In Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith's (2018) "Advocacy Coalition Framework," which focuses participants on a shared understanding of problems and draws them into shared political pursuit of a chosen solution, the most well-developed conceptualization of such ideational linkages can be found. A policy community's personality can be significantly impacted by the number of advocacy coalitions and the connections between their favored policy solutions. The "epistemic community" is a comparable idea that has been proposed by international relations scholarship (Haas 2019). Here, rather than more subjective opinions, it is seemingly objective expertise that binds policy actors into shared understanding and cross-national cooperation.

Policy scholars have been able to connect the participants' mental states to their interactions both inside and outside the policy community, and then correlate these relationships with actual policy orientations by defining the boundaries of policy communities and then examining what happens inside these spaces. The likelihood of collaborative methods to policymaking increases with the degree of actor integration within a policy community, according to one significant finding from this line of inquiry. According to Scharpf (2019), more integrated policy communities can pursue policy options that go beyond the lowest common denominator and address the needs of a wider cross-section of policy actors than would be able to collaborate in less integrated contexts. This is in contrast to less integrated contexts, which are more likely to have a short-term focus and a zero-sum calculus of competition. Another conclusion is that the ideals and norms of a specific advocacy coalition or epistemic community will confer legitimacy on some actors while denying it to others once those groups have gained widespread recognition for their influence or knowledge (Smith 2005; Eniafe and Adejuwon 2021). As long as there is a value consensus, some policy choices will therefore be considered more valid than others. But when consensus within a policy community erodes, political conflict over options at each stage of policy-making can be expected.

The policy network perspective focuses on a limited resource that is crucial to overcoming the limitations posed by organizational interdependencies, technical difficulties, and factual uncertainties when analyzing the ways in which political

authority manifests itself in a policy subsystem. This perspective looks beyond the cognitive and discursive characteristics of policy community members. Power, in especially the power that derives either directly or indirectly from state sovereignty, is that resource. The ability to make decisions that are binding on the entire society based on the sovereign authority of government will have a significant impact on outcomes during the strategic maneuvering of policy actors, the sharing of information and ideas, and the negotiation of competing interests and perspectives. Even while this power may be divided among members of the policy community and delegated to them, power still has an impact on how policies are created. And it is due to these various power arrangements that certain configured policy networks can have a substantial influence on the policy-making process.

Policy network typologies have made it possible to advance governance study beyond the simple categorization of corporatism and pluralism (van Waarden 2012: 30; Abioye 2022: 286). With the merging of public and private roles in policy formulation and delivery, more detailed network designs like "state corporatism" and "clientelism" are able to capture the impact of delegating public authority to coalitions or to specific organizations within the policy community. The authoritative dynamics of transnational policy communities, in which public actors operating at various levels of government interact and share their authority over policy-making, can be sorted out with even greater precision. These communities may consist of a small group of societal actors and organizations or the entire population of public actors operating at various levels of government. More nuanced policy network categories can be more valuable in highlighting both the effectiveness and the accountability of specific governance modes the more hybridized such relationships become and the more policy-making dynamics blur the line between the public and private spheres of accountability.

Other structures that can integrate the ideas and interests of policy communities with the influence and power used in policy networks merit greater analytical attention in a world where some of the boundaries that used to matter most for policy-making—those between government and the private sector, and those separating one state's sovereignty from another—are no longer dominant. In attempts to understand policy-making, it is important to place more emphasis on the influence of ideas that cross state and social boundaries rather than on the forces of cohesion within policy subsystems that originate from formal state institutions. The core of a policy paradigm is these views about what needs to be done and how it should be done. As Peter Hall (2013) has shown, globally accepted paradigms like the function of monetary policy and the financial institutions that carry it out can have a greater impact than any government's formal ability to enact economic policy. As a result, policy paradigms provide an intellectual hub that can partially fill the function that state institutions and actors have traditionally played

in influencing the dynamics of policy subsystems. The policy paradigm will be examined in the part that follows as a conceptual framework that can provide direction for understanding a policy universe that now contains more diverse international forces than before.

How Policy Paradigms Steer Governance Networks

The amount of instability in policy-making has increased due to the increased volume and velocity of forces from the policy universe that are transferred into policy communities as a result of the increasing permeability of boundaries, both between nations and between the state and society. However this increased exposure to exogenous pressures has also facilitated the spread of a particular kind of ideas that might stabilize unstable governance networks by creating consensus among policy actors. Numerous scholars have noted the influence that a coherent set of ideas can exert in aligning the vision of policy actors toward a shared set of goals (Hall 2013; Jobert and Muller 2016; Shon and Rein 2016). The mainstay of policy practitioners' work is providing guidance on which issues are crucial and which ones are less significant, which policy instruments offer effective solutions for these issues and which do not, and what instrument settings could best fix a problem. The guiding assumptions behind such discussions are referred to as a "policy paradigm" by Hall (2013). These concepts are referred to as "policy frames" by Shon and Rein (2016), and a reference system that directs French policy-making is discussed by Jobert and Muller (2016). Each of these ideas emphasizes how a set of norms can direct policy communities toward related objectives and foster trust in the causal links that will lead community members to concur that particular instruments should be used in particular ways. These policy paradigms have an impact through conjuring "pictures" or "generative metaphors" that aid in the understanding of a complex and variable policy world by policy actors. Energy Security, Universal Health Care, and Free Trade are a few examples of such powerful images. Some policy players and their beliefs are given more legitimacy in the policymaking process by these concepts and images than can be mustered by other groups and people.

The spread of consistent, if not always convergent, policy paradigms has benefited from the speed and volume increase in communication across borders (Ahmed and Vogenbeck 2020). The emergence of a worldwide cadre of policy consultants who see financial incentives to market comparable solutions across a variety of policy jurisdictions has been one such vector (Perl and White 2012). The role of public and private financial institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund and financial rating agencies, which apply comparable measures of risk and efficacy to public policies and programs around the world, has also been a driving force for consistent thinking about how to approach problems. These and other inputs give policy makers clear signals to follow, incentives to do so, and potential

repercussions for deviating too much from the global agreement on the best course of action and solutions.

A policy paradigm will be generally adopted when these transmission mechanisms are effective, and the policy subsystem enters a state of political inertia. Policy communities reduce dialogue and participation in their specific policy domain, which frequently coincides with a transfer of authority from state actors to specific policy community participants. With the use of these rules of engagement, one policy community may be able to control all phases of the policy cycle, from agenda-setting to policy evaluation. The majority of the time, the players or advocacy coalitions that the policy paradigm gives legitimacy to end up being the main civil society actors that take part in important decisions, perform informal or formal oversight, and even provide program deliverables. As questions of day-to-day management and fine-tuning of policy instruments are recognized relevant themes for discourse, policy discourse becomes increasingly technical.

Nevertheless, the same exchange of ideas and information that can promote viewpoint consistency across political divides and across a significant number of policy actors in civil society can also erode the consensus that a policy paradigm had helped to establish. Experiences and concepts that defy conventional thought can be shared more quickly and widely than ever before, from the abrupt disclosure of private material through Wikileaks sources to the flash mobs that are organized to protest policy alternatives on Facebook and Twitter. When faced with such difficulties, policy-makers' first inclination is to turn inward toward the members of the policy community that they are most familiar with and ask for a slight modification to the methods that they are most accustomed to. In order to respond to a global perturbation on a second level, the state would have to alter its interactions with key players in the policy community. These modifications might take one of two paths. Either an expansion of the possible outcomes that could be deemed acceptable or the admission of additional actors into positions of authority. Alternately, the number of participants in the governance network may be reduced such that eventually a new paradigm can develop. The policy community may be better equipped to "handle" the process of policy change with such a revision of boundary rules and a reallocation of influence.

When neither of these attempts to change the policy paradigm within the policy community is successful, the discussion is likely to move from easily resolved disagreements to more heated arguments where an established policy paradigm is directly contested by an opposing paradigm. Political leaders will have to decide who to take as the final word when competing viewpoints are present, particularly when it comes to issues of technical credibility. In these conditions, it is highly possible that the policy community will engage in a political struggle over the pertinent issues (Hall 2013: 281). When there is such extensive disagreement on the

best course of action to take, political players from outside the policy community and from less well-known and less predictable areas of the policy universe become involved. Contributions from untapped sources of knowledge, such as those made by the "sub-elites" Etzioni-Halevy (2021: 194) identified as exerting influence by formulating alternate political options between political decision-making points (such as elections), will broaden the conversation and introduce fresh perspectives and viewpoints. Furthermore, the policy community would be subjected to more in-depth discussions regarding what should be done if the paradigmatic consensus that was established to exclude nonconforming ideas were to disappear. Political ideologies will compete to win over the hearts and minds of the policy community and the larger engaged public in these situations by professing universal principles to guide policy-making (Swidler 2006).

Changes in policy communities and networks will be more significant when there is such a wide-ranging disagreement over policy. The rules for appropriate language and action will become looser, if not completely suspended, which will lead to a drop in levels of integration among policy communities. As the intensity of the conflict rises, state actors may withdraw the authority they have granted to social players or transfer that authority from one group of actors to another. As a result, corporatist policy networks would be most susceptible to restructuring, whereas looser-knit issue networks would experience less change in their structure. The state may take the lead in restructuring a policy community and establishing a state-directed policy network if the amount of conflict rises above a certain threshold, which may differ across jurisdictions.

Generally speaking, the less likely it is that the policy community will be able to manage the full spectrum of change, the more polarized the disagreements over policy options will be. There will be many sources of input into the creation, implementation, and evaluation of policies, and there will be more opportunity for global participation at all phases of policy development. If the European Central Bank prescribes and proscribes fiscal options for nations like Greece, Portugal, and Ireland who are having difficulty refinancing their public debt, there may even be international confirmation of the policy. According to Jobert's (2019) examination of French policy paradigm shifts, policy actors' adherence to expert consensus evaporates and tends to break down in times of intense conflict as a result of conflicting interests and ideologies. When this occurs, the disparate inputs and unpredictable combinations of ideas and interests can resemble the "garbage can" model of policy-making proposed by Cohen, March, and Olsen in 2002.

Policy paradigms can thus offer a structure for managing the flood of ideas and information that inundates policy domains around the clock, 365 days a year, as the velocity and volume of global communication accelerates. Nevertheless, the same discourse channels and expert sources that frequently succeed in interpreting

and filtering the policy inputs in a way that concentrates policy communities on a single strategy can also discredit the consensus underlying a policy paradigm. The same policy actors who have supported open borders and international conventions may suddenly be upset by these same sources of input in this schizophrenic twist to policy formulation in an unpredictable environment. Under the influence of transnational ideas and information, structures such as policy communities and modalities of governance used in policy networks that had appeared perfectly effective inside a specific policy paradigm would swiftly deteriorate into confusion and conflict. When the global effects on policy-making switch from fostering consensus to undermining it, patterns and trajectories can be better understood by placing an explicit focus on supranational governance arrangements, or lack thereof. Such a framework for analyzing the impact of forces influencing supranational governance will be provided in the section that follows.

Internationalized Policy Environments' Mediating Effects

Policy community and policy network analytical methodologies are particularly suited to studying the factors that cross state borders as well as the barrier between the state and society because of their relational focus. It does not matter if there are established policy paradigms or if they are in flux; what matters is the extent to which policy communities and networks are taken into account when assessing the locus and distribution of authority, as well as the degrees of shared understanding and discourse.

Scaling up notions, which were created to look at policy-making at the national and subnational levels in order to understand the dynamics of supranational governance, have been met with skepticism by some (Kassim 2014). Because of its transnational dynamics, policies adopted by the European Union or efforts made by the UN to create legally binding accords on climate change, for instance, can present difficulties for meso-level research. Exogenous sources can produce uncontrollable bursts of disruptive information that can have unforeseen effects on the way policy groups and networks operate. Such instabilities within state-society connections, however, have not jeopardized studies of volatile political environments by the policy community and network. According to Risse-Kappen (2015), modern transnational governance arrangements feature the same kind of horizontal coordinating networks that span international boundaries in addition to erasing societal barriers.

Coleman and Perl (2009) advanced the idea of internationalized politics to investigate a context in which at least some stages of the policy cycle take place at a more comprehensive level than the nation-state. They did this by expanding the usefulness of policy community and network concepts into policy-making contexts that experience high levels of global influence. With this definition, internationalized policy environments can be classified based on the extent of

public sector activism and the institutionalization of supranational governance structures. Activism in the public sector refers to the active management of governance dynamics inside and among policy communities by elected officials and senior civil servants. When public sector activity is low, societal actors will manage governance through policy communities and networks, and when it is strong, politicians and senior civil employees will direct such governance.

The extent to which international institutions play a developed role in formulating policy represents the second aspect of internalized politics. International institutions are required by supranational law to provide a function in specific areas of policy. International organizations are better able to administer governance in policy communities and networks when they have a legal mandate. National policy actors will maintain greater liberty in responding to foreign influences where supranational rules do not explicitly define a role for international organizations. One can distinguish between the four ideal-typical internationalized policy environments by using these two characteristics of internationalized politics to examine how policy networks and communities are impacted by global forces. These are briefly described below.

When the levels of public sector activism and institutionalization of supranational governing arrangements are both high, policy-making will be characterized by a dynamic of multilevel governance (MLG). In places where MLG is common, like the European Union (EU), both national and supranational governments are well developed institutionally. As a result, politicians, bureaucrats, and civil society actors and organizations engage in a multitude of cooperative working arrangements that cross organizational boundaries and lead to well-integrated policy communities. Public authority for policy-making is more likely to be delegated under such conditions. Although MLG is most developed in Europe, international institutions' work in trade, finance, and the environment has improved the circumstances under which this form of globalized politics is influential in the operations of policy communities and networks far beyond Europe. National level policy communities are likely to assume sizable responsibilities in multilevel policy implementation when they are adequately integrated. There are also likely to be transnational policy communities that link these various national policy communities and link them to international institutions. These communities are made up of actors from both the national and international levels.

Transnational experts are likely to collaborate closely with national policy communities during the implementation stage, and transnational policy communities can have a significant impact on the formulation of policy options. The trajectory of how MLG adapts to global drivers of change will be shaped over time by the relative level of integration in domestic and transnational policy communities. The transnational policy community's ability to focus inputs entering

the domestic policy arena and the coherence of its proposals for policy alternatives to meet those inputs will both increase with increased transnational policy community integration. The domestic policy community will have more freedom to filter those inputs and (re)interpret those policy recommendations the more interconnected it is. Transnational policy communities are frequently likely to be less integrated than their domestic counterparts due to the range of interests and the flexibility of involvement. As analyses of the 2008 global financial crisis and its continuing effects start to reveal the complexities of transnational policy community activity and influence, one research area that promises interesting findings is the ways in which these various layers interact to either reinforce or undermine a policy paradigm.

Policy effects are likely to be observed through the mechanism of intergovernmental talks when nations continue to actively drive policy communities but do so in a global setting devoid of supranational governance frameworks. One of the most influential models of how these negotiations relate to domestic policy may be found in Putnam's (2008) "two-level games metaphor," as developed by Evans et al (2020). This is a well-explored area of international relations literature. Here, heads of state or their representatives negotiate treaties at the international level that can be ratified formally or through some other means of political legislation recognized at the domestic level. The anticipated degree of difficulty in such ratification, or acceptance, creates smaller or larger win sets (i.e. possible agreements that can be accepted) for the negotiators.

So, intergovernmental negotiations will strengthen the importance of the national policy communities in the stages of agenda-setting, ratification, and policy implementation (Akinbobola 2021; Eniafe and Adejuwon 2021). Ad hoc coalitions of political actors will be drawn from outside domestic policy communities to participate in "people's summits" that are held concurrently with, but separate from, official negotiations when intergovernmental negotiations become routine, such as in the regularly scheduled conferences of parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or meetings of the Group of Eight (G8) heads of state. Here, opposing parties outline and promote alternative policy choices to those being addressed in formal negotiations. These options are not meant to take the place of the ones being thought upon by authorized negotiators. However, they are anticipated to have an impact on these options by mobilizing domestic support for alternative stances or inciting opposition to the talks, thereby reducing the range of proposals that the official negotiators can anticipate will be accepted by their respective domestic political jurisdictions.

The ground rules in many policy subsystems were established by private actors, who have continued to play a significant role in developing norms and enforcing them. The markets for stocks, bonds, and the complex derivative

instruments that have put such a strain on the world financial system since 2008 are a prime illustration of such a regime. Several factors led to the emergence of these privately run governing systems. In certain instances, private companies had an oligopolistic monopoly on the technical expertise required to create and manage the policy subsystem. In other cases, jurisdictional or financial restrictions (such as federalism) led to capacity shortfalls in the public sector, which private entities filled. These self-regulating policy communities rarely remained purely private.

These privately formed regulations and practices would receive approval from the state either through incorporation into the legislation or through delegation of the power to seek self-regulation in the public interest. Under such delegated authority, private organizations, typically non-profit industry associations, would oversee a particular policy area, resulting in the development of "private interest governments" (Streeck and Schmitter 2005). Such self-regulatory and private regimes have been crucial in the areas of policy that have seen the most rapid and intense global exchange. These formal and informal organizations have taken on a central role in the regulation of crucial aspects of the globalization architecture, such as financial transactions that cross the borders of the majority of states and establish new standards of conduct and responsibility.

Transnational policy communities are likely to be far more strongly connected when operating under self-regulatory and private regimes than when doing so in multilevel governance or intergovernmental negotiations environments. The formation and upkeep of clientelist policy network relationships will be aided by the dominant role that private players (such as domestic financial organizations) play in the domestic nodes of these transnational policy communities. Private regimes will gain power via the unequal distribution of resources, particularly information, between state and private actors, which will provide them great incentives to operate opaquely.

The absence of institutionalized organizations and the absence of any blatant delegation of public authority serve to characterize the internationalized policy environment that gives rise to a framework of loose couplings (Abioye 2022). While there is no solid commercial organization to sustain a privately led policy regime, the high levels of scientific and technical uncertainty associated with new areas of innovation (like social networks) may deter state players from meddling. Physical or political catastrophes occasionally destabilize preexisting frameworks, triggering new arrangements of global and local initiative to reform rogue states (such as Bosnia or Iraq) or restore shattered local jurisdictions (e.g. New Orleans, Port-au-Prince).

Implementing policy in the context of pragmatic alliances among policy players can lead to what Browne (2000) refers to as "issue niches," or temporary policy communities that cluster around specific understandings of a problem and

possible solutions. In order to conceptualize the arbitrary consequences that result from such unstructured interactions between policy problems, solutions, participants, and decision possibilities, the famous "garbage can model" of Cohen et al. (2002) can be useful. In such cases, the structure of the policy community will be highly fluid, with state and social players flitting in and out of various policy-making stages. The distribution of power will resemble an issue network where people are more likely to share knowledge and concepts than beliefs and preferences.

Concluding Remarks

In the middle of the 1960s, the public policy analysis movement had its start. It is now sizable, diversified, and international. For a number of reasons, it is possible to argue that the phenomena of many people producing policy analysis for consumption by various audiences qualifies as a movement. First of all, policy analysts concentrate their efforts in one way or another on identifying, comprehending, and addressing societal issues, regardless of where they are situated within society. New issues and innovative solutions to them have come to light as policy analysis tools have been more frequently used to investigate public issues. A limited number of known policy issues may exist at any given moment, but this list is constantly being updated as some issues are fixed and new ones come to light. Second, there is a widely held understanding that thorough, theory-driven, and evidence-based research is necessary in order to understand public problems and the best ways to address them. This is true even though those involved in policy analysis come from a variety of perspectives and frequently present contradictory and conflicting arguments. This is very important since it has become tougher for long-established organizations to use their covert, silent power to sway political decisions due to shifting views on the types of assertions that should shape public discourse. Finally, a core of individuals have been necessary to frequently apply a well-established set of analytical and research procedures due to the growing reliance on this type of policy analysis. As a result, a distinct mainstream of policy analysis has been defined, and numerous university programs have been formed to professionalize aspiring analysts. Fourth, those using traditional methods have not been the only ones to produce policy analysis. There has been a degree of tolerance to alternate theoretical and empirical explanations regarding specific policy issues coming from individuals from other disciplines. When conventional methods are criticized, major attempts are frequently made to enhance the analytical techniques used. Lastly, regardless of their immediate goals or substantive interests, those involved in public policy analysis have a common awareness that they are carrying out significant, socially valuable work. They agree that systematic attempts to alter social institutions are at the heart of public policy. This work's importance contributes to understanding why policy disagreements are frequently drawn-out and contentious. When considered collectively, these many aspects of modern

policy work unmistakably show who the movement's leaders are. People involved in it are, in a variety of unique ways, advancing the continual process of defining the proper place of government in society and the most effective methods for resolving social and economic issues.

The movement's potential for growth is likely to be ensured by both internal and external dynamics. The conversation that has just taken place makes it quite evident that sound policy analysis generates demand on its own in terms of internal dynamics. This occurs because opposing parties are strongly motivated to outsmart one another in competitive circumstances, such as discussions over policy options. Other parties will soon realize the value of upping their own game if one party's views are constantly supported by solid policy analysis and this appears to provide them an advantage in debate. This may entail copying, editing, or criticizing the strategies used by rivals. Nonetheless, the end outcome is always more policy analysis being produced. In addition, painstaking policy analyses, particularly assessments of current programs, frequently point out aspects of policy design or implementation that need further attention. More policy analysis takes place when we are compelled to start over. The lesson that sound policy analysis generates demand for itself predicts that the movement's current energy and vibrancy will persist.

The social, economic, and political situations that are changing are the external forces that propel the growth of the policy analysis movement. Future economies and cultures will likely become more integrated, a process known as globalization, which will likely lead to new sets of policy issues. In this way, the dynamics seen in federal systems from the late nineteenth century through the twentieth century are echoed in the changes brought on by globalization. During that time, new ideas about the function of government in society were stimulated by expanding trade across state and provincial borders and the emergence of fierce inter-jurisdictional competition. The appropriate tiers of government for carrying out various tasks were also carefully considered. Fresh issues and questions arise with new times. By using historical lessons, it is obvious that numerous new policy issues will appear on government agendas and become the subject of in-depth discussions in the ensuing decades. Many of these concerns will be brought on by globalizing forces, but the problems themselves will show up at all tiers of government, starting at the local level. People inside and outside of government should continue to express a strong interest in these policy issues, as they have in the past, and they should want more original and excellent policy research to expand their knowledge and support their arguments.

Focusing on the relational dynamics of authority found in the analytical viewpoints of the policy community and the policy network can help policy researchers and international relations scholars to better comprehend the dynamic

effects of global influences on public policy. Such relational strategies have been adopted in both domains to highlight the significance of horizontal coordination efforts in decision-making. These policy actor groups can produce rules and norms that flow across boundaries in the wake of information and resources that traverse borders ever more quickly, from multinational agreements to impromptu "coalitions of the willing".

Insights on various configurations of transnational policy communities will gather as more study is conducted on the governance of globalized policy domains from both the policy studies and international relations fields of inquiry. These findings are anticipated to provide light on the function of mediators in transnational policy communities, who may also have an impact on the interconnections between local and global politics at the locations where they meet and overlap. Similar to how Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (2018) define a "policy broker" or how Kingdon (2019) defines a "policy entrepreneur," these mediators may serve as pragmatic policy brokers that connect issues with potential solutions by creating windows of political opportunity.

The translation of policy paradigms between policy communities that are connected by information or interest flows that cross established boundaries is another sort of mediation that may be even more crucial in a growing policy universe. Kuhn predicted that some experts would serve as interpreters between the various linguistic communities in instances where scientific paradigms clash. Such translation, according to Schön and Rein (2016), may hold the key to resolving conflicts between several paradigms or frames. The policy community mediator must create a worldview that can engage the thoughts and interests of various policy communities and foster communication amongst them in order to resolve such conflict. Such cross-cutting policy discussions might offer a way to deal with the disruptive forces brought on by novel and frequently incomprehensible information and ideas that freely traverse the boundaries of modern policy subsystems.

References

Abioye, Ranney. 2022. International Politics and Public Policy. New York: Markham.

Ahmed, Ostrom and Vogenbeck, Elinor. 2020. Understanding Policy Process and Institutional Diversity. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Akinbobola, Larry. 2021. Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Public Policy. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Baoku, Martin. 2022. Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Behavior in Policy-Making. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Browne, William P. 2000. 'Organized interests and their issue niches: A search for pluralism in a policy domain', Journal of Politics 52(2): 477—509.

Cerny, Philip. 1995. 'Globalization and the changing logic of collective action,' International Organization 49(4): 595—625.

Cohen, Michael James March, and Johan Olsen. 2002. 'A garbage can model of organizational choice', Administrative Science Quarterly 17(1): 1—25.

Coleman, William and Anthony Perl. 2009. 'Internationalized policy network environments and policy network analysis', Political Studies 47(4): 69—709.

———and Grace Skogstad (eds). 2018. Policy Communities and Public Policy in Canada: A Structural Approach, Toronto: Copp Clark Pittman.

Dyson, Kenneth. 2020. The State Tradition in Western Europe: A Study of An Idea and an Institution. Oxford: M. Robertson.

Eniafe, Daniel and Adejuwon, Paul S. 2021. Implementation and Public Policy. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Etzioni-Halevy, Eva. 2021. The Elite Connection: Problems and Potentials of Western Democracy. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Evans, Peter, Harold Jacobson and Robert Putnam. 2020. Double-edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gourevitch, Peter. 2008. 'The second image reversed: The international sources of domestic politics', International Organization(32)4: 881—912.

Haas, Peter. 2019. 'Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination,' International Organization 46(1): 1—35.

Hall, Peter, 2013. 'Policy paradigms, social learning and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain', Comparative Politics 25(3): 275—96.

Hassenteufel, Patrick. 2017. 'Do policy networks matter?', in P. Le Gales and M. Thatcher (eds) Les reseaux de politique publique: Débat autour des policy networks. Paris: L'Harmattan, 91—108.

Held, David. 2015. Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Jobert, B. 2019. 'Rhétorique politique, Controverses scientifiques et construction des normes institutionelles: Esquisse d'un parcours de recherche', in A. Faure, G. Pollet and R. Warin (eds) La construction du sens dans les politiques: Débats autour de la notion de référentiel. Paris: L'Harmattan, 13—24.

———and Pierre Muller. 2016. L'État en action: Politiques publiques et corporatismes. Paris: Presses Universités de France.

Jordan, G. and K. Schubert. 2002. 'A preliminary ordering of policy network labels', European Journal of Political Research 21(1—2): 7—27.

Kassim, Hussein. 2014. 'Policy networks and European Union policy making: A skeptical view', West European Politics 17(4): 15—27.

Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. 2007. Power and Interdependence: World politics in transition. Boston: Little, Brown.

Kingdon, John. 2019. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. New York: Longman.

Kooiman, Jan. 2018. Governing as Governance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Laumann, Edward. and David Knoke. 2017. The Organizational State: Social Choice in National Policy Domains. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 226—48.

Le Gales, P. and M. Thatcher. 2017. Les réseaux de politique publique. Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Perl, Anthony and Donald White. 2012. 'The changing role of consultants in Canadian policy analysis', Policy, Organisation and Society 21(4): 49—73.

Perl, Anthony and James A. Dunn Jr. 2007. 'Reframing automobile fuel economy policy in North America: The politics of punctuating a policy equilibrium,' Transport Reviews 27(1): 1—35.

Putnam, Robert. 2008. 'Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games', International Organization 42(3): 427—60.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 2006. 'The new governance: Governing without government', Political Studies 44(3): 652—67.

Risse-Kappen, T. 2015. 'Bringing transnational relations back in: Introduction' and 'Governance and transnational relations: What have we learned,' in Thomsa Risse-Kappen (ed.) Bringing Transnational Relations Back In. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3—36, 280—313.

Sabatier, Paul A. and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 2018. Polity Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach. Boulder: CO: Westview Press.

Scharpf, Fritz W. 2019. Games Real Actors Play: Actor Centred Institutionalism in Policy Research. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schön, D and M. Rein, 2016. Frame Reflection, Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies. New York: Basic Books.

Smith, A. 2005. 'Réintroduire la question du sens dans les réseaux d'action publique', in P. Le Gales and M. Thatcher (eds) Les réseaux de politique publique: Débat autour des policy networks. Paris: L'Harmmattan, 109—20.

Streeck, Wolfgang and Philippe Schmitter. 2005. 'Community, market and state associations?', in Wolfgang Streeck and Philippe Schmitter (eds) Private Interest Government, London: Sage, 1—29.

Swidler, Ann. 2006. 'Culture in action: Symbols and strategies', American Sociological Review 51(2): 273—86.

van Waarden, Frans 2012. 'Dimensions and types of policy networks', European Journal of Political Science 21(1): 29—52

الأبعاد والديناميكيات الدولية لصنع السياسات

د . بيمبو أوجونبانجو

دائرة الحكومة جامعة ولاية لاغوس

كلية الدراسات الأساسية والمتقدمة

لاغوس، نيجيريا

Gmail   mbimboogunbanjo@yahoo.com

الكلمات المفتاحية: العولمة، السياسة، صنع السياسات،

الملخص:

كان بوسع الباحثين في مجال السياسات الاعتماد فيها على السياسة الداخلية والمجتمع للمساهمة بالبيانات الكافية لإجراء تحليل مرض أصبحت الآن ذكرى. وسواء كان الباحثون في مجال السياسات مستعدين لدخول عالم تحليلي آخر أم لا، فإن التدفق المتسارع للأفكار والمعلومات والسلع والأموال عبر الحدود الوطنية قد أثر على طبيعة مشاكل السياسة، وأعاد تشكيل المحاولات للتعامل مع هذه المشاكل، وبالتالي أعاد توجيه الطريقة التي يتم بها تفسير هذه المشاكل. يمكن متابعة عملية صنع السياسات بشكل منتج. ربما لم تتغير الأسئلة الكبرى التي تحرك دراسات السياسات، ولكن البيانات المتاحة والمفاهيم اللازمة لتحليلها كانت في تحول. وستسعى هذه الورقة إلى ربط هذه الديناميكيات العالمية الناشئة بالدوافع المعترف بها منذ فترة طويلة لصنع السياسات وتقديم إطار مفاهيمي يمكن أن يساعد في فهم التفاعلات الناتجة. إن تعزيز الارتباط بين الأطر النظرية التي استرشدت بها العلاقات الدولية ومفاهيم السياسة العامة يعد بفهم أفضل لعملية صنع السياسات في عالم متقلب. ستنظر هذه الورقة في قيمة تطبيق منظور الشبكة على فهم التأثيرات العالمية من خلال أربع مراحل من الدراسة. في البداية سوف يدرس مفهوم العولمة ويقيم بإيجاز الآثار المترتبة على دراسة صنع السياسات. بعد ذلك، ستنتقل الورقة إلى الأدبيات المتعلقة بمجتمعات السياسات وشبكات السياسات لتسليط الضوء على الأدوات التي يمكن استخدامها في تقييم التأثيرات العالمية على الأنظمة الفرعية للسياسات. بعد ذلك، سوف ينظر في مفهوم نماذج السياسة ويفكر في الدور الذي تلعبه التأثيرات الفكرية في تعديل التأثيرات العالمية على السياسة. وأخيرا، سيتم عرض تصنيف رباعي لبيئات السياسات الدولية، من أجل إلقاء الضوء على كيف يمكن لتكوينات معينة من مجتمعات وشبكات السياسة أن تكسر التأثيرات العالمية على الحكم. في الختام، سيتم النظر بإيجاز في الدور الديناميكي لوسطاء مجتمع السياسة في محاولة توجيه استجابات النظام الفرعي للقوى العالمية.