

Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy



Institutional Entrepreneurship and Policy Change

Theoretical and Empirical Explorations

Edited by
Caner Bakir and Darryl S.L. Jarvis



Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy

Series Editors

Toby Carroll

Department of Asian and International Studies

City University of Hong Kong

Hong Kong

Paul Cammack

Department of Asian and International Studies

City University of Hong Kong

Hong Kong

Kelly Gerard

School of Social Sciences

The University of Western Australia

Australia

Darryl S.L. Jarvis

Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

The Education University of Hong Kong

Hong Kong

Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy presents cutting edge, innovative research on the origins and impacts of public policy. Going beyond mainstream public policy debates, the series encourages heterodox and heterogeneous studies of sites of contestation, conflict and cooperation that explore policy processes and their consequences at the local, national, regional or global levels. Fundamentally pluralist in nature, the series is designed to provide high quality original research of both a theoretical and empirical nature that supports a global network of scholars exploring the implications of policy on society. The series is supported by a diverse international advisory board drawn from Asia, Europe, Australia, and North America, and welcomes manuscript submissions from scholars in the global South and North that pioneer new understandings of public policy.

International Advisory Board: Michael Howlett, Simon Fraser University, Canada; John Hobson, University of Sheffield, UK; Stuart Shields, University of Manchester, UK; Lee Jones, Queen Mary, University of London, UK; Kanishka Jayasuriya, Murdoch University, Australia; Shaun Breslin, University of Warwick, UK; Kevin Hewison, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Richard Stubbs, McMaster University, Canada; Dick Bryan, University of Sydney, Australia; Kun-chin Lin, University of Cambridge, UK; Apiwat Ratanawaraha, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand; Wil Hout, Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University, The Netherlands; Penny Griffin, University of New South Wales, Australia; Philippe Zittoun, Science Po, Grenoble, France; Heng Yee Kuang, University of Tokyo; Heloise Weber, University of Queensland, Australia; Max Lane, Victoria University, Australia.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14465>

Caner Bakir • Darryl S.L. Jarvis
Editors

Institutional Entrepreneurship and Policy Change

Theoretical and Empirical Explorations

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Caner Bakir
Department of International Relations
Koç University
Istanbul, Turkey

Darryl S.L. Jarvis
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social
Sciences
The Education University of Hong
Kong
Hong Kong

Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy

ISBN 978-3-319-70349-7

ISBN 978-3-319-70350-3 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70350-3>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017964668

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: Brain light / Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

For Nuran and Kaan

CB

For Hamish and Oliver

DSLJ

PREFACE

Scholarship into institutions has grown enormously over the last four decades. Political science, sociology, economics, anthropology and history, among others, have each witnessed an ‘institutional turn’, in the process producing a legion of new institutionalisms and voluminous literatures. In policy science the institutional turn has been particularly pronounced, with scholars exploring the complex relationships between institutional environments and policy actors, the role of institutions in shaping policy choices, agential preferences and problem framing, and the consequent impact on policy design, modes of implementation and policy outcomes. Extensive theoretical work has also emerged, addressing broader questions about structure and agency, how institutions constrain policy choices but also how they enable choice in terms of the institutional frames that generate interpretative frameworks, shared understanding, and thus the resources for coordination and policy responses.

Perhaps not surprisingly, recent policy scholarship on institutions has focused increasingly on issues of institutional change. How, why and through what processes policy entrepreneurs are able to generate institutional change, what strategies and resources they marshal to facilitate change, and how change is realised in institutional environments that often resist or steer change in specific directions, have become core concerns of much policy scholarship.

This volume continues this tradition of inquiry, bringing together a collection of scholars who, while empirically diverse in the cases and contexts they analyse, are united by a common desire to understand the role of entrepreneurship, policy actors and agential authority in institutional

change. Drawing on a shared set of debates and literatures, this volume seeks to contribute to the ongoing effort to more adequately explain some of the enduring theoretical and practical puzzles in policy science: how policy actors precipitate change, how institutional obstacles are moderated, and under what institutional contexts change occurs.

Glasgow
Hong Kong
June 2017

Caner Bakir
Darryl S.L. Jarvis

CONTENTS

1	Institutional and Policy Change: Meta-theory and Method	1
	Caner Bakir and D. S. L. Jarvis	
Part I	Theorizing Institutional Entrepreneurship and Policy Change	39
2	Enablers and Time: How Context Shapes Entrepreneurship in Institutional and Policy Change	41
	Maria Tullia Galanti	
3	Institutional Change Through Institutionalization: Combining Different Approaches	63
	Luciana de Oliveira Miranda and Paulo Carlos Du Pin Calmon	
4	The New Economic, Sociological and Historical Institutionalisms in Social Policy	85
	José G. Vargas-Hernández and Victor Manuel Castillo-Girón	

Part II Explorations in Institutional Entrepreneurship	111
5 Local Policy Entrepreneurship in Authoritarian China: The Case of a “Model” Health Care Reform	113
Alex Jingwei He	
6 Political Entrepreneurship and Policy Change in the End of Life Debate in Israel	139
Michal Neubauer-Shani and Omri Shamir	
7 Institutional Entrepreneurship in Education Policy: Societal Transformation in Israel	163
Netta Sagie and Miri Yemini	
8 The Effects of Institutional Change on Austrian Integration Policy and the Contexts that Matter	191
Oliver Gruber and Sieglinde Rosenberger	
9 Embedding Innovation: Bricolage and the Case of the Phnom Penh Water Supply Authority	221
Yishu Zhou and Leong Ching	
10 Institutional Entrepreneurship and the Mission Creep of the National Bank of Hungary	243
Miklós Sebők	
Index	279

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Caner Bakir is Associate Professor of Political Science, with a special focus on International and Comparative Political Economy, and Public Policy and Administration at Koc University, Istanbul. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Monash University in Melbourne. He is Co-director of Center for Globalisation, Peace and Democratic Governance (GLODEM). He is the Associate Editor of *Policy Sciences*. His work relates to political economy and public policy with special emphasis on comparative institutional analysis and policy change. His research interests include varieties of national financial systems, the political economy of central banking, financial regulation and governance, state and international business relations, Turkish multinationals and macroeconomic bureaucracies. He has published articles in leading journals such as *Policy Sciences* (forthcoming), *Governance*, *Public Administration*, *Development and Change*, and *New Political Economy*. He is the author of *Bank Behaviour and Resilience: Effect of Structures, Institutions and Agents* (Palgrave Macmillan 2013), *Merkezdeki Banka* [Bank in the Centre] (Bilgi University Press 2007), and (with Louis Brennan) of *Emerging Market Multinationals in Europe* (Routledge 2016). He is the recipient of The 2010 Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) Incentive Award, and TUBITAK Early Career Award in 2008. He has been the principal investigator of various TUBITAK funded projects and his recent research has been linked with Cooperation on Science and Technology (COST) project entitled 'The Emergence of Southern Multinationals and their Impact on Europe' (*ISCH COST Action IS0905*).

Paulo Carlos Du Pin Calmon is the Director of the Institute of Political Science at University of Brasilia, Brazil. He received his Ph.D. from The University of Texas at Austin, USA, with a specialization in Public Policy. His research focus on the role of institutions in public policy and development. His articles have appeared in journals such as *Public Management Review*, *Revista de Administracao Publica*, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, and *Review of Development Economics*.

Leong Ching is Assistant Professor and Deputy Director of the Institute of Water Policy at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. Her research focuses on institutional change, water policy and the role of narratives and emotions. Her empirical work has been in the area of urban water governance in Asia, recycled drinking water and transboundary water issues at the Yellow River and Mekong.

Maria Tullia Galanti is post-doctoral research Fellow in the Department of Social and Political Sciences, at the University of Milan, Italy. She holds a Ph.D. in political science and public policy from the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, Scuola Normale Superiore, Florence, Italy. Her research has explored the privatisation of local utilities, the regulation of local public services such as water supply, waste, gas and energy in Italy. Her research also focuses on public policy processes and change, with a particular focus on leadership, policy advice and entrepreneurship as agency. She has also published on urban planning and social assistance in Italian municipalities. Her publications have appeared in journals such as *Utilities Policy*, *Regulation and Competition of Network Industries*, *Contemporary Italian Politics*, *Rivista Italiana di Politiche Pubbliche* and *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*.

Víctor Manuel Castillo-Girón holds a Ph.D. from the Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Agriculture, Montpellier, France. He is currently a Level II Researcher in the National System of Researchers (SNI), as well as a Senior Research Professor and the Provost at the University of Guadalajara, Valley Center, Mexico. His current research interests include agri-food development, the environment, and educational and technological innovation. He has published extensively in various international journals as well as authored a series of book chapters and monographs.

Oliver Gruber is post-doctoral lecturer in Political Science at the University of Vienna, Austria. His research focuses on immigration/integration policy, party politics, political communication and democratic

inclusion. His first book titled *Campaigning in Radical Right Heartland. Electoral politicization of immigration and ethnic relations in Austria, 1971–2013* was published in 2014 by LIT publishing. His articles have appeared in journals such as *Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *British Politics*, the *Austrian Journal of Political Science*, with chapters appearing in edited volumes published by *Springer* and *Oxford University Press*. As a member of the research group “INEX—The Politics of Inclusion & Exclusion” he coordinated the recently completed project on “Institutional and Policy Change in Immigration Integration in Austria”, funded by the Austrian Central Bank.

Alex Jingwei He is Associate Professor and Associate Head (Research & Development), Department of Asian and Policy Studies, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences at the Education University of Hong Kong. He earned his Ph.D. degree in public policy from the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. He specializes in social policy reforms and health policy and governance with particular reference to the Greater China region. He has published extensively in leading international journals in these areas, including *Social Science and Medicine*, *Health Policy and Planning*, *China Quarterly*, and *Public Administration Review*. He co-edits the *Journal of Asian Public Policy*.

Darryl S.L. Jarvis is Professor and Head, Department of Asian and Policy Studies, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences at the Education University of Hong Kong (formerly the Hong Kong Institute of Education). He has held previous positions at the National University of Singapore and the University of Sydney, Australia. He has published widely in the areas of international relations, comparative public policy, regulatory politics, and political economy. His publications include *Asia after the Developmental State: Disembedding Autonomy* (with Toby Carroll); *Markets and Development: Civil Society, Citizens and the Politics of Neoliberalism* (with Toby Carroll); *Financialisation and Development in Asia* (with Toby Carroll); *The Politics of Marketising Asia* (with Toby Carroll); *ASEAN Industries and the Challenge from China* (with Anthony Welch); *Infrastructure Regulation: What Works, Why, and How do we Know? Lessons from Asia and Beyond* (with Ed Araral, M. Ramesh & Wu Xun); *Handbook of International Business Risk: The Asia Pacific*; *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline*; *International Relations. Still an American Social Science? Toward Diversity in International Thought* (with R. M. Crawford); and

Post-modernism and its Critics: International Relations and the Third Debate.

Michal Neubauer-Shani is a lecturer of governance and politics at The Ashkelon Academic College, Israel. She received her Ph.D. from The Hebrew University in 2007 with a specialization in Public Policy. Her research focuses on: agenda setting, the role of state-religion relationships in public policy making, civic education. More recently, her research has focused on end of life debates and euthanasia. Her articles have appeared in journals such as *Israel Affairs*, and *Journal of Travel Research*.

Luciana de Oliveira Miranda is a Fellow of Public Policy at Brasilia University, Brazil. She received her Ph.D. from Brasilia University in 2013 with a specialization in Public Administration and Public Policy. Her research focuses on institutionalization theory and change. More specifically, she studies the processes and mechanisms of institutional change in various public administration contexts.

Sieglinde Rosenberger is Full Professor of Political Science at the University of Vienna. Her research focuses on migration and asylum policies, politicization of immigration and protest research. Her articles have appeared in journals such as *Citizenship Studies*, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *Social Movement Journal*, *Politics and Governance*, and most recently in *Politics, Groups and Identities* on “The politics of categorization”. Sieglinde is a member of several editorial and advisory boards and is head of the research group “INEX—The Politics of Inclusion & Exclusion” at the University of Vienna, Austria. She has led a number of national and international research projects, among them the recently completed project on “Institutional and Policy Change in Immigration Integration in Austria”, funded by the Austrian Central Bank.

Netta Sagie is a lawyer, social activist and a doctoral student at Tel Aviv University, School of Education. Her main research interests include educational entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship policy in the education system. In the last three years Netta is a lecturer and a teaching assistant in project management course for school leadership in Tel Aviv University. She published her research in: *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization*, *Educational Review*, *Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. Netta has won several scholarships including research scholarship under European Commission EACEA TEMPUS

(IDEA) grant and a scholarship for social involvement. She presented her studies in various international conferences such as the British Association of International and Comparative Education (BAICE), 2014 (Bath, U.K) British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society (BELMAS), 2015.

Miklós Sebők is a Research Fellow and Head, Department of Government and Public Policy, Centre for Social Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest. He earned an M.A. degree in politics from the University of Virginia and an M.A. degree in economics from Corvinus University, Budapest. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from ELTE University of Budapest. He currently serves as the research director of the Hungarian Comparative Agendas Project. His research interests include political economy and public policy with a special emphasis on comparative institutional analysis and executive-legislative relations. His recent work has focused on the political economy of financial supervision in Western Europe, Japan and Hungary. He has published articles in, inter alia, the *Journal of Legislative Studies*, *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management*, *Journal of Comparative Politics*, *Japanese Journal of Political Science* and *Intersections—East European Journal of Society and Politics*. He is the author of *Hatalom szabályok nélkül* (*Power without Rules—Új Mandátum Publishing*, 2014), a comparative examination of the impact of the financial crisis on institutional change and delegation, for which he received the Kolnai Prize for best Hungarian language publication in political science.

Omri Shamir is a lecturer of Public Policy in the Department of Politics and Government, Ashkelon Academic College in Ashkelon, Israel. He received his Ph.D. from Ben Gurion University with a specialization on Public Policy. His research focuses on Political Consumerism, Political Entrepreneurship and Public Policy. More specifically he studied the role of political entrepreneurs that uses consumerism a political strategy in order to create social and political change. His articles appeared in journals such as *World Political Science*, *Contemporary Politics*, *Religion and Politics* and *Journal of Consumer Culture*.

José G. Vargas-Hernández is a Research Professor at University Center for Economic and Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara. He received his Ph.D. from Keele University in 1992 with a specialization on Economics. His research focuses on organizational economics, strategic management and global marketing.

Miri Yemini is a lecturer and researcher in School of Education, at Tel Aviv University. Her research interests include entrepreneurship in education, globalization and internationalization in education and project management in education systems. Her first book titled *Cosmopolitanism, Localism and Internationalization in Education* was published by Magnes Academic Press. Her next book titled 'Internationalization in Education' will be published in late 2016 by Palgrave Macmillan. In the last five years Dr. Yemini teaches graduate courses in entrepreneurship and project management for school leadership in Tel Aviv University. She published her research among others in: *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *Comparative Education Review*, *Teaching and Teachers Education*, *Compare*, *Discourse*, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *Urban Education*, *Educational Review*.

Yishu Zhou is a Research Associate at the Institute of Water Policy at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. Her research interests focus on institutional analysis, public policy, and the politics of development in East and Southeast Asia.

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 3.1	Framework for explaining modes of institutional change. Source: Mahoney and Thelen (2010, p. 15).	71
Fig. 3.2	A summary	80
Fig. 8.1	Number of relevant plenary agenda items, press releases and media articles	202
Fig. 10.1	Time series of MNB benchmark interest rate. Source: http:// www.global-rates.com/interest-rates/central-banks/central- bank-hungary/mnb-interest-rate.aspx	257

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Features of different types of entrepreneurship	57
Table 3.1	Types of institutional change: Processes and results	66
Table 3.2	Institutional change: Five types of gradual transformation	70
Table 3.3	Types of change agent	72
Table 3.4	Creating institutions	75
Table 3.5	Maintaining institutions	76
Table 3.6	Disrupting institutions	77
Table 4.1	Comparison of the main institutional approaches	88
Table 5.1	Cost profiles of public hospitals in Sanming, 2011–2014	129
Table 5.2	Cost profiles of three levels of hospitals, 2014	130
Table 8.1	Analytical framework for policy change in immigrant integration	195
Table 8.2	Contextual factors explaining a new executive actor’s potential for policy change: The case of the Austrian State Secretariat for Integration (SSI)	205
Table 9.1	PPWSA’s transformation (1993–2008)	228
Table 10.1	The institutional work of Matolcsy	267

Institutional and Policy Change: Meta-theory and Method

Caner Bakir and D. S. L. Jarvis

1 INTRODUCTION

This volume emerged from a general call for papers for a panel on institutional entrepreneurship and institutional change at the International Conference on Public Policy (ICPP) held in Milan, Italy, in the summer of 2015. We were overwhelmed by submissions to the panel and a level of interest in the topic which far exceeded our expectations. In retrospect, we should not have been surprised. Issues of institutional change continue to be of central concern to political scientists, economists, sociologists, and policy scholars alike—indeed, why and how institutions emerge, change, or are transcended over time is a core theoretical question at the centre of most social science inquiry. As North famously noted:

History matters. It matters not just because we can learn from the past, but because the present and the future are connected to the past by the continuity

C. Bakir (✉)

Department of International Relations, Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey

D. S. L. Jarvis

Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, The Education University of Hong Kong, Ting Kok, Hong Kong

© The Author(s) 2018

C. Bakir, D. S. L. Jarvis (eds.), *Institutional Entrepreneurship and Policy Change*, Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70350-3_1

of society's institutions. Today's and tomorrow's choices are shaped by the past. And the past can only be made intelligible as a story of institutional evolution. (North, 1990, p. vii)

For North, the focus on institutions was driven by an intellectual interest to understand how social agents create entities that facilitate cooperation, especially around complex phenomena such as exchange relations where interests do not always coincide. It was North's contention that at the very core of successful societies, which North defined in relation to sustained economic growth and deepening economic and technological complexity, lay the role of institutions—or, more specifically, 'institutional frameworks'. But, as North also observed, not all institutional frameworks are created equal; 'not all human cooperation is socially productive' (North, 1990, p. vii). North's self-professed task was thus to correct the oversight of his own profession, integrating into economic theory a theory of institutional change by 'explaining the evolution of institutional frameworks that induce economic stagnation and decline' and those that induce success (North, 1990, p. vii).

North, of course, has not been alone in this project. The rise of institutional analysis and renewed interest in institutions has been intimately associated with structural changes in the institutional fabric of modern industrial societies, particularly in the last few decades of the twentieth century. The decline of Keynesianism and with it transformations in the socio-political and economic institutions which guided management of the economy, labour relations, welfare, tax and redistributive measures, social policy and the provision of health, education and public housing, has generated extensive debates about the extent of these changes and their causes (Campbell & Pedersen, 2001). Ideational changes associated with the rise of market-oriented policy preferences, and of political movements seeking to reframe the relationship between the state and market, and between the state, market and citizen, also coincided with the rise of institutional analysis—especially the rise of rational choice institutional paradigms which see institutions (or what the World Bank terms 'enabling environments') as central determinants of economic and political performance (Campbell & Pedersen, 2001, p. 1; Carroll & Jarvis, 2015, 2017; North, 1981, 1990, 2005).

The coextensive nature of these developments has fostered a burgeoning industry of institutional paradigms (Campbell & Pedersen, 2001, p. 5). Rational choice institutionalism (North, 1990; Ostrom, 1993),

while perhaps the most influential, has also been joined by historical institutionalism (Clemens & Cook, 1999; Hall, 2010; Immergut, 2006; Pierre, Peters, & Stoker, 2008; Steinmo, 2008; Thelen, 1999), sociological institutionalism (or what some term organisational institutionalism) (Campbell, 1998, 2008; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Hall & Taylor, 1996; March & Olsen, 1989; Scott & Myer, 1994) and post-modern or discursive institutionalism (Bourdieu, 1998; Foucault, 1969, 2007; Jameson, 1997; Schmidt, 2008). Despite substantive variation in approach and epistemology, the new institutionalisms all grapple with the enduring issue of institutional construction, instantiation (or how institutions become embedded), and institutional change—in particular, the role of agency in mediating and intercepting power and influence (conceived both in the visceral sense of capturing institutions and steering them but also in the ideational sense of emerging knowledge systems and of the role of ideas in shaping and determining social, political and economic orders).

This volume continues this tradition of intellectual inquiry, attempting to grapple both theoretically and empirically with questions of institutional isomorphism. The vantage points of its contributions are variously informed by the ‘great debates’ of institutional theory. These have typically wrestled with ontological issues about structure and agency, in part to understand the nature of institutional stasis but most obviously as a means to explain change—gradual, evolutionary change and particularly dramatic or revolutionary transformation. Earlier historical institutionalists such as Theda Skocpol (1979), for example, famously analysed the structure and composition of pre-revolutionary state institutions to explain revolutionary outcomes. State capture and the dominance of the state over populations could induce long periods of stability while also laying the foundation for social revolution and the birthing of new institutional orders. Similarly, Chalmers Johnson’s analysis of the rise of ‘revolutionary nationalism’ and the ‘exigencies and requirements of national survival and mobilization’ were used to explain institutional outcomes in Japan and China in the post-war era (Johnson, 1966, 1982; Steinmo, 2008; Woo-Cumings, 1999, p. 2). Both Skocpol and Johnson viewed the state and state institutions as central to the stabilization of social, political and economic orders, while also seeing the state as the primary source of social fissure because of non-adaptability or non-responsiveness to changing contexts. For historical institutionalists, in other words, the span of history was understood as wave like; long periods of stasis interjected by sudden periods of crisis—or,

as Blyth notes, they posit a model as thus: ‘institutional equilibrium → punctuation → new institutional equilibrium’ (Blyth, 2002, p. 7).

Such a model, of course, posits two contradictory axioms: institutions constrain, order, moderate, and pattern agential behaviours, in large measure constricting the possibility of institutional change, while, at the same time, agents and agency are by definition the drivers of history, manufacturing institutional change and new institutional orders. Rational choice institutionalists too explain the tendency to stasis and equilibrium using similar theoretical fiats. Long periods of institutional stasis reflect institutional maturation, in which formal and informal rules act as mechanisms that sanction certain behaviours and induce agential compliance. As long as the functional predominance of institutions in transmitting rules and norms is sustained, the tendency toward change is constrained. Change, in this sense, is either an outgrowth of the breakdown of institutional sanctions and signalling mechanisms causing agential compliance to be fractured, or a reflection of poor institutional design in which the wrong signals (perverse incentives) are transmitted, producing disequilibria and causing agential authority to reconfigure new institutional arrangements.

Institutionalists of various persuasions have thus assumed a *hierarchical ontology* between institutions and actors. While change, evolutionary or revolutionary, is uniformly viewed as a filament of social action, institutions are typically viewed as minding the store, as it were, tending to constrain actors and stabilize patterns of behaviour which, in turn, reproduce institutional orders. For institutionalists, such ontological relationships help explain the tendency toward equilibria; long periods of continuity, the infrequency of revolutionary change and the predominance of evolutionary or gradual institutional change through ideational adaptation and incremental rule and norm modification. Equally, for social theorists, the predominance of structure—defined in terms of institutional setting or context—has similarly been understood as the substantive force shaping the choices of agents which in turn shapes the universe of potential outcomes or the pathways via which change occurs (Campbell, 2004, 2010; Giddens, 1979, 1993; Heugens & Lander, 2009). Agency, by contrast, has typically been understood as a second-order variable and subservient to the overarching role of socio-economic structure and history.

This tendency toward a hierarchical ontology in theory construction, most often encapsulated in anthropology, sociology, philosophy, economics, political science and history with the rise of *structuralism*, has had far-reaching implications for how research into policy entrepreneurship

and institutional change has proceeded. As Bakir notes, this has essentially funnelled research into two broad questions: (1) *how* and *why* institutional contexts inform and frame agential actions?; and (2) how do policy entrepreneurs initiate institutional change if their decisions and actions are conditioned by the very institution they wish to change? (Bakir, 2013; Bathelt & Glückler, 2014, p. 353; see also DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Morgan, Campbell, Crouch, Pedersen, & Whitley, 2010, pp. 4–5; Peters, 2001, p. 71).

In social theory, of course, structuration theory was meant to overcome this ontological dilemma. Giddens' 'duality of structure', for example, attempted to replace ontological hierarchies with a reflexive situationalism, in which the 'recursive' or reflexive 'character of social life' was constituted by the interactions of agents with structures that reproduced social orders while also modifying them. As Giddens notes, structuration theory understands that 'even action which disrupts the social order, breaking conventions or challenging established hierarchies, is mediated by structural features which are reconstituted by the action, albeit in a modified form' (Giddens as quoted in Thompson, 1989, p. 58; Giddens, 1984). History and historical change, in other words, were to be explained through recursive interactions; 'social structures are both constituted *by* human agency, and yet at the same time they are the very *medium* of this constitution' (our emphasis) (Giddens, 1993, p. 121).

Rational choice institutionalism has similarly dealt with the problem of hierarchical ontologies. As Campbell observes, one of the main contributions of political scientists and sociologists to rational choice perspectives has been to develop a 'choice-within-constraints approach' in which agential authority is seen to be limited by the coextensive institutional frameworks in which agents operate (Campbell, 2004, p. 15; Peters, 2001, p. 67; Roberts & Greenwood, 1997). Much like structuration theory, rational choice institutionalists have sought to level the ontological playing field by conceiving of agents and institutions as processes of mutuality, codependent but differentiated by the quality of institutional endowments (capacities) across institutional contexts—which provides either more or less space for agential interventions and thus greater or lesser latitude for institutional change. Institutional constraints, in other words, are context specific and change through time, either through the erosion of institutional quality or the failure of institutions to adapt to changing exogenous forces which, in turn, explain the preponderance of institutional stasis and incremental change and the infrequency of sudden revolutionary transformation.

2 POLICY SCIENCE AND THE PROBLEM OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Despite these theoretical advances the sense in which they can be simply imported, adapted, deployed and operationalised as research frameworks in order to understand policy change and institutional isomorphism remains problematic. Five interrelated issues are apparent.

The first arises from what we might term the vantage point of observation or temporality. Social theorists, for example, enjoy the benefit of hindsight when examining the sweep of history. Hindsight provides a vast laboratory for investigation, observation and theorization, allowing the historian to examine known outcomes and draw connections between events, time and place, identifying causalities of change and how these manifest in terms of new or evolving institutional orders. Hindsight, in other words, provides the historian with a *fungible temporality* which, as North noted, demonstrates how 'today's and tomorrow's choices are shaped by the past' (North, 1990, p. vii).

Absent a fungible temporality, however, how do social scientists operationalise structuration theory as a means of explaining institutional change, particularly change which is contemporaneous? How do we identify 'choice-within-constraints' when the choices may not be readily apparent or the constraints obvious? For policy scholars, for example, the vantage point of hindsight is not always available, 'recursive interactions' are often hidden behind institutional facades and the professional practitioners who populate them, while knowledge about change is typically empirically fuzzy, contradictory, or contested. More obviously, how do policy scholars assess which change is important, what impact it will have on institutional orders or practices, whose interests it may serve and how, and whether what they observe is incremental, episodic or potentially revolutionary change? Much policy science, for example, is projection: scholarship designed to intercept emerging problems, change trends with potentiality deleterious implications, or avoid outcomes that may generate negative social and economic consequences (global climate change, the impact of ageing demographics, deterring low rates of savings to ensure sufficient income in incidences of increasing longevity, etc.). Policy science invariably sits at the intersection of contemporaneous intellectual inquiry and is designed to project into the future to change outcomes that have yet to transpire. Rather than a fungible temporality which allows assessments of institutional change to be triangulated through time and interrogated in terms of sig-

nificance, direction, impact and outcome, policy scholars are often required to address change in contexts of indeterminate temporalities and make assessments about change in present and future contexts.

Second, while a core analytical variable, the concept of *change* remains both under-theorised and analytically diffuse. Historically, for example, first-wave institutionalism concerned itself predominantly with patterns of stasis or institutional stickiness, focusing on the role of authority, power and legitimacy, along with the high transaction costs (and risks) associated with institutional isomorphism, in order to explain the reproduction of institutional orders through path dependencies (Bush, 1987; Koning, 2015, p. 641). In part, this reflected the way first-wave institutionalism defined institutions; as a ‘stable, recurring pattern of behaviour’ (Goodin, 1996, p. 22). Change, in other words, was antithetical to the core idea of institutions as technologies of social, economic and political reproduction. Krasner, for example, encapsulated this dialectic noting ‘a basic analytic distinction [...] between periods of institutional creation and periods of institutional stasis’, where change was important but only in the context of the birthing or ending of institutional orders—the bookends of epochs. Gradual or incremental change was, in essence, squeezed out of analytical view, with change understood episodically and often the result of systemic crisis (Krasner as quoted in Koning, 2015, p. 643; Krasner, 1984, p. 240).

This intellectual legacy continues to impact how issues of institutional isomorphism and isomorphic processes are framed theoretically. Much contemporary institutional scholarship, for example, is unable to differentiate between *patterns* or types of change and thus ‘the degree to which a given episode of change is actually evolutionary, revolutionary or something else’ (Campbell, 2004, p. 5). Capano reinforces this point, noting while there is a ‘plentiful selection of studies from various academic fields examining the question of whether the processes of change should be considered evolutionary or revolutionary, reversible or irreversible, linear or non-linear, contingent or partially determined’, the ‘*explanandum* (change) is too frequently defined in an ambiguous manner’, its complexity set aside or treated as a mechanical variable (e.g., t^1 to t^2) (Capano, 2009, p. 8). A continuing theoretical dilemma for institutional scholars, in other words, is the conceptual indeterminacy of one of its core analytical categories: *change*.

Third, this intellectual legacy also has implications for where scholars situate the *locus* of causality that produces change. When institutions are conceived as patterns of recurrent behaviour that propagate stability or

stasis through combinations of cascading norms, rules, authority structures (legal and juridical systems), power relationships and traditions, for example, the locus of change is typically identified as *exogenous* to institutional orders rather than propagated through *endogenous* institutional processes. Change is viewed as institutionally alien and most often conceptualised in relation to large-scale structural transformations or the sudden, episodic rupture of institutional stability brought about, for example, by war, financial crises, sudden environmental change, or other large-scale disruptive exogenous events and processes. Much historical institutionalism has thus posited change as an episodic consequence of institutional non-adaptability, or a consequence of insufficient institutional capacity to manage various large-scale exogenous processes. Issues of endogeneity, by contrast, while not dismissed entirely from analytical view, have tended to be framed as issues of institutional inertia, where the absence of institutional change, or the right types of institutional adaptability in relation to increasing tensions brought about by emergent exogenous realities, ultimately ruptures institutional orders and produces new institutional configurations. Endogeneity as a core locus of isomorphic processes has thus often been marginalised, or seen as less consequential and thus less professionally rewarding as an object of intellectual inquiry.

Fourth, and relatedly, the tendency of historical and rational choice institutionalists to theorise institutions through functionalist lenses has also tended to marginalise issues of endogeneity as a locus of institutional change. The dominant means of analysing institutional change, for example, has rested on mapping interests with institutional type, functions, and capacities in order to correlate specific institutional endowments (or institutional designs) with their ability to satisfy economic, social and political needs—i.e., the institutional characteristics which manufacture *legitimacy*, where legitimacy is understood as central to the reproduction of institutional orders. For many historical and rational choice institutionalists, in other words, institutions are understood as sets of social and political relations that, above all, contain distributional instruments in relation to power and economic resources (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010a, pp. 8–9). What makes some institutions more effective than others simply reflects the balance of legitimacy in respect of how adroitly power and economic resources are distributed, and how, over time, institutional capacities to manage distributional instruments adapt to changing realities. Rational choice and historical institutionalists thus posit institutional stasis as a function of legitimacy, and thus, in turn, as a reflection of individual interests

being institutionally derived. It reflects what Bathelt and Glückler (2014) term the ‘paradox of embedded action’, whereby the interests of actors is both derived from, and reflected in, the prevailing institutional orthodoxy, rendering change through agential authority irrational. The paradox of embedded action thus made *endogenous* change theoretically nonsensical, substantially blinding first-wave institutionalism to issues of institutional adaptation, institutional learning and other *endogenous* isomorphic processes (Blyth, 2002, pp. 19–20; Koning, 2015, p. 647).

Fifth, while second-wave institutionalism has attempted to overcome this problem by focusing on *endogenous* sources of change, and by addressing explicitly the paradox of embedded action, it has often attempted to do so by situating interests in more diffuse theoretical containers. Ideational institutionalism, for example, focuses on the receptiveness of institutions to ideational innovation, institutional learning, and the way institutions do or don’t, as the case may be, interact with values, norms and beliefs. It thus posits the central importance of *ideas* in institutional change—if not their role as the constituting basis of institutional orders. As Blyth points out, institutions do in fact change, ‘sometimes without obvious punctuations, and because of this theoretical problem, ideas also become attractive to historical institutionalists as an *endogenous* source of change’ (Blyth, 2002, p. 20). For Blyth, ideas are the *zeitgeist* and intellectual scaffolding that ‘provide agents with an interpretive framework’, a scientific and normative framing of the economy and polity, and a blueprint about how these entities should be constituted and related. Ideas act as normative frames or constructions which facilitate the design of new institutions and the development of plans and politic strategies—ideas, in other words, are an important source of endogenous change:

... such an analysis of institutional change suggests that the reduction of uncertainty, the specification of causes, and the actual supply of new institutions are parts of a temporally distinct sequence of events where ideas have different effects at different junctures.... This is *not* to say that only ideas matter, nor that institutional change is purely an ideational affair; they do not and it is not. (Blyth, 2002, p. 11)

Blyth thus suggests that there exists a certain reciprocity between ideas, institutional learning, processes of policy or ideational diffusion and change—in which ideas form an important, perhaps even dominant, agency in institutional change.

But if we accept the importance of *ideas* as a source of change, as does much contemporary institutional scholarship, then how should *ideas* be understood? How do ideas manifest, propagate, and impact institutions and produce change; indeed, how do they overcome the paradox of embedded action especially if they impact or threaten interests? As an analytical category, *ideas* are conceptually slippery. Do we view ideas as a thought or suggestion, an aim or a purpose, a mental impression, an opinion or belief, a cognitive map, as shared values or concerns, or as strategies to inform actions? How do we differentiate between ideas? Are economic ideas as important as ideas about social values and beliefs in terms of inducing institutional change? And where do ideas sit in terms of their locus; within institutions as statements of purpose, mandate, role, function or aspiration, broadly within the polity as a means of projecting group identity, or diffusely as conceptual boundaries which allow for inter-subjective understanding? More fundamentally, how do we understand the relationship between ideas and interests? Do ideas trump interests, or do ideas reflect the ways and means of projecting interests (Colomy, 1998)?

Equally, why should we assume that ideas are the repository of agency that produces change? Ideas can be constraining and disciplining. Ideas comprise knowledge systems which impose meaning, reproduce social, political and economic institutional orders and often resist change. The canon law of the Catholic church, for example, or the notion of Christendom are ideas that involve the imposition of certain values to the exclusion of others, seeking to embed certain social relations and modes of conduct, and resist ideational deviation other than through acts of proselytising. Similarly, as Campbell notes, paradigms can act as 'cognitive background assumptions that constrain decision making and institutional change by limiting the range of alternatives that decision-making elites are likely to perceive as useful and worth considering' (Campbell, 2002, p. 22, 2004, p. 94). There is no reason to assume that ideas are always sources of change. They can also be sources of stasis, a means of constraining change or of disciplining contrarian thinking (Carstensen, 2011).

As an *explanandum*, *ideas* thus remain theoretically obtuse and suffer from indeterminacy and contestation. It is one thing to assert that ideas are important, even powerful, but quite another to trace their origins, to map why some ideas become more powerful than others, and how ideas manifest as a change agent to influence actors, interests, or cause variation, modification, or innovation in institutional orders. No one doubts the

pervasive influence of Keynesianism, liberalism, and neoliberalism, but demonstrating ideational pathways as mechanisms of change and their manifestation in institutional orders is both theoretically complex and vexed. Blyth's statement of the problem perhaps best summarises this theoretical conundrum:

Despite ... historical institutionalist analyses opening up more fully to ideas as independent causal elements, some problems remain. For example, Helleiner's study, explaining why ideas about the role and function of finance changed in the 1930s and 1970s, relies on the ostensible "facts" of economic difficulties promoting new ideas. However, positing that the supply of new ideas is reducible to material changes itself relegates ideas to being autonomic responses to periods of crisis. If this is the case, then the transformative role of ideas is limited at best. Similarly, although McNamara's and other recent historical institutionalist scholarship has been increasingly open to viewing ideas and interests "not as competing causal factors, but as ... inherent[ly] interconnect[ed]," such scholarship has not, as yet, explicitly theorized exactly how this occurs [T]he assumptions behind this body of theory—and the lack of explicit theorizing about the relationship between ideas, interests, and institutions—dictate that ideas tend to be seen ... as auxiliary hypotheses employed to account for the anomaly of change within otherwise static theories. (Blyth, 2002, p. 23)

At one and the same time, Blyth's statement is a call for more explicit theorising about the relationship between ideas, interests, and institutions, but also an admission that ideas, values, and beliefs remain problematic as stand-alone theoretical categories—unless, that is, social scientists reconceptualise *ideas* such that they are not seen as simply 'anterior or external to interests' (Blyth, 2002, p. 27).

To a large degree, this has been the most recent project of ideational institutionalists—a third-wave institutionalism. Recent work by scholars such as Mukand and Rodrik (2016), for example, has sought to demonstrate that 'ideas and interests both matter for policy and institutional change, and also feed into each other' (Mukand & Rodrik, 2016, p. 5):

On the one hand economic interests drive the kind of ideas that politicians put forward. As Shepsle (1985) put it, ideas can be regarded as "hooks on which politicians hang their objectives and further their interests." However, ideas also shape interests. In our model, this happens because they alter voter preferences *ex post* and/or shift their worldviews, in both cases shifting rankings over policy. (Mukand & Rodrik, 2016, p. 5; Shepsle, 1985)

For Rodrik, in other words, ‘interests are an idea’ (Rodrik, 2014, p. 206). Interests ‘are not fixed or predetermined. They are themselves shaped by ideas—belief about who we are, what we are trying to archive, and how the world works. Our perceptions of self-interest are always filtered through the lens of ideas’ (Rodrik, 2012). Indeed, for third-wave institutionalists the historical primacy of *interests* in social science is puzzling. For them, the market place of ideas is rarely centred on purely economic interests but filtered through political entrepreneurs developing new ideas, institutions, or policy by appealing to values, identities or other normative reference points which make new ideas or policy compelling and thus change possible. As Mukand and Rodrik (2016, p. 1) note, ideas matter, ‘ideational politics seems at least as important as interest-based politics’—indeed more important especially if we understand interests as a sub-set of preferences defined in relation to ideational values and beliefs (see also Rodrik, 2014). For ideational institutionalists, it is ideas which provide the ‘interpretive frameworks that give definition to our values and preferences and thus make political and economic interests actionable’ (Carstensen & Schmidt, 2016, p. 318). This is why resources are given to think tanks, lobbyists, civil society organisations and religious orders who each attempt to shape opinions, push certain ideas and thus achieve change relative to the values they hold.

For third-wave ideational institutionalists, far from ideas being the jet-sam and flotsam floating above the realpolitik of power and interests, ideas in fact embody and reflect power; they manifest in institutional orders, impacting the organisation of social, political and economic relations. Indeed, for more recent discursive institutionalists, ideas are the constituting basis of power and power projection. As Carstensen and Schmidt observe, ideational power reflects the ‘capacity of actors to persuade other actors to accept and adopt their views on what to think and do’, while the persuasiveness of ideas, the entrepreneurialism of brokers marketing ideas, and the way actors view, interpret and understand ideas, help to explain the complex and reflective processes by which some ideas become accepted and thus powerful, either engendering institutional and policy change or, by their very dominance and power, precipitating stability and long waves of stasis (Carstensen & Schmidt, 2016, p. 323).

While such insights have made valuable contributions to institutionalist literatures, the theorising of ideas and their relationship to interests, and of ideational power and its relationship to institutional change and stasis, remains theoretically vexed. Despite several decades of scholarly effort and