



The Policy Effects of Internationalization: A Subsystem Adjustment Analysis of Policy Change

MICHAEL HOWLETT

Department of Political Science, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby (BC), Canada, V5A 1S6

howlett@sfu.ca

M. RAMESH

School of Economics and Political Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

ramesh@econ.usyd.edu.au

Key words: policy networks, policy subsystems, international–domestic linkages, path dependency, policy learning

Abstract

This article contributes to a better understanding of contemporary policy analysis and management by setting out the parameters for analyzing policy change induced by internationalization. It first maps the dynamics of policy change in domestic settings and then explores how internationalization has affected the dynamics identified. The central proposition of the article is that internationalization promotes the restructuring of policy subsystems in such a way as to form hospitable circumstances for swifter and deeper policy changes than would otherwise be the case. However, the analysis suggests that this is a two-stage process in that once its initial impact is felt, internationalization serves to entrench and stabilize reconstructed policy systems, thus constraining the scope for further change.

Introduction¹

It is common for economic and business commentators to observe that internationalization² has fundamentally changed how states govern, without specifying how the changes are actualized through the policy process (Lazar, 2001; Botcheva and Martin, 2001). Scholars of public policy, too, avoid this question, and indeed the international realm generally.³ Scholars of international relations do address the effects of internationalization on states (Cerny, 1996, 1999; Keohane and Milner, 1996) but largely ignore the effects of domestic variables in determining the receptiveness of states to exogenous influences, an understanding of which is essential for comprehending the processes at work in “internationalization.” The challenge before scholars is to incorporate changes induced by internationalization into conceptions of the policy process and its outcomes (Hollingsworth, 1998).

Although initially conceived in somewhat simplistic terms, the recent literature on internationalization recognizes its highly complex character and the different forms it takes across space and time (Weiss, 1999; Brenner, 1999; Omae, 1990). This recent literature suggests that the effects of international influences are highly variable, not least because they are mediated by domestic institutions that vary across nations and across policy sectors (Bernstein and Cashore, 2000; Bennett, 1991; Walsh, 1994). Drawing on earlier works that stressed the reciprocal or dialectical nature of international-domestic policy linkages (Gourevitch, 1978; Almond, 1989; Hintze, 1975), contemporary researchers have largely abandoned an early tendency to cast internationalization in quasi-Hegelian terms as an all-encompassing socio-cultural *geist* (Fukuyama, 1992) and are now explicitly investigating the means, manner, and mechanisms through which domestic policy actors are linked to international systems and vice versa (Coleman and Perl, 1999; Risse-Kappen, 1995; Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Keck and Sikkink, 1998). The purpose of the present article is to advance this research agenda by developing a model of policy change that highlights the role played by international factors at different levels and upon different aspects of domestic policymaking. It concentrates upon the nature of, and the interplay between, ideas and actors in international and domestic policy systems (Hansen and King, 2001; Clark, 1998; Cortell and Peterson, 1999) and, as such, contributes to the emerging synthesis of traditional studies of international relations, comparative politics, and political economy characteristic of contemporary policy studies and policy analysis (Milner, 1998; Risse-Kappen, 1996).

Understanding policy change: beyond exogenous crises and homeostatic systems

All claims about the influence of internationalization on public policy are about policy change: that is, about how policy outputs are affected by the interpenetration of domestic and international policy processes. Until recently, it was widely held that significant changes affecting the underlying conceptual aspects of policy goals occurred largely as a result of events and occurrences taking place outside of stable policymaking institutions (Heclo, 1976, 1994; Sabatier, 1998). This thinking was based on the belief that policy sectors constituted distinct policy regimes consisting of the current collectively accepted definition of an issue, the current relevant policies (laws, regulations, fiscal instruments, government programs and relationships), and the actors and institutions (both inside and outside government) actively engaged in implementing and modifying the policies (Harris and Milkis, 1989; Eisner, 1994a, 1994b). These policy regimes were viewed as examples of a general class of stable "homeostatic" systems that are self-adjusting or self-equilibrating in routine circumstances. Under the influence of major external shocks or "jolts" that introduce new extraneous elements into the system, however, these system could be thrown out of equilibrium (Starling,

1975; Aminzade, 1992; Meyer, 1982; Meyer, Brooks, and Goes, 1990), resulting in changes in policy outcomes.

This notion of the exogenous nature of significant policy change focused attention on the various types of external crises that could provoke changes in policy goals and objectives and in instruments or their settings (Wilsford, 1985). "Internationalization" tended to be considered simply as the intrusion of external elements into otherwise stable domestic policymaking processes. While this insight was a useful corrective to frameworks for policy analysis that tended to concentrate upon, or otherwise overemphasize, the role of domestic factors in the policymaking process (Kubler, 2001), the metaphor of contemporary policymaking as a homeostatic system that underlies this analysis has increasingly come to be challenged.

More recent conceptions of policy regimes are more chaotic and largely eschew notions of systems as capable of retaining their own balance in a dynamic equilibrium. Rather contemporary thinking tends to favor adaptive constructs in which it is assumed that policy actors not only react to external changes but can also affect their own environments and, as a result, can endogenously induce significant change (Daneke, 1992; Jervis, 1997; Marion, 1999; Buckley, 1968). In policy analysis, this shift has manifested itself in the acknowledgment that external crises are not the only source of policy change and that factors internal to policy systems or subsystems can also independently, or in conjunction with external factors, lead to significant policy change (Thomas, 1999; Smith, 2000). This reconceptualization has led to greater efforts to measure, chronicle, and account for policy change. To date, however, these latter analyses have not developed a systematic analysis of internationalization and of the change processes associated with this phenomenon.

As shall be discussed below, the central importance of the introduction of new actors and ideas in precipitating and shaping specific types of policy change are particularly evident in many recent works on policy dynamics derived from the analysis of policy regimes as complex adaptive systems. Taken together, these works establish the basis for a *subsystem adjustment* model of policy change in which specific change types—policy goals, program specifications, policy instrument types, and instrument component parts—are linked to specific processes that either facilitate or impede the entrance of new actors and ideas into existing policy regimes. Understanding the nature of these processes and their interrelationships is essential to understanding the manner in which internationalization affects policy processes and outcomes.

Types of policy outputs and the general variables responsible for policy change

In a widely cited study, Peter Hall identified three different levels or "orders" of policy outputs associated with alterations in policy means or goals: the *settings* of policy instruments, the types of *instruments*, and the *goals* of policy

(Hall, 1993).⁴ For example, the goal of an industrial policy might be to enhance industrial diversification, an instrument that could be used to accomplish this end might be a subsidy, and that subsidy would be set at a specific level or rate. However, as Daugbjerg (1997) correctly points out, the logic behind Hall's insight in analytically distinguishing between instruments and settings is that policy outputs differ not only according to whether the goals or means of policy are affected but also according to differences in their conceptual or practical aspects.

Taking these two dimensions (conceptual and practical, and means and ends) into account yields a fourfold taxonomy of policy outputs. That is, there are not only the policy goals, policy instruments types, and instrument components or "settings," as Hall discussed, but also a fourth type of "practical" objectives consisting of the specifications of the programs intended to operationalize an abstract goal. In the example given above, these practical objectives would refer to the specific programmatic principles used to give effect or meaning to the more general goal of "diversification," such as the desire, for example, to enhance regional employment by 10% or national technological or manufacturing capacity by 50% over a 10-year period.

Any or all of the four basic policy output types can be affected by change processes such as internationalization. At the level of ideas and concepts, policy change can involve alteration or reformulation of abstract policy goals or ends, or of the general nature of the types of policy instruments used as the means to implement those goals. At a more practical or programmatic level, change can involve shifts in program specifications or the calibration of specific policy instrument components in use.

But what drives the process of policy change? That is, why is one change outcome apparent in some circumstances and not in others? In this regard, a sizable literature suggests that, in a general sense, changes in the ends of policies, be they conceptual or practical, require new ideas to be incorporated into policymaking processes (True, Jones, and Baumgartner, 1999; Campbell, 1998; Blyth, 1997; Hall, 1993). Similarly, a sizable body of policy research links changes in the conceptual aspects of policymaking to the presence of new actors in policy subsystems (Baumgartner and Jones, 1993; Howlett and Rayner, 1995; Hoberg, 1996; Jacobsen 1995; Pontusson, 1995). These findings suggest that the propensity for specific types of policy change can be associated with the presence or absence of new ideas and actors in policy processes. The logic of this model is set out in Table 1 below.

This model suggests that "substantial" change involving a reconsideration of policy goals is likely to occur only in situations characterized by the presence of both new ideas and new actors in the policymaking process. On the other extreme, when new ideas and actors are absent, one would anticipate only minor changes in instrument components or "settings." In between these extremes are two other situations characterized by the absence of either new actors or new ideas, which would lead to a propensity for changes in program specifications or policy instrument type.

Table 1. A model of the effects of the presence or absence of new actors and ideas on types of policy change.

	Presence of new actors	Continuity of old actors
Presence of new ideas	Change in policy goals (e.g., enhance national industrial capacity and productivity)	Change in program specifications (e.g., develop new technology sectors over the next 10 years)
Continuity of old ideas	Change in instrument types (e.g., provide subsidies to new technology start-ups)	Change in instrument components or "settings" (e.g., set subsidy as 33%, five-year accelerated depreciation allowance)

In the abstract, of course, it is possible for meta-policy processes such as internationalization to affect either or both of the means or ends of policies, as well as either or both of their general conceptual or practical, programmatic, aspects. Simply outlining the potential policy elements that processes such as internationalization could affect, of course, does not tell us anything about the *likely* effect of such processes. In order to understand the propensity for specific types of policy changes to be triggered by internationalization, it is first necessary to consider in more detail the nature of the policy processes that lead to policy change, the question to which we now turn.

Elements of a subsystem adjustment model of policy change

Construed as a complex adaptive construct, policymaking is usually seen as the result of the ongoing behavior of policymakers interacting at a meso, or sectoral, level over issues of common interest and definition. Analyses at the level of policy fields or policy domains center on the emergence of relatively consistent sets of actors interacting within more or less well established sectoral institutional parameters: that is, upon the sectoral *policy subsystem*. According to Sabatier (1998, p. 99), "A subsystem consists of actors from a variety of public and private organizations who are actively concerned with a policy problem or issue, such as agriculture, and who regularly seek to influence public policy in that domain." He argues that policy subsystems provide "the most useful unit of analysis for understanding the overall policy process," superior to the use of other units such as government organizations or programs.

Numerous policy initiatives are simultaneously considered in policy subsystems, and each issue or initiative tends to involve specific subsets of subsystem actors (Jones, 1994). As mentioned above, the dynamic aspect of subsystem behavior revolves around the entrance of new ideas and new actors into established networks, altering the nature of their deliberations and

discourses and promoting policy change (Buckley, 2000; Singer, 1990) and most of the literature in this field has focused on identifying the specific forces and processes that promote subsystem change. Few papers have tried to identify processes that inhibit such change (Rayner et al., 2001; Howlett and Rayner, 1995), and fewer still have attempted to analyze the manner in which these two effects interact or to identify the type of change likely to occur as a result of this interaction (Howlett, 2001).

Nevertheless, the identification of both subsystem change and stability processes and the assessment of their impact are essential tasks required for an adequate understanding of the impact on policy outcomes of a meta-policy process such as internationalization. In what follows, the basic change and stability processes identified in the literature are examined. Following this, an evaluation of the interactive effects of these processes is provided. This analysis is then applied to the case of internationalization.

Policy change processes

The processes identified in the policy literature to date that foster the emergence of new actors and ideas in policy subsystems are *systemic perturbations*, *subsystem spillovers*, *policy learning*, and *venue changing*.

Systemic perturbations is a formal term used in the literature to describe the well-known external events—including contingent occurrences such as wars or disasters, or repeating events such as critical elections and leadership changes—that upset established policy routines. As noted above, Paul Sabatier, for example, has argued that “changes in the core aspects of a policy are usually the result of perturbations in non-cognitive factors external to the subsystem such as macro-economic conditions or the rise of a new systemic governing coalition” (Sabatier, 1988). The principal mechanism by which change occurs is via the introduction of new actors into policy processes, very often in the form of enhanced public attention being paid to a policy issue as a result of a perceived crisis situation. Crises afford enhanced opportunities to policymakers, because they are required to look beyond routine and there is often not the time for extensive consultation or for opposition to change to build up. There are numerous examples of such perturbations, from airline accidents that focus public attention on issues such as transportation safety to election results that bring new administrations to power (Kingdon, 1984; Birkland, 1998).

Subsystem spillovers refers to a second type of exogenous change process that occurs when activities in otherwise distinct policy subsystems transcend their boundaries and affect the structure or behaviour of other subsystems (Dery, 1999; Haas, 1976). Although this particular process of policy change has just begun to be examined, it would appear that spillovers can occur on specific issues without any permanent change in subsystem membership (through subsystem intersection) or they can be more long-term in nature (caused by

subsystem convergence) (Hoberg and Morawski, 1997; Grant and MacNamara, 1995). These processes, like systemic perturbations, affect policy outcomes largely through the temporary or permanent introduction of new actors into otherwise stable subsystems. Unlike systemic perturbations, however, as Grant and MacNamara (1995) have noted, the new actors tend to be policy specialists and interested parties, rather than simply members of the aroused public. Subsystem spillovers are very common in areas affected by technological change—such as the convergence of previously more or less independent sectors, like computers and broadcasting, caused by the invention and popularization of the internet—but also occur in other areas when principles and practices from one policy area inform deliberations in another: for example, when environmental ideas such as biodiversity spillover into industrial sectors such as forestry or mining (Howlett and Rayner, 1995) or when considerations about human rights affect issues such as gender-based inequities in employment relationships (True and Mintrom, 2001).

Policy learning refers to an endogenous change-enhancing process in which, as Hugh Heclo (1974) has noted, a relatively enduring alteration in policy results from policymakers and participants learning from experience with similar policies (Heclo, 1974; Bennett and Howlett, 1992; May, 1992). The material learned is often knowledge and ideas generated from the experiences of other jurisdictions, but can also involve reflection on experiences originating within the confines of the subsystem's existing boundaries (Rose, 1991, 1993; Olsen and Peters, 1996). This behavior can result in a variety of feedback-like learning processes that affect the behavior of subsystem members (Pierson, 1993; Knoepfel and Kissling-Naf, 1998). An increasingly common and sought-after process, policy learning is apparent in areas such as the extension of rules and regulations for protection of privacy and freedom of information from one country to the next, and in many other areas of government policymaking activity (Bennett, 1992, 1997).

Finally, *venue change* refers to another endogenous change process resulting from actors' efforts to shift the venue where policy decisions are made in order to provide a more receptive hearing for their concerns. This process takes the form of actors transferring the policy to another subsystem by altering the "image" or understanding of a policy with the objective of altering the resulting policy outputs in a way that suits the actors' interests (Schattschneider, 1960). In their work on policy formation in the United States, for example, Baumgartner and Jones (1991, 1993) noted several common strategies employed by actors to gain access to policy deliberations and affect policy outcomes, notably by altering the venue for hearings from the executive realm to the legislative or vice versa. In Canada and Australia, for example, very successful venue-shifting activities have been undertaken in recent years by First Nations or Aboriginal groups, which have moved freely between the legislatures, executives, and the courts, seeking favorable action on their land claims and other grievances (Howlett, 1994).

Policy stability processes

Against these change processes are arrayed a number of processes that promote policy stability. Two of the most important of these identified in the policy literature are *path dependence* and *closed networks*.

Path dependence refers to the manner in which current policy decisions are influenced by the institutional and behavioral legacies of past decisions (Pierson, 2000; Rose, 1990). Policy legacies affect current policymaking due to factors such as sunk costs or institutional routines and procedures that can force decision-making in particular directions by eliminating or distorting the range of options available to governments (Weir, 1992). Hence, for example, a decision to alter an existing nuclear energy program in which billions may already have been invested, is a much more difficult decision to make than a corresponding decision about a program that has not yet been started. Evidence of the stabilizing effects of past policies, or policy legacies, is apparent in many policy areas, from the impact of past spending on hospitals for healthcare systems (Wilsford, 1994) to the nature of privatization decisions taken by postcommunist governments in eastern Europe and elsewhere (Rona-Tas, 1998).

Closed networks refers to policy stability promoted by the ability of existing key policy actors to prevent new members from entering into policy debates and discourses. Rhodes (1997), Schaap and van Twist (1997), and many others (e.g., Baumgartner and Jones, 1991) have argued that all subsystem actors attempt to construct "policy monopolies" in which the interpretation and general approach to a subject is more or less fixed. However, not all attempts are successful. In most sectors, the structure of a subsystem provides certain actors with the ability to veto or block change in the sector, sometimes by creating "critical subsectors" with special abilities or resources vis-à-vis other subsectors (Rayner et al., 2001). This situation can occur, for example, in instances when governments refuse to place prominent critics on advisory boards when funding is not provided for interveners at regulatory tribunals, or when the creation of such boards and procedures is resisted (Smith, 1977; de Bruijn and ten Heuvelhof, 1995).

A subsystem adjustment model of policy change: actors and ideas as dynamic variables

The change and stability processes identified above share the two central variables previously identified as the general factors underlying policy change: the presence or absence of new actors and ideas in the policymaking process. Since they share these common factors, the specific change processes can be "paired" with specific processes enhancing policy stability (see Table 2).

The existing literature thus points to the manner in which policies change through different processes but primarily as the result of the entry into policy subsystems of new actors, be they the public or policy "elites," and new ideas,

Table 2. Key variables involved in policy change and stability processes.

Change variable	Change process	Stability process	Variation promoting change/stability
Actors	Systemic perturbation, and subsystem spillovers	Closed networks	Entrance of new actors into subsystem, or lack thereof
Ideas	Policy learning, and venue/image change	Path dependency	Entrance of new ideas into subsystem, or lack thereof

which may be specific new knowledge or more general policy frames. The literature on change and stability processes, however, emphasizes the fact that the entrance of new actors and ideas into policy arenas is not automatic, since stability processes can undermine a change process's capacity to alter existing constellations of policy ideas and actors (Hansen and King, 2001; Coleman and Perl, 1999). As a result, policy change tends to result less from the operation of a single change process than from the interaction, or *vector*, of competing change and stability processes at work in specific policy subsystems at specific points in time.

Since the subsystem change and stability processes outlined above affect the configuration of actors and ideas involved in policymaking, it follows that the basic propensity for policy change is closely related to the manner in which change and stability processes interact to produce specific configurations of actors and ideas in policy deliberations. As Table 2 suggests, each of the subsystem change and stability processes fundamentally involves the introduction, or the prevention of the introduction, of either new actors or new ideas into a policy process, and, as a result, each of these processes can be linked to a propensity for a specific types of change in policy outputs. The basic expectations for the impact of subsystem change and stability processes on policy outcomes are set out in Table 3.

Table 3. Policy change propensities of major change and stability processes.

Policy change type	Requisite variables	Configuration of subsystem change and stability processes
Changes in policy goals	Presence of new actors Presence of new ideas	Systemic perturbations or spillovers and policy learning or venue change
Change in program specifications	Continuity of old actors Presence of new ideas	Policy learning or venue change and closed networks
Change in policy instrument types	Presence of new actors Continuity of old ideas	Systemic perturbations or spillovers and path dependency
Change in instrument components	Continuity of old actors Continuity of old ideas	Closed networks and path dependency

Understanding the relationships between the two central change variables—actors and ideas—and the specific change and stability processes they affect thus leads us to new insights into the dynamics of policy change. Policy goals change only if there is a simultaneous presence of new actors (as a result of systemic perturbations and/or subsystem spillovers) as well as new ideas (emerging from policy learning and/or change in the venue where policy is made). At the opposite end, minimal changes are accomplished—only the instrument components change—when stability processes such as closed networks and path dependency predominate. Pressures for change from new ideas countered by closed networks tend to lead to changes in program specifications, while the entrance of new actors into a path-dependent situation is likely to lead only to a change in the type of instruments used to address a problem.

At any particular conjuncture, therefore, the propensity for specific types of policy change can be thought of as being determined by the interactive effects of change and stability processes on subsystem membership and deliberations. As such, assessing the impact of any large-scale socioeconomic, political, or cultural phenomenon (such as internationalization) on furthering or intensifying policy change requires the analysis of how such macro-level processes affect more micro- or meso-level subsystem change and stability processes (Welch and Wong, 2001; Wilson, 2000). The likely pattern of the effects of internationalization on domestic policymaking is set out in the following section.

The effects of internationalization on domestic policymaking

Effects on subsystem change and stability processes

While internationalization does not itself cause *systemic perturbations*, it has accentuated the speed and frequency with which such perturbations occur and has strengthened the depth and extent of their impact. As is frequently noted, one of the most noticeable features of internationalization is the speed with which the effects of events elsewhere (natural calamities, financial crises, stock market gyrations, etc.) spread via the telecommunications media, and the profound impact this has on a range of related (and unrelated) areas (Rosenau, 1969; Reinicke, 1999). The potential for policy *spillovers* is also augmented in absolute terms as previously isolated sectors converge, overlap, and collide. What were in the past seen as discrete sectors—such as telecommunications and computers, or agriculture and trade—are often now increasingly viewed as elements of a single sector (Coleman and Grant, 1998). Another example is the fear of capital flight, which haunts policymakers when they are faced with major decisions involving large public expenditures that require tax increases or budget deficits. Traditional social policy areas such as social security and health have become a part of economic policymaking as a result (Unger and van Waarden, 1995).

New opportunities for *policy learning* are also created by internationalization. This is the theme of much recent work on policy transfers, which especially highlight the role of transnational epistemic communities and nongovernmental organizations in promoting learning activities (Haas, 1992; Stone, 1999; Bennett and Howlett, 1992; Evans and Davies, 1999). The lessons of privatization of telecommunications in Britain and the deregulation of airlines in the United States in the 1980s, for example, rapidly spread around the world and across policy sectors because of the active role played by the associated epistemic communities (Ikenberry, 1990). Opportunities for *venue change* have also expanded with the proliferation of international regimes in trade and nontrade-related areas (Haggard and Simmons, 1987; Krasner, 1982; Rittberger and Mayer, 1993). When a domestic policy actor loses out in a domestic setting, it now may seek to have the policy transferred to international organizations if it expects its position to receive a more favorable reception in that venue. Powerful new international organizations such as the European Union and the World Trade Organization have opened up new venues to domestic policy actors for pursuing their interests (Richardson, 1999; Cortell and Davis, 1996).

The subsystem effects of two-stage internationalization

Internationalization thus serves to introduce new actors and new ideas into domestic policymaking processes and undermines existing closed networks and path dependencies at the domestic level. This situation explains the well-recognized propensity of internationalization to lead to significant policy changes in many sectors and areas of social and political life. However, use of the subsystem adjustment model also draws attention to a less well-recognized aspect of internationalization, namely, its "two-step", or staged, evolution from stability to instability and then back to stability again (Kubler, 2001).

In the first instance, internationalization promotes all the major change-enhancing policy processes noted above. However, once its initial impact is felt, internationalization also serves to entrench reconstructed policy subsystems. This phenomenon is not yet fully recognized. In its first, initial, phase, internationalization promotes significant shifts in domestic policies by promoting change processes and undermining stability ones. However, this effect soon gives way once the policy shift is accomplished and the new policy is institutionalized. This is because, in the second phase, while the potential for policy change precipitated by systemic perturbations and fostered by policy learning continues as before, the scope for subsystem spillovers and venue/image change is considerably reduced. The new actors and ideas that come to dominate the policy subsystem in the first phase undermine further changes by reducing the potential for new subsystem spillovers and venue changes. This outcome is augmented by the new stability processes set in motion by direct stage internationalization whereby the newly reconfigured

subsystem is closed off to new entrants and the new policies foster their own path dependencies. The result is a considerably reduced propensity for substantial policy change.

In other words, once in place, new actors and new ideas become elements of a new policy regime and, as such, tend to promote the formation of new policy monopolies and path dependencies, albeit on a different trajectory and with different membership than the old regimes they displaced. This outcome can be seen when internationalization opens up domestic policy discourses that quickly become closed again when international agreements legalize/technicalize many formerly purely domestic issues. These agreements—which may eventually crystallize into a *regime*—serve to exclude new options from being considered and narrow the scope for further policy innovations (Coleman, Skogstad, and Atkinson, 1996; Davis, 1998; Glasbergen, 1998). Examples of this process exist in the EU—for example, dealing with policy sectors related to steel manufacturing and water regulation, among others (Dudley, 1999; Dudley and Richardson, 1999). And there are numerous other examples of such processes at work in other forums. Epstein (1997), for example, found such a two-stage pattern in the negotiation of French agricultural policy following the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations. True and Mintrom's (2001) findings concerning the impact of human rights activities on gender mainstreaming revealed a similar pattern. The rapid spread of private financing of health care (World Bank, 1993) and the shift away from defined-benefits to defined-contribution income maintenance schemes for the aged (World Bank, 1994) also provide evidence of this pattern as the changes promoted by international economic institutions have quickly taken deep roots; changing them back is unlikely to be easy in the future, despite emerging evidence that some of the reforms may be misguided. The removal of border controls on capital movement in recent decades is similarly entrenched, for example, again despite growing evidence of its dysfunctional effects (Kahler, 1998; Obstfeld, 1998).

Hence, while most changes in all types of policy are initially enhanced by internationalization, they are soon counterbalanced by the heavy weight of a new institutional legacy promoting path dependency. From that point onwards, pressures for change are offset by the newly entrenched policy practices and frames that inhibit substantial changes.

The projected effects of subsystem change and stability processes associated with internationalization in its first and second stages are set out in Table 4 below.

Conclusion: assessing the impact of internationalization on policy change

This article has argued that the effects of internationalization on public policy should primarily be viewed as arising from the particular configuration of well-known processes promoting and inhibiting policy subsystem change. And

Table 4. Stability and change processes related to the initial and secondary impacts of internationalization.

Process	Phase I		Phase II	
	Impact of internationalization	Policy effect	Impact of internationalization	Policy effect
Change processes				
Systemic perturbations	More rapid dissemination	Sporadic, random impact introducing new actors	Continuation of the first phase	Sporadic, random impact introducing new actors
Subsystem spillovers	Enhanced by increased linkages	Sporadic, ongoing impact introducing new actors	Reduced scope for spillovers	Less frequent introduction of new actors
Policy learning	Greatly enhanced by increased transnational linkages	Significant ongoing impact introducing new ideas	Continuation of the first phase	Significant ongoing impact introducing new ideas
Venue change	Greatly enhanced by creation of new international institutions	Significant ongoing impact introducing new ideas	Reduced scope for venue change	Less frequent introduction of new ideas
Stability processes				
Closed subsystem	Undermined by introduction of new international and transnational actors	Significant, ongoing impact allowing new actor involvement	Closing up of the newly re-configured subsystem	Significant impact limiting additional actor participation
Path dependency	Domestic regimes undermined by creation of international institutions	Significant, ongoing impact encouraging new ideas and actors	Entrenched by institutionalization	Significant impact limiting additional ideas

understanding these processes is more and more a significant part of policy analysis as internationalization proceeds apace.

Seen in this light, internationalization is, initially, a vital catalyst promoting processes inducing change and undermining those maintaining stability. This understanding helps explain why, in its first phase, internationalization can

lead to dramatic "paradigm shifts" in policy by introducing new actors and ideas into policy regimes, thereby undermining the stabilizing aspects of policy monopolies and path dependencies and leading to the consideration and implementation of new policy goals and instrument types. However, as issues, sectors, and affected jurisdictions "deepen" the process of internationalization, the result, somewhat paradoxically, is less significant change, since only the practical methods for achieving policy objectives—program specifications—or the components of the instruments used to achieve them will tend to be altered (Kahler, 1989; Coleman and Perl, 1999; Pappi and Henning, 1999).

From a methodological standpoint, for policy analysis, these findings reveal the usefulness of developing a more nuanced understanding of the policy effects of internationalization than is currently found in the literature and suggest the merits of utilizing a subsystem adjustment model of policy change in so doing. Applying a subsystem adjustment model to understand policy change resulting from internationalization processes helps to reveal the underlying dynamics behind these processes and their differential impact on different policy sectors.

Moreover, from a more practical perspective, this analysis implies that those who are counting on the new "liberal" policies induced by internationalization to end any time soon will most likely be disappointed. Internationalization has created a new set of national and international actors and ideas that sustain and perpetuate the new policy regimes developed through this process (March and Olsen, 1998). The subsystem adjustment model suggests that the imperatives for conforming national policies to international forces are likely to continue in the near future, at least until such time as some other set of ideas and actors arises to undermine the new order and precipitate another substantial shift in policy contents.

Notes

1. This article has benefitted from the comments of several reviewers for the *Journal*. We would like to thank them for their perceptive criticisms and suggestions for improvement.
2. Given the controversy, not to mention deep emotions, that the term *globalization* generates, we avoid the term as far as possible in this article. We are also sympathetic towards the view that much of what is referred to as *globalization* is really *internationalization*. For a summary of the contending arguments, see Held et al. (1999). According to Moran and Wood, "Internationalization is a process through which the authority and autonomy of the state is challenged or supplanted by structures, process or policy developments which cut across national boundaries" (1996, p. 125). Scholars of international relations define the term more strictly, using it to refer to the process of increasing links among states in a way that maintains the fundamentals of the state system.
3. The literature that does deal with both internationalization and public policy tends to focus on *global public policy*, defined as the study of international interactions dealing with shared public policy problems rather than how domestic policy institutions and outcomes are affected by internationalization. See, for example, Gummert (1996), Reinicke (1998), Parry (1993), and Willett (1988).

4. The use of the term *setting* by Hall has caused some confusion. This term does not refer to the general context or policy environment but rather to the specific calibration of a policy tool—in the “settings” for a machine tool or lathe.

References

- Almond, Gabriel A. (1989). “Review Article: The International–National Connection.” *British Journal of Political Science* 19(2), 237–259.
- Aminzade, Ronald. (1992). “Historical Sociology and Time.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 20(4), 456–480.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Bryan D. Jones. (1991). “Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems.” *Journal of Politics* 53(4), 1044–1074.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Bryan D. Jones. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, Colin J. (1991). “What is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?” *British Journal of Political Science* 21(2), 215–233.
- Bennett, Colin J. (1992). *Regulating Privacy: Data Protection and Public Policy in Europe and the United States*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bennett, Colin J. (1997). “Understanding Ripple Effects: The Cross-National Adoption of Policy Instruments for Bureaucratic Accountability.” *Governance* 10(3), 213–233.
- Bennett, Colin J. and Michael Howlett. (1992). “The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change.” *Policy Sciences* 25(3), 275–294.
- Bernstein, Steven and Benjamin Cashore. (2000). “Globalization, Four Paths of Internationalization and Domestic Policy Change: The Case of EcoForestry in British Columbia, Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 33(1), 67–100.
- Birkland, Thomas A. (1998). “Focusing Events, Mobilization, and Agenda Setting.” *Journal of Public Policy* 18(1), 53–74.
- Blyth, Mark M. (1997). “Any More Bright Ideas? The Ideational Turn of Comparative Political Economy.” *Comparative Politics* 29, 229–250.
- Botcheva, Liliana. (2001). “Institutional Effects on State Behaviour: Convergence and Divergence.” *International Studies Quarterly* 45 (Lisa L. Martin), 1–26.
- Brenner, Neil. (1999). “Beyond State-Centrism? Space, Territoriality, and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies.” *Theory and Society* 28, 39–78.
- Buckley, Walter. (1968). “Society as a Complex Adaptive System.” In W. Buckley (ed.), *Modern System Research for the Behavioural Scientist*. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 490–513.
- Bulkley, Harriet. (2000). “Discourse Coalition and the Australian Climate Change Policy Network.” *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 18, 727–748.
- Campbell, John L. (1998). “Institutional Analysis and the Role of Ideas in Political Economy.” *Theory and Society* 27(5), 377–409.
- Cerny, Philip G. (1996). “International Finance and the Erosion of State Policy Capacity.” In P. Gummert (ed.), *Globalization and Public Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 83–104.
- Cerny, Philip G. (1999). “Globalization and the Erosion of Democracy.” *European Journal of Political Research* 36, 1–26.
- Clark, William Roberts. (1998). “Agents and Structures: Two Views of Preferences, Two Views of Institutions.” *International Studies Quarterly* 42, 245–270.
- Coleman, William D. and Anthony Perl. (1999). “Internationalized Policy Environments and Policy Network Analysis.” *Political Studies* 47, 691–709.
- Coleman, William D. and Wyn P. Grant. (1998). “Policy Convergence and Policy Feedback: Agricultural Finance Policies in a Globalizing Era.” *European Journal of Political Research* 34, 225–247.
- Coleman, William D., Grace D. Skogstad, and Michael Atkinson. (1996). “Paradigm Shifts and Policy Networks: Cumulative Change in Agriculture.” *Journal of Public Policy* 16(3), 273–302.

- Cortell, Andrew P. and James W. Davis. (1996). "How Do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, 451-478.
- Cortell, Andrew P. and Susan Peterson. (1999). "Altered States: Explaining Domestic Institutional Change." *British Journal of Political Science* 29, 177-203.
- Daneke, Gregory A. (1992). "Back to the Future: Misplaced Elements of Political Inquiry and the Advanced Systems Agenda." In W.N. Dunn and R.M. Kelly (eds.), *Advances in Policy Studies Since 1950*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, pp. 267-290.
- Daugbjerg, Carsten. (1997). "Policy Networks and Agricultural Policy Reforms: Explaining Deregulation in Sweden and Re-regulation in the European Community." *Governance* 10(2), 123-142.
- Davis, Christina. (1998). "How Do International Institutions Matter? Reciprocal Issue Linkages and the Politics of Agricultural Trade Negotiations." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.
- De Bruijn, Johan A. and Ernst F. ten Heuvelhof. (1995). "Policy Networks and Governance." In D.L. Weimer (ed.), *Institutional Design*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 161-179.
- Dery, David. (1999). "Policy by the Way: When Policy is Incidental to Making Other Policies." *Journal of Public Policy* 18(2), 163-176.
- Dudley, Geoffrey. (1999). "British Steel and Government Since Privatization: Policy 'Framing' and the Transformation of Policy Networks." *Public Administration* 77(1), 51-71.
- Dudley, Geoffrey and Jeremy Richardson. (1999). "Competing Advocacy Coalitions and the Process of 'Frame Reflection': A Longitudinal Analysis of EU Steel Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(2), 225-248.
- Eisner, Marc Allen. (1994a). "Discovering Patterns in Regulatory History: Continuity, Change and Regulatory Regimes." *Journal of Policy History* 6(2), 157-187.
- Eisner, Marc Allen. (1994b). "Economic Regulatory Policies: Regulation and Deregulation in Historical Context." In D.H. Rosenbloom and R.D. Schwartz (eds.), *Handbook of Regulation and Administrative Law*. New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 91-116.
- Epstein, Paul J. (1997). "Beyond Policy Community: French Agriculture and the GATT." *Journal of European Public Policy* 4(3), 355-372.
- Evans, Mark and Jonathan Davies. (1999). "Understanding Policy Transfer: A Multi-Level, Multi-Disciplinary Perspective." *Public Administration* 77(2), 361-385.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. (1998). "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52(4), 887-917.
- Fukuyama, Francis. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Avon Books.
- Glasbergen, Pieter. (1998). "Modern Environmental Agreements: A Policy Instrument Becomes a Management Strategy." *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 41(6), 693-709.
- Gourevitch, Peter. (1978). "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32, 881-912.
- Grant, Wyn and Anne MacNamara. (1995). "When Policy Communities Intersect: The Cases of Agriculture and Banking." *Political Studies* 43, 509-515.
- Gummett, P. (ed.). (1996). *Globalisation and Public Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Haas, Ernst B. (1976). "Turbulent Fields and the Theory of Regional Integration." *International Organization* 30(2), 173-212.
- Haas, Peter M. (1992). "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46(1), 1-36.
- Haggard, Stephen and Beth A. Simmons. (1987). "Theories of International Regimes." *International Organization* 41(3), 491-517.
- Hall, John A. (1993). "Ideas and the Social Sciences." In J. Goldstein and R.O. Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 31-56.
- Hall, Peter. (1993). "Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy-Making in Britain." *Comparative Politics* 25(3), 275-296.
- Hansen, Randal and Desmond King. (2001). "Eugenic Ideas, Political Interests, and Policy Variance: Immigration and Sterilization Policy in Britain and the U.S." *World Politics* 53 (January), 237-263.

- Harris, Richard and Sidney Milkis. (1989). *The Politics of Regulatory Change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heclo, Hugh. (1974). *Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden: From Relief to Income Maintenance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heclo, Hugh. (1976). "Conclusion: Policy Dynamics." In R. Rose (ed.), *The Dynamics of Public Policy: A Comparative Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 237–266.
- Heclo, Hugh. (1994). "Ideas, Interests and Institutions." In L.C. Dodd and C. Jillson (eds.), *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches and Interpretations*. San Francisco: Westview, pp. 366–392.
- Held David et al. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Oxford: Polity.
- Hintze, Otto. (1975). "The Formation of States and Constitutional Development: A Study in History and Politics." In F. Gilbert (ed.), *The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 157–177.
- Hoberg, G. and E. Morawski. (1997). "Policy Change Through Sector Intersection: Forest and Aboriginal Policy in Clayoquot Sound." *Canadian Public Administration* 40(3), 387–414.
- Hoberg, George. (1996). "Putting Ideas in Their Place: A Response to Learning and Change in the British Columbia Forest Policy Sector." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 29(1), 135–144.
- Hollingsworth, J. Rogers. (1998). "New Perspectives on the Spatial Dimensions of Economic Coordination: Tensions Between Globalization and Social Systems of Production." *Review of International Political Economy* 5(3), 482–507.
- Howlett, Michael. (1994). "Policy Paradigms and Policy Change: Lessons From the Old and New Canadian Policies Towards Aboriginal Peoples." *Policy Studies Journal* 22(4), 631–651.
- Howlett, Michael. (2001). "Complex Network Management and the Governance of the Environment: Prospects for Policy Change and Policy Stability Over the Long Term." In E. Parsons (ed.), *Governing the Environment: Persistent Challenges, Uncertain Innovations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Howlett, Michael and Jeremy Rayner. (1995). "Do Ideas Matter? Policy Subsystem Configurations and the Continuing Conflict Over Canadian Forest Policy." *Canadian Public Administration* 38(3), 382–410.
- Ikenberry, G. John. (1990). "The International Spread of Privatization Policies: Inducements, Learning, and 'Policy Bandwagoning.'" In E.N. Suleiman and J. Waterbury (eds.), *The Political Economy of Public Sector Reform and Privatization*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 88–110.
- Jacobsen, John Kurt. (1995). "Much Ado About Ideas: The Cognitive Factor in Economic Policy." *World Politics* 47, 283–310.
- Jervis, Robert. (1997). *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, Bryan D. (1994). *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kahler, M. (1998). *Capital Flows and Financial Crises*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kahler, Miles. (1989). "Organization and Cooperation: International Institutions and Policy Coordination." *Journal of Public Policy* 8(3/4), 375–401.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink (eds.). (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Helen V. Milner (eds.). (1996). *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kingdon, John W. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Knoepfel, Peter and Ingrid Kissling-Naf. (1998). "Social Learning in Policy Networks." *Policy and Politics* 26(3), 343–367.
- Krasner, S.D. (1982). "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables." *International Organization* 36(2), 185–205.

- Kubler, Daniel. (2001). "Understanding Policy Change with the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Application to Swiss Drug Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(4), 623-641.
- Lazar, David. (2001). "Regulatory Interdependence and International Governance." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(3), 474-492.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. (1998). "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders." In P.J. Katzenstein, R.O. Keohane, and S.D. Krasner (eds.), *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 303-330.
- Marion, Russ. (1999). *The Edge of Organization: Chaos and Complexity Theories of Formal Social Systems*. London: Sage.
- May, Peter J. (1992). "Policy Learning and Failure." *Journal of Public Policy* 12(4), 331-354.
- Meyer, Alan D. (1982). "Adapting to Environmental Jolts." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 27, 515-537.
- Meyer, Alan D., Geoffrey R. Brooks, and James B. Goes. (1990). "Environmental Jolts and Industry Revolutions: Organizational Responses to Discontinuous Change." *Strategic Management Journal* 11, 93-110.
- Milner, Helen V. (1998). "Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics." *International Organization* 52(4), 759-786.
- Moran, Michael and Bruce Wood. (1996). "Globalization and Public Policy." In P. Gummert (ed.), *Globalisation and Public Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Obstfeld, M. (1998). "The Global Capital Market: Benefactor or Menace?" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12(4), 9-30.
- Olsen, Johan P. and B. Guy Peters (eds.). (1996). *Lessons From Experience: Experiential Learning in Administrative Reforms in Eight Democracies*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Omae, Ken'ichi. (1990). *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked World Economy*. New York: Harper Business.
- Pappi, Franz U. and Christian H.C.A. Henning. (1999). "The Organization of Influence on the EC's Common Agricultural Policy: A Network Approach." *European Journal of Political Research* 36, 257-281.
- Parry, Geraint. (1993). "The Interweaving of Foreign and Domestic Policy-Making." *Government and Opposition* 28(2), 143-151.
- Pierson, Paul. (1993). "When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change." *World Politics* 45, 595-628.
- Pierson, Paul. (2000). "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94(2), 251-267.
- Pontusson, Jonas. (1995). "From Comparative Public Policy to Political Economy: Putting Institutions in Their Place and Taking Interests Seriously." *Comparative Political Studies* 28(1), 117-147.
- Rayner, J., M. Howlett, J. Wilson, B. Cashore, and G. Hoberg. (2001). "Privileging the Sub-Sector: Critical Sub-Sectors and Sectoral Relationships in Forest Policy-Making." *Forest Policy and Economics* 2(3-4), 319-332.
- Reinicke, Wolfgang H. (1999). "The Other World Wide Web: Global Public Policy Networks." *Foreign Policy* 117, 44-57.
- Reinicke, Wolfgang H. (1998). *Global Public Policy: Governing Without Government?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997). *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Richardson, Jeremy. (1999). "Interest Groups, Multi-Arena Politics and Policy Change." In S.S. Nagel (ed.), *The Policy Process*. Commack, NY: Nova Science Publishers, pp. 65-100.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. (1995). *Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. (1996). "Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(1), 53-80.

- Rittberger, Volker and Peter Mayer (eds.). (1993). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rona-Tas, Akos. (1998). "Path Dependence and Capital Theory: Sociology of the Post-Communist Economic Transformation." *East European Politics and Societies* 12(1), 107–131.
- Rose, Richard. (1990). "Inheritance Before Choice in Public Policy." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 2(3), 263–291.
- Rose, Richard. (1991). "What is Lesson-Drawing." *Journal of Public Policy* 11(1), 3–30.
- Rose, Richard. (1993). *Lesson-Drawing in Public Policy: A Guide to Learning Across Time and Space*. Chatham: Chatham House Publishing.
- Rosenau, James N. (1969). *Linkage Politics: Essays on the Convergence of National and International Systems*. New York: Collier-Macmillan.
- Sabatier, Paul A. (1988). "An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein." *Policy Sciences* 21, 129–168.
- Sabatier, Paul A. (1998). "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Revisions and Relevance for Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(1), 98–130.
- Schaap, L. and M.J.W. van Twist. (1997). "The Dynamics of Closedness in Networks." In W.J.M. Kickert, E.-H. Klijn, and J.F.M. Koppenjan (eds.), *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*. London: Sage, pp. 62–78.
- Schattschneider, E.E. (1960). *The Semisovereign People; A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Singer, Otto. (1990). "Policy Communities and Discourse Coalitions." *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 11(4), 428–458.
- Smith, Adrian. (2000). "Policy Networks and Advocacy Coalitions: Explaining Policy Change and Stability in UK Industrial Pollution Policy?" *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 18, 95–114.
- Smith, Thomas B. (1977). "Advisory Committees in the Public Policy Process." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 43(2), 153–166.
- Starling, Jay D. (1975). "The Use of Systems Constructs in Simplifying Organized Social Complexity." In T.R. La Porte (eds.), *Organized Social Complexity: Challenge to Politics and Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 131–172.
- Stone, Diane. (1999). "Learning Lessons and Transferring Policy Across Time, Space and Disciplines." *Politics* 19(1), 51–59.
- Thomas, Gerald B. (1999). "External Shocks, Conflict and Learning as Interactive Sources of Change in U.S. Security Policy." *Journal of Public Policy* 19(2), 209–231.
- True, Jacqui and Michael Mintrom. (2001). "Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 27–57.
- True, James L., Bryan D. Jones, and Frank R. Baumgartner. (1999). "Punctuated-Equilibrium Theory: Explaining Stability and Change in American Policymaking." In P.A. Sabatier (ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 97–115.
- Unger, Brigitte and Frans van Waarden. (1995). "Introduction: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Convergence." In B. Unger and F. van Waarden (eds.), *Convergence or Diversity? Internationalization and Economic Policy Response*. Aldershot: Avebury, pp. 1–35.
- Walsh, James I. (1994). "Institutional Constraints and Domestic Choices: Economic Convergence and Exchange Rate Policy in France and Italy." *Political Studies* 42, 243–258.
- Weir, Margaret. (1992). "Ideas and the Politics of Bounded Innovation." In S. Steinmo, K. Thelen, and F. Longstreth (eds.), *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 188–216.
- Weiss, Linda. (1999). "Globalization and National Governance: Autonomy or Interdependence." *Review of International Studies* 25 (Supplement), 59–88.
- Welch, Eric W. and Wilson Wong. (2001). "Effects of Global Pressures on Public Bureaucracy: Modeling a New Theoretical Framework." *Administration and Society* 33(4), 371–402.
- Willett, Thomas D. (1988). "National Macroeconomic Policy Preferences and International Coordination Issues." *Journal of Public Policy* 8(3/4), 235–263.

- Wilsford, David. (1985). "The *Conjoncture* of Ideas and Interests." *Comparative Political Studies* 18(3), 357–372.
- Wilsford, David. (1994). "Path Dependency, or Why History Makes It Difficult but Not Impossible to Reform Health Care System in a Big Way." *Journal of Public Policy* 14(3), 251–284.
- Wilson, Graham K. (2000). "Globalization, internationalization and policy networks in the USA." Washington, D.C.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Political Science Association*.
- World Bank. (1993). *World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. (1994). *Averting the Old Age Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Michael Howlett, Professor, Department of Political Science, Simon Fraser University, received his (Hons.) B.A. in political science from the University of Ottawa, his M.A. from the University of British Columbia, and his Ph.D. from Queen's University. He taught at Queen's and the University of Victoria before Simon Fraser University. His research interests include public policy analysis, Canadian political economy, and Canadian resource and environmental policy. He is co-author of *In Search of Sustainability: British Columbia Forest Policy in the 1990s* (2000), *Canadian Political Economy: An Introduction* (1999 and 1992), *Canadian Natural Resource and Environmental Policy: Political Economy and Public Policy* (1997), and *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* (1995). He is the editor of *Canadian Forest Policy: Adapting to Change* (2001) and co-editor of *The Provincial State in Canada: Politics in the Provinces and Territories* (2001 and 1992), *Innovation Systems in a Global Context: The North American Experience* (1998), *The Puzzles of Power: Introductory Readings in Political Science* (1997 and 1994), and *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art* (1996).

M. Ramesh is Associate Professor in Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney. He is currently teaching courses (both on-campus and distance) on international political economy, Asian Pacific politics, and public policy in the newly industrializing countries. He is the author of *Welfare Capitalism in Southeast Asia* (Macmillan, 2000; one chapter co-authored with Mukuk Asher) and co-author (with Michael Howlett) of two books, *Studying Public Policy* (1995) and *The Political Economy of Canada* (1999), both published by Oxford University Press. He is currently in the advanced stages of completing a book on *Social Development Policies in Northeast Asia*. He has also published in numerous refereed journals and edited books.