1. Policy formulation: where knowledge meets power in the policy process

Michael Howlett and Ishani Mukherjee

INTRODUCTION: DEFINING POLICY FORMULATION

Public policies emanate from societies' efforts to affect changes in their own institutional or public behaviour in order to achieve some end goal key policy actors consider to be important. Such policies are determined by governments but involve other actors and institutions – private, commercial, family and others – in often complex governance and governing arrangements and relationships (Howlett & Ramesh, 2016).

Policy formulation is part of the process of developing public policies and involves governments and other policy actors asking and answering questions about how societies can deal with various kinds of problems and conditions affecting citizens and organizations in the pursuit of their goals. These questions vary in range and scope, but addressing them typically involves deliberations among a wide range of actors about what kinds of activities governments can undertake, and what kinds of policy instruments or levers they can employ, in crafting solutions for the public and private dilemmas they identify, or consider to be, policy problems. Some problems may defy solution, such as poverty or homelessness in many countries and jurisdictions, and others may be more easily resolvable. But whatever solutions emerge from formulation activity are the basis of what, once adopted, becomes a public policy.

The exercise of matching policy goals and means is thus central to the tasks and activities of policy formulation. This is not a neutral or 'objective' or technical process, of course, although it may sometimes be viewed in this way. As one of the earliest proponents of the policy sciences, Harold Lasswell, stated in 1936, it is a political activity thoroughly immersed and grounded in questions about 'who gets what, when and how' in society (Lasswell, 1936).

In this light, the formulation of policies, or the matching, and often mis-matching, of goals and means, or policy aims and instruments, occurs through the interplay of knowledge-based analytics of problems and solutions with power-based political considerations. It emerges through the interaction of technical analyses of goals and instruments and the political assessment of the costs and benefits to particular actors, the partisan and electoral concerns of governments, and the realm of ideas and beliefs held by political actors as governments attempt to articulate feasible policy options capable of resolving problems and meeting social goals with at least a modicum of social and political support.

That is, all of this activity occurs within the context of the need to meet and placate the diverse interests of the public, social actors and their administrations. As a result, this process often ends in complex assemblages or mixes of policy aims and policy tools that are somewhat unique to each jurisdiction and may or may not embody much in the way of 'technical' merit (Howlett & Cashore, 2009). However, in this formulation process

and in the subsequent implementation or evaluation of policies, governments can and do learn from their own and others' experiences and can often improve their performance to more effectively attain their aims and goals. Such trial and error, as well as the ability of governments and formulators to learn directly or indirectly from other governments and societies' experiences, allows them to engage in emulation and other forms of interaction that can serve to reduce the differences found between jurisdictions and can lead to large similarities in policy design and content among even the most diverse societies (Bennett, 1991; Bennett & Howlett, 1992).

POLICY FORMULATION AS A (SUB-)PROCESS OF POLICY-MAKING

In general, 'policy formulation', or the activity of finding, devising and defining problem solutions, takes place once a public problem has been recognized as warranting government attention. Formulation thus follows an initial 'agenda-setting' stage of policy-making and entails the various processes of generating options about what to do about an identified and prioritized problem. During this period of policy-making, policy options that might help resolve issues and problems recognized at the agenda-setting stage are identified, refined and formalized. Formulation activities are thus distinct from other aspects of policy-making that involve authoritative government decision-makers choosing a particular course of action, or the actual implementation of the policy on the ground (Schmidt, 2008).

This provision of solutions to problems is a complex matter and in practice the development of options and alternatives to specific kinds of problems facing societies and governments in think tanks, research institutes and other venues often precedes the articulation of problems by a particular government. Hence, governments often find themselves in the position of being either leaders or laggards in recognizing and addressing problems and discussing or implementing possible solutions (Gunningham et al., 1998). While there are some advantages to being leaders, there is a greater risk of failure with innovating problem definitions and solutions. Laggards can benefit from both the positive and negative experiences of leaders and often can inherit an already well-discussed and elaborated set of policy solutions when they do eventually turn to address a particular problem already dealt with in other jurisdictions (Béland & Howlett, 2016). Thus, a major component of the policy formulation activity undertaken by governments is the monitoring of events in other jurisdictions, and even other branches of the same government, to see how various efforts and tools aimed at providing solutions to problems have fared.

POLICY FORMULATION AS A FIELD OF POLICY STUDY

Policy scholars have always been interested in how policy instruments fare and how successful a government has been in their creation and deployment, but the literature on policy formulation has thus far remained quite rudimentary and fragmented (Sidney, 2007).

The study of policy tools and their design has been one major venue for building knowledge about policy formulation (Salamon, 1989, 2002). Policy instrument studies have over the last several decades been concerned with what Cochran and Malone (1999) deem to be the substantive ‘what’ questions of policy-making. That is, ‘What is the plan for dealing with the problem? What are the goals and priorities? What options are available to achieve those goals? What are the costs and benefits of each of the options? What externalities, positive or negative, are associated with each alternative?’ (Cochran & Malone, 1999, p. 46). In parallel with this effort, the study of policy design has also dealt with the ‘how’, or the procedural and process-oriented questions about how best to formulate policy solutions and how such solutions have evolved over time and spread over space (Considine, 2012; Howlett, 2000; Linder & Peters, 1990; Schneider & Ingram, 1997). Much useful knowledge about processes and designs has emerged from these studies (Howlett et al., 2015).

Key questions regarding the different actors involved in the process of policy formulation and the capacity and extent of their involvement, on the other hand, until recently have remained relatively less well explored and their findings more poorly integrated (Howlett & Lejano, 2013). This Handbook makes a novel contribution in exploring both the existing strong and weakly addressed subjects of policy formulation by examining the analytics as well as the politics entailed in these processes, and by bringing together for the first time a wide range of research findings on the subject.

ORGANIZATION OF THE HANDBOOK

Using the various questions about policy formulation posed above as a guide, this Handbook unites scholarship on policy tools and design with that examining policy actors and the roles they play, why and with what effect, in the formulation process.

The contributions in Part I situate policy formulation in the greater policy process in order to set the context for the remaining chapters and parts. Part II then deals with the ‘what’ and ‘how’ components of formulation, detailing the substantive and process-oriented considerations concerning what goals are defined during formulation and how policy artefacts – such as policy instruments and their combinations in policy mixes and programmes – are created to address them. Part III continues the focus on the ‘how’ questions and picks up on the operational facets of formulation and its modes of analyses, including chapters on the participation of non-state actors in policy creation. This focus on the agency or ‘who’ of policy formulation is further developed in Part IV, where several chapters discuss the various actors who supply information, knowledge, policy advice and enterprise during the formation of policy. The contributions in Part V then look more closely at the role that experts of different kinds play in defining policy problems through their collective activities as epistemic actors who, among other things, influence how policy targets are defined and considered during formulation.

In Part VI, the contribution of various actors in proposing policy solutions is explored. This part examines the role of ‘instrument constituencies’, think tanks and research organizations in shaping and disseminating policy alternatives, while also discussing the institutional and behavioural aspects of their activities that influence their ability to shape formulation.

Delving deeper into the politics of policy formulation, Part VII includes a discussion of policy paradigms and the political economy that inform and influence the nature of formulation activities including the kinds of ideas and beliefs that shape policy alternatives and considerations and determinations of their acceptability or political as well as technical 'feasibility'. The influence of political parties as well as interest groups is also examined in this part.

Part VIII concludes with chapters that discuss trends in contemporary policy formulation research and practice such as the significance of movements towards the increased 'politicization' of policy advice, the struggle between proponents of experience- versus evidence-based formulation processes, the changing role of media in influencing and informing policy actors, as well as the phenomenon of the intentional disproportionality of government responses to problems in many circumstances.

WHAT DOES 'POLICY FORMULATION' MEAN?

As set out above, formulation is that stage of policy-making where a range of available options is considered and then reduced to some set that relevant policy actors, especially in government, can agree may be usefully employed to address a policy issue. This generally occurs before the issue progresses onwards to official decision-makers for some definitive determination, although those decision-makers may have in their public pronouncements or electoral platforms and other statements already signalled which kinds of efforts they might countenance and which they would not.

Formulation activity hence entails not only calculations of the relative benefits and risks of the various policy means that can be considered to match stated policy goals but also their potential feasibility or likelihood of acceptance and thus involves both a technical as well as a political component.

That is, once a social problem has been elevated to the formal agenda of the government, policy-makers are usually expected to act in devising alternatives or potential solutions to it. Although they may ultimately do nothing or react in a purely symbolic way, as Charles Jones (1984) highlighted, the essence of policy formulation is simply that various ways to deal with societal problems are proposed and deliberated upon by government officials and others knowledgeable about the problem. Their proposals for action or inaction may come about during the initial agenda-setting discussions, during which a policy problem and a possible solution can become coupled on the government's agenda (Kingdon, 1984); they may also arise from past efforts, successful and otherwise, in dealing with an issue.

This depiction paints formulation as involving several disjointed activities within a larger policy-making process that will be carried out differently in each jurisdiction and situation given the range of different actors, institutions and histories involved in efforts to define and resolve policy issues. However, others have noted that it is possible to identify general attributes of the formulation process that are similar across jurisdictions (Howlett et al., 2009).

Several characteristics of generic policy formulation activities have been described in the policy studies literature. Jones (1984, p. 78), for example, depicted the following broad attributes of formulation in practice:

- Formulation need not be limited to one set of actors. There may well be two or more formulation groups producing competing (or complementary) proposals.
- Formulation may proceed without a clear definition of the problem, or without formulators ever having much contact with the affected groups. Along the same vein, ill-structured problems, or those which embody a great deal of uncertainty in terms of the range of their impact, are also dealt with during formulation, as explored in Chapter 2 by Nair and Howlett.
- There is no necessary coincidence between formulation and particular institutions, though formulation is a frequent activity of bureaucratic agencies.
- Formulation and reformulation may occur over a long period of time without ever building sufficient support for any one proposal.
- There are often several appeal points for those who lose in the formulation process at any one level.
- The process itself never has neutral effects. Somebody wins and somebody loses even in the workings of science.

In terms of process, Harold Thomas (2001) noted that four aspects of policy formulation are usually visible: appraisal, dialogue, formulation and consolidation.

During appraisal, information and evidence necessary to understand the issue at hand is sought and considered. This step in formulation is where data about policy problems and their solutions – in the form of research reports, expertise and input from stakeholders and the general public – is considered. Following this, a dialogue phase between actors engaged in policy formulation ensues. This dialogue is centred on the deliberation and exchange of different viewpoints about the policy goals and potential means to resolve them. Dialogues can be structured with the involvement of chosen experts and representatives from the private sector, labour organizations or other interest groups, or they can take place as more open and unstructured processes. The structure of the dialogue can make a significant difference on the impact of that participation in the formulation process (Hajer, 2005). While established expert opinion is often sought at the expense of new input during formal proceedings, efforts to involve participants from less established organizations and viewpoints can invigorate the discussion.

Central to this process is the actual formulation phase, wherein administrators and public officials scrutinize the costs, benefits, challenges and opportunities of various policy alternatives in the effort to consolidate a proposal or proposals about which alternatives or mix of alternatives will proceed through to authoritative decision-makers. This phase embodies the actual policy ‘work’ that defines policy formulation, an aspect that is discussed further by Nekola and Kohoutek in Chapter 3. The choice of some policy alternatives over others is likely to draw opposition from actors whose preferred instruments are sidelined. These and other forms of feedback about shortlisted policy options are considered during a final consolidation phase in which proposed policy solutions are amended or refined before moving forward.

While some of the issues involved in formulation are technical and have a significant knowledge component, the issues that lead policy formulators to choose some policy options over others need not be based on facts (Merton, 1948). If powerful policy actors believe that a policy option is infeasible or unacceptable, this contention can be enough

to exclude it from further discussion (Carlsson, 2000). Burroughs addresses some of these effects of negative and positive feedback on formulation processes in Chapter 4.

THE CONTENT OF POLICY FORMULATION: INSTRUMENTS AND DESIGN

While this discussion says something about ‘how’ a policy is formulated, it is less clear about ‘what’ is being formulated. Here it should be noted that the policy options that are considered during formulation are the embodiment of techniques or artefacts of governance that, in some way, use resources of the state to define and attain government goals (Dahl & Lindblom, 1953; Hood, 2007).

These goals result from the translation of multifaceted and interconnected societal problems into governmental aims and objectives. This translation has implications for what items are considered to be administratively achievable, technically feasible and politically acceptable, and is thus an often contentious process (Dror, 1969; Majone, 1975, 1989; Meltzer, 1976; Webber, 1986). Indeed, even if policy-makers agree that a problem exists, they may not share an understanding of its causes or ramifications (Howlett et al., 2009, p. 113). Focusing specifically on the delimitation of policy goals that are considered during formulation, Vesely’s chapter (Chapter 5) discusses the processes involved in the construction of different types of policy problems, their current scenarios and desirable future states.

This raises the question, of course, about the means which governments have at their disposal to address policy problems. Policy instruments, alternatively known as ‘policy tools’, ‘governing instruments’ or the ‘tools of government’, are ‘the set of techniques by which governmental authorities wield their power in attempting to ensure support and effect social change’ (Vedung, 1998, p. 21).

These two fundamental ambitions, at the most basic level of analysis, place policy tools into one of two categories. The first involves instruments that aim to affect social change, that is, the substance of social behaviour or activity as they directly ‘effect or detect’ change in the production, distribution and consumption of social goods and services (Hood, 1986). The second category is procedural and focuses internally towards the governments’ own policy-making activities. These instruments affect the political or policy behaviour involved in the process of formulation in order to ensure that government initiatives are supported (Howlett, 2000). Chapter 6 by Howlett goes into greater length to distinguish between these two major categories of tools and review various typologies of substantive and procedural tools and their contributions to the policy process.

In the creation of both substantive and procedural policy responses to issues and problems, policy formulation again can be seen to involve the identification of both technical and political limitations in the path of effective state action. That is to say, formulation faces a number of constraints that limit the ability of policy-makers to embark on just any possible proposed course of action (Majone, 1989).

Substantive constraints may arise within the problem itself. The problem of global warming, for example, cannot be entirely eliminated because there is no known effective solution that can be employed without causing tremendous economic and social dislocations. This often leaves policy-makers to tinker with options that barely scratch the surface of the problem (Howlett et al., 2009, p. 112). Such constraints can be considered

‘objective’ in a sense, since reinterpreting them or recasting them in different terms does not eliminate them.

Procedural constraints, on the other hand, are those that directly impinge upon the process of adopting policy options and are more subjective in nature and subject to reformulation and reinterpretation. These constraints are embedded in the social and institutional contexts within which formulation unfolds, and can include constitutional specifications, the organization of society and the policy-making administration, and established patterns of ideas and beliefs that can lead decision-makers and formulators to favour some options over others (DeLeon, 1992; Falkner, 2000; Montpetit, 2002; Yee, 1996). The specific relationship between social groups and the state, as well as the groups’ internal organization and political styles, for example, can create ‘policy horizons’ or limits to the arrangement of acceptable policy options for certain policy actors that condition their actions, but which are also subject to government manipulation and reorientation (Bradford, 1999; Warwick, 2000).

While many policy formulation studies have been engaged in the exploration of various kinds of policy tools and how they are implemented, there has also been a dedicated focus in the literature on how policy tools and outcomes can be better matched or ‘designed’. This latter concentration on the specific devising of policy responses captures the essence of what has come to be known as the policy design ‘orientation’ in the policy sciences (Howlett et al., 2015). Policy design scholars recognize that policy decisions may often be made in a contingent and irrational fashion, but highlight the nuances of translating ideal ‘technical’ models of instrument use to context-sensitive solutions. As Linder and Peters argued, the

design orientation to analysis can illuminate the variety of means implicit in policy alternatives, questioning the choice of instruments and their aptness in particular contexts. The central role it assigns means in policy performance may also be a normative vantage point for appraising design implications of other analytical approaches. More important, such an orientation can be a counterweight to the design biases implicit in other approaches and potentially redefine the fashioning of policy proposals. (1990, p. 104)

In contrast with earlier policy design studies that were concerned with the relatively simple mechanics of mapping single-tool uses, the new policy design orientation adopts a more complex multi-level analytical orientation (Howlett, 2011a). It emphasizes the design of policy instrument bundles and the interactions that take place within such bundles when multiple tools are used in policy portfolios designed to address multiple goals (Givoni et al., 2013; Howlett et al., 2015; Oikonomou et al., 2011).

The design orientation thus envisions policies as being composed of multiple components ranging from abstract policy goals to the more operational objectives of policy programmes, to policy instrument settings and calibrations at the micro level of policy formulation (Cashore and Howlett, 2007; Hall, 1993; Howlett & Cashore, 2009). Effective formulation seeks to integrate these various goals and means within policy mixes, so that their component elements reinforce rather than contradict each other (Briassoulis, 2005; Meijers, 2004).

Drawing on these various themes of multiple policy tool mixes and multiple elements or layers of policies, as well as the temporal processes through which policies develop, the topic of policy design has propagated a burgeoning body of literature.¹ Drawing from

this literature, Chapters 7 (Howlett and Rayner) and 8 (Howlett, Mukherjee and Rayner) delve deeper into the considerations of dealing with multi-tool policy mixes as well as enumerate and investigate the principles of effective design.

HOW DOES FORMULATION OCCUR AND WHY?

Another major question is exactly ‘how’ policy formulation occurs. As highlighted above, the analyses and comparisons between potential alternatives that are considered during formulation depend greatly on the nature of the policy actors who propose them, their beliefs and ideas about society, and the problems that they feel formulation should address, in conjunction with the nature of the institutional and organizational frameworks within which they work. As noted by Charles Anderson, policy design and formulation are tantamount to ‘statecraft’ – the exercise of government as ‘the art of the possible’ (1971, p. 120). Formulation ‘is always a matter of making choices from the possibilities offered by a given historical situation and cultural context’, and those who are engaged in formulation and policy design use the tools of statecraft to ‘find appropriate possibilities in the equipment of society’ in order to meet their goals (Anderson, 1971, p. 121).

Understanding the variety of inputs these actors bring to the policy formulation activity and the contexts within which they function thus can shed considerable light on why some policy options gain significant attention while others fall by the wayside. As mentioned above, formulation can take place even without a definite depiction of the policy problem at hand (Weber & Khademian, 2008), and it often proceeds over time in successive ‘rounds’ of formulation and reformulation of policy goals and means (Teisman, 2000; Thomas, 2001). Within this process, while some policy-makers may look for ‘win-win’ solutions that maximize the complementarities between the views of different actors, the costs and benefits of different policy choices are borne disproportionately by different participants, leading to contested processes of evaluation and deliberation (Wilson, 1974).

Formulation and design processes are therefore fraught with both political and technical considerations. This reality, however, does not suggest that the systematic effort to pair policy means with goals is impractical and not worthwhile. Instead, it simply means that the implementation of some designs may be impossible in certain contexts and that the choice of any policy alternative involves different policy actors trying to raise and evaluate different preferred policy designs (Dryzek, 1983; Thomas, 2001). This evaluation of the benefits and costs of different policy options by various policy actors can still occur through more or less formal modes of policy analysis, and thus remains a central activity of modern policy formulation (Dunn, 2008; Gormley, 2007; Sidney, 2007).

Discussions of the range of formal and informal analytical techniques that can be undertaken to evaluate options *ex ante* during policy formulation are featured in the contributions to Part III of this Handbook. Chapter 9 by Adelle and Weiland explores formal policy appraisal techniques in policy formulation, while Lehtonen in Chapter 10 discusses the use of measures and indicators to operationalize information during policy formulation. In Chapter 11, Van der Steen focuses on the use of forecasting tools in policy formulation such as impact assessments, future scenarios and planning. In Chapter 12, Johnson looks into the role of public participation and consultation during policy formulation.

SUPPLY, DEMAND AND BROKERAGE OF POLICY ADVICE

These chapters on the ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘why’ and ‘how’ of formulation lead the way to the fourth part of the Handbook, which explores in more detail the nature of policy advice and of the advisors who inform decision-makers during the policy formulation process. While powerful political and administrative leaders with decision-making authority are the ones who eventually decide on and thus ‘make’ public policy, in modern states they do so by following the counsel of bureaucrats, civil servants and other advisors whom they trust to evaluate and consolidate policy options into coherent designs, and who provide policy leaders with expert advice about the merits and risks of the proposals being considered (Heinrichs, 2005; MacRae & Whittington, 1997).

It is useful to think about this wide array of policy advisors as being arranged in an overall ‘policy advisory system’ within which proximate decision-makers occupy central positions. Studies of advisory systems in a variety of jurisdictions such as New Zealand, Israel, Canada and Australia have furthered this idea of government decision-makers operating at the centre of a network of policy advisors which includes both ‘traditional’ policy advisors, such as civil servants and non-state actors (non-governmental organizations and think tanks), as well as informal forms of advice supplied by colleagues, members of the public and political party affiliates, among others (Dobuzinskis et al., 2007; Maley, 2000; Peled, 2002).

It is generally considered beneficial to have a large range of actors in the policy advisory system, as this indicates ‘a healthy policy-research community outside the government [which] can play a vital role in enriching public understanding and debate of policy issues’, serving ‘as a natural complement to policy capacity within’ (Anderson, 1996, p. 486). The existence of different types of policy advisory systems is linked with the nature of the demand and supply of knowledge in particular policy contexts and sectors (Halfman & Hoppe, 2005).

Policy advisory systems thus are central to the study of policy formulation and to the understanding of the selection and reception given to different policy alternatives and arrangements (Brint, 1990). Conceived of as knowledge utilization venues or ‘marketplaces’ of ideas and information, advisory systems are comprised of three separate components: the supply of policy advice; its demand by government decision-makers; and a set of brokers who work as intermediaries to match knowledge supply with demand (Brint, 1990; Lindquist, 1998). That is, policy advisory systems undertake one of several general types of analytical activities linked to the types of positions that participants hold in the creation and exchange of knowledge in the policy formulation process.

More specifically, members of policy advisory systems can be identified as being in one of four ‘communities’ of advisors depending on the advisory role they perform as well their proximity to policy actors and their location either inside or outside government (Table 1.1).

The core actors are those members of the public sector who are closest to the official policy-making units of government and include central government agencies, executive staff and professional government policy analysts. Governmental actors or insiders who work further away, at the periphery of policy advisory systems, belong to federal commissions, special committees and task forces, or serve on research councils and as scientists at international organizations. From the non-governmental sector, actors who are close

Table 1.1 The four communities of policy advisors

	Proximate actors	Peripheral actors
Public/governmental sector	CORE ACTORS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Central agencies● Executive staff● Professional governmental policy analysts	PUBLIC SECTOR INSIDERS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Commissions, committees and task forces● Research councils/scientists● International organizations
Non-governmental sector	PRIVATE SECTOR INSIDERS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Consultants● Political party staff● Pollsters● Donors	OUTSIDERS <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Public interest groups● Business associations● Trade unions● Academics● Think tanks● Media● International non-governmental organizations

Source: Howlett (2011b).

to decision-makers during formulation and are considered private sector insiders may include private sector consultants, political party staff, pollsters and donor representatives. Actors who are considered to be farthest from the central core of policy formulators, or outsiders, include those belonging to public interest groups, business associations, trade unions, think tanks or non-governmental organizations, or are independent academics or members of the media.

In terms of the specific contribution that policy advisors can make to different policy components, these sets of actors can be thought to exist on a spectrum of influence (Table 1.2). Members of the general public, non-governmental outsiders and insiders often impact the policy discourse at the broad level of abstract policy goals and general policy preferences, while insiders and core actors become more influential as formulation

Table 1.2 Advisory system actors by policy level

	High-level abstraction	Programme-level operationalization	Specific on-the-ground measures
Policy goals (Normative)	General abstract policy aims Public, outsiders and insiders	Operationalizable policy objectives Insiders and core actors	Specific policy targets Core actors
Policy means (Cognitive)	General policy implementation preferences Public, outsiders and insiders	Operationalizable policy tools Insiders and core actors	Specific policy tool calibrations Core actors

Source: Howlett (2014).

and design moves to programme-level operations and then on to specifying on-the-ground measures and instruments (Page, 2010).

The contributions in Part IV of the Handbook explore the role that different policy advisors can play during formulation. Craft and Howlett's chapter (Chapter 13) provides an overview of the policy advisory system concept and outlines the significance of various advisory roles during policy formulation. Chapter 14, by Matheson, puts forward a typology to understand the organizational structure of policy formulation in government, while Chapter 15 by Bandola-Gill and Lyall focuses specifically on the role of brokers or the 'third community' in policy advisory systems. In Chapter 16, Gunn examines how individuals can operate in such contexts, focusing on the contribution of policy entrepreneurship to alternative generation and acceptance during policy formulation.

WHY IS FORMULATION DONE THE WAY IT IS?: THE ROLE OF IDEAS

A key component of the content of formulation, also mentioned above, is the type of beliefs and ideas that policy advisors and policy-makers have about the feasibility and optimality of the deployment of various arrangements of policy tools to address social concerns and policy problems. Understandably, the beliefs held by decision-makers about these and other issues plays a key part in influencing their efforts to construct policy alternatives and assess policy options (Chadwick, 2000; George, 1969; Gormley, 2007; Ingraham, 1987; Jacobsen, 1995; Mayntz, 1983). It follows that some ideas about policy instrument choices and options are likely to be more influential than others when it comes to policy formulation, assessment and design (Lindvall, 2009) and that different types of ideas will impact different elements of formulation. For example, abstract policy-level goals such as economic development or ecological conservation emerge out of general ethical logics about alleviating poverty or protecting the environment, while more specific causal constructs about issues such as how increasing household incomes can lead to greater economic gains or how limiting agriculture near ecologically sensitive areas results in environmental gains are also significant at the operational level. The same is true for policy means that address these various goals, as they stem from ideas about what has worked and what has not.

Differentiating between these different types of ideas in terms of their degree of abstraction and their normative appeal is thus an important step in understanding the reasoning that policy formulators apply when creating policy content (Campbell, 1998). In their work on the influence of ideas in foreign policy-making situations, Goldstein and Keohane (1993) and their colleagues noted at least three types of ideas that combined normative and cognitive elements but at different levels of generality: world views; principled beliefs; and causal ideas (see also Braun, 1999; Campbell, 1998). World views or ideologies have long been recognized as helping people make sense of complex realities by identifying general policy problems and the motivations of actors involved in politics and policy. These sets of ideas, however, tend to be very diffuse and do not easily translate into specific views on particular policy problems.

Principled beliefs and causal stories, on the other hand, can exercise a much more direct influence on the recognition of policy problems and on policy content. These ideas

Table 1.3 Ideational components of policy contents

		Level of policy debate affected	
		Background	Foreground
Level of ideas affected	Normative (Value)	Public sentiments	Symbolic frames
	Cognitive (Causal)	Policy paradigms	Programme ideas

Source: Howlett (2014), adapted from Campbell (1998).

can influence policy-making by serving as ‘road maps’ for action, defining problems, affecting the strategic interactions between policy actors, and constraining the range of policy options that are proposed (Carstensen, 2010; Stone, 1989, 1998). At the micro level, ‘causal stories’ and beliefs about the behaviour patterns of target groups heavily influence choices of policy settings or calibrations (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, 1994; Stone, 1989).

As laid out in Table 1.3, ideas stemming from public sentiments or symbolic frames appeal to the perception of appropriateness or ‘legitimacy’ of a certain policy choice and are largely expected to affect policy goals (Durr, 1993; Stimson, 1991; Stimson et al., 1995; Suzuki, 1992). On the other hand, policy paradigms indicate ‘a set of cognitive background assumptions that constrain action by limiting the range of alternatives that policy-making elites are likely to perceive as useful and worth considering’ (Campbell, 2002, p. 35; see also Surel, 2000). Programme ideas similarly represent a selection of particular solutions from the set of options that are designated as being appropriate within a prevailing policy paradigm. Paradigms and programme ideas thus influence the selection of policy means (Hall, 1993; Stone, 1989).

The contributions of Part V of this Handbook examine these issues of policy-level ideas and the framing of issues as problems. Chapter 17 by May, Koski and Stramp explores the impact of policy expertise during policy formulation and identifies a small group of ‘go-to’ experts whose ideas carry an outsize weight in many areas of policy deliberations in the United States. Zito in Chapter 18 highlights the role of expert networks and epistemic communities in articulating knowledge while Schneider and Ingram, in Chapter 19, explore the impact that ideas about the nature and motivations of policy targets (those members of society whose behaviour the policy is meant to address) have on policy formulation. Gunter (Chapter 20) looks into the role of consultants and the ideas they bring to the formulation process.

THE ARTICULATION OF SOLUTIONS: KEY ACTORS IN POLICY FORMULATION

Part VI of the Handbook then looks specifically at what factors influence the development and articulation of some policy solutions rather than others. Simons and Voß in Chapter 21 discuss the role of instrument constituencies involved in framing and forwarding particular policy solutions during formulation. In Chapter 22, McGann looks at the role of think tanks, academics and research institutes during the formulation of policy

options, while institutional isomorphism, or the penchant for governments to mimic each other, sometimes with reason and sometimes without, is critically reviewed by Jarvis in Chapter 23.

In many formulation situations, general abstract policy aims and implementation preferences are taken as given, establishing the context in which design decisions relating to programme-level and on-the-ground specifications are made by policy insiders and core actors. And in many cases, even the goal components of programmes may be already established, leaving the formulator only the task of establishing specific policy tool calibrations which must cohere with these already existing or well-established policy elements. Galizzi in Chapter 24 explores the behavioural aspects of this kind of policy formulation through a review of the use of experiments and behavioural insights such as ‘nudges’ that affect the reception of policy initiatives on the ground by target groups and individuals.

FORMULATION IN SPACE AND TIME: THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT AND INFLUENCE

In general, it is understood that policy formulation takes place within present day governance structures that have their own existing policy logic. In order to address these issues, it is recognized that policy-makers need to be cognizant about the internal mechanisms of their polity and constituent policy sectors (Braathen, 2007; Braathen & Croci, 2005; Grant, 2010; Skodvin et al., 2010). The amount of ‘elbow room’ or ‘degrees of freedom’ that formulators have in a given formulation context heavily impacts how formulation activities proceed. Where earlier work on formulation and design often assumed that policy-makers were operating with a constrained yet blank slate, modern thinking about policy design is more rooted in empirical experience that policy designers work in scenarios with already established policy mixes and significant policy histories. This work draws on historical and sociological neo-institutionalists such as Kathleen Thelen (2004; Thelen et al., 2003), who noted how macro-institutional arrangements have normally not been the product of calculated planning but rather the result of processes of incremental modifications or reformulations such as ‘layering’ or ‘drift’.

That is, legacies from earlier rounds of decision-making affect the introduction of new elements that may conflict with pre-existing policy components. As Martin Carstensen has argued, policies may change through gradual processes and are often created much less through systematic reflection on (practice-derived) first principles than through a process of bricolage (Carstensen, 2015).

Contributions to Part VII of the Handbook look more closely at the situational anomalies and their politics that can influence the contexts within which formulation takes place. Although new or different policy instrument groupings could theoretically be more complementary and thus create a more successful combination of policy elements (Barnett & Shore, 2009; Blonz et al., 2008; Buckman & Diesendorf, 2010; del Río, 2010; Grabosky, 1994; Gunningham et al., 1998; Hou & Brewer, 2010; Howlett, 2004; Howlett & Rayner, 2007; Roch et al., 2010), it may be very difficult to accomplish or even propose such changes, and designs instead often focus on reform rather than replacement of an existing arrangement. Bricolage can ensue through the work of policy formulators as irregularities emerge through the accumulation of new policy elements that are conflicting with original

policy goals (Wilder & Howlett, 2014). Wilder in Chapter 25 explores these dynamics between the accrual of conflicts and a continual process of bricolage that can dominate formulation.

The contextual ‘lock in’ that leads to layering thus can impact the formulation process by restricting a government’s ability to evaluate alternatives and plan or design in a purely optimal instrumental manner (Howlett, 2009; Oliphant & Howlett, 2010; Williams, 2012). Layering thus typically results in processes of (re)design which alter only some aspects of a pre-existing arrangement and can thus be distinguished from processes of new policy packaging or complete replacement. While complete replacement or a brand new ‘package’ of policies is rare, there are exceptionally rare instances whereby entirely dedicated, or ‘bespoke’, policy packages are created to address an unprecedented policy problem. Customization of policy might be somewhat more common as a means for a new, multi-dimensional policy problem by adapting lessons from other similar policy contexts.

Another type of policy adaptation is ‘patching’, which can be done well if governments possess sufficient capacity but poorly if they do not. An example of poor patching is policy ‘stretching’ (Feindt & Flynn, 2009). This is where, operating over periods of decades or more, elements of a mix are simply extended to cover areas they were not intended to at the outset. Stretching is especially problematic as small changes in the mixture of policy elements over such a time period can create a situation where the elements can fail to be mutually supportive, incorporating contradictory goals or instruments whose combination creates perverse incentives that frustrate initial policy goals. When these problems are identified, further rounds of tinkering and layering may make them worse (Feindt & Flynn, 2009). Jorgensen, in his discussion of the politics of policy formulation in Chapter 26, adds to the discussion about problematic layering by going beyond the topic of a government’s ability to design, to a critical evaluation of government willingness to design.

Layering as a formulation process can thus have two sides. On the one hand, negative stretching or destructive layering exacerbates tensions between regime elements and more politicized or less instrumental forms of policy-making and outcomes. However, layering can also have a positive side and help ameliorate or reduce tensions through ‘smart’-patching. Stretching and poor patching are thus formulation practices that exist at the break point between design and non-design activities of government. Both these processes fall between the ‘pure’ design and ‘pure’ non-design ends of the spectrum of design processes suggested in Figure 1.1.

Non-design types of policy formulation also vary in the same way as partisan and ideological, religious or other criteria cloud, crowd out or replace instrumental design intentionality. Non-design mechanisms, as highlighted above, include activities such as bargaining or log-rolling, through corruption or co-optation efforts, or faith-based or pure electoral calculations that are not instrumental in the same sense as are design efforts. In such contexts, the ability to meet policy goals or the means to achieve them are secondary to other concerns such as ideological purity, the need to retain or augment legislative or electoral support, or other similar kinds of coalition behaviour.

Highlighting these different processes of formulation, the other two contributors to Part VII of the Handbook address several related issues. In Chapter 27, Eichbaum and Shaw shed light on the increasing impact of political parties and political staff on policy

Source: Adapted and modified from Howlett and Mukherjee (2014).

Figure 1.1 A spectrum of policy design and non-design types

formulation in many countries, adding to the complexity of formulation processes. In Chapter 28, Scott addresses questions about the actual mechanisms of influence that interest groups and lobbyists employ during formulation.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In bringing to life policy solutions to address complex policy problems, formulation is the result of various processes of policy evolution that are shaped by time as well as a government's intention towards creating policy. These policy-making efforts can be systematic in attempting to match policy ends and means in a logical, knowledge-informed fashion, or they can result from much less systematic and more irrational processes. How 'unintended' policy mixes evolve, are created and limited by historical legacies, and are hampered due to internal inconsistencies are equally subjects of investigation in formulation studies as are the factors which lead to formulation and policy success (del Río, 2010; Grabosky, 1994; Gunningham et al., 1998; Howlett & Rayner, 2007).

Transforming policy ambitions into practice is a complex process. While formulation efforts can be done well or poorly, they reflect some wholesale or partial effort to match policy goals and means in a sophisticated way to improve outcomes. Non-design types of formulation also vary in the same way but more by process of decision-making than by their sphere of activity. The efforts of policy-makers often have failed due to poor designs that have inadequately incorporated the inherent complexity in policy formulation (Cohn, 2004; Howlett, 2011a). These experiences have led to a greater awareness of the various obstacles to policy design and have gradually fuelled a desire for a better understanding of the unique characteristics of policy formulation processes and the spaces in which design efforts are embedded.

While early formulation and design thinking tended to suggest that the creation of instruments could only occur in spaces where new policy packages could be designed from scratch, it is now widely recognized that in most circumstances policy formulation

involves building on the foundations created in another era and working with the constraints they pose. Students of policy formulation are thus interested in how policy formulators, like software designers, can issue ‘patches’ in order to correct flaws in existing mixes or allow them to adapt to changing circumstances (Howlett, 2011a; Howlett & Rayner, 2014; Rayner, 2013). In this context, subjects such as policy experiments that can help to examine the possibilities of redesign (Hoffmann, 2011) and building temporal properties into tool mixes through adaptive policy-making (Swanson et al., 2010), which can make policy mixes more flexible or resistant to shifting conditions (Haasnoot et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2010) are all subjects of interest in contemporary formulation studies.

Some of the major trends and patterns in policy formulation studies related to these issues are picked up in the last part of this Handbook. Craft and Howlett’s chapter (Chapter 29) looks at developments in the realm of policy advisory systems and the inclination towards greater externalization and politicization of policy advice. Strassheim, in Chapter 30, reviews the movement towards experience-based versus evidence-based policy-making. In Chapter 31, Linders and Ma discuss the changing role of the public in policy formulation through an exploration of changes brought on by new mass and social media. Maor’s chapter (Chapter 32) concludes the collection with an analysis of the proportionality of government responses, looking specifically at the reasons behind under- and over-reaction in the formulation of policy options in the short and long term.

Portrayed in this Handbook is the very essence of policy-making activity: the articulation of policy goals, the presentation of policy alternatives and the choice of policy tools. The contributions in this collection provide a multi-dimensional understanding of policy formulation, and a deeper exploration of what formulation activity entails, how the formulation process unfolds, who influences and who formulates policy, and what are their incentives.

NOTE

1. A full bibliography of policy design publications is available through the Policy Design Lab and Policy Tools Wiki. <http://policy-design.org/wiki/towards-a-new-generation-of-policy-design-studies/further-readings/footnotes/full-bibliography/> (accessed 2 November 2016).

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C.W. (1971). Comparative policy analysis: the design of measures. *Comparative Politics* 4(1), 117–31.
- Anderson, G. (1996). The new focus on the policy capacity of the federal government. *Canadian Public Administration* 39(4), 469–88.
- Barnett, C.K., & Shore, B. (2009). Reinventing program design: challenges in leading sustainable institutional change. *Leadership & Organization* 30(1), 16–35.
- Béland, D., & Howlett, M. (2016). How solutions chase problems: instrument constituencies in the policy process. *Governance* 29(3), 393–409.
- Bennett, C.J. (1991). What is policy convergence and what causes it? *British Journal of Political Science* 21(2), 215–33.
- Bennett, C.J., & Howlett, M. (1992). The lessons of learning: reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy Sciences* 25(3), 275–94.
- Blonz, J.A., Vajjhala, S.P., & Safirova, E. (2008). *Growing Complexities: A Cross-sector Review of U.S. Biofuels Policies and their Interactions*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

- Braathen, N.A. (2007). *Instrument Mixes Addressing Non-point Sources of Water Pollution*. Paris: OECD.
- Braathen, N.A., & Croci, E. (2005). Environmental agreements used in combination with other policy instruments. In E. Croci (ed.), *The Handbook of Environmental Voluntary Agreements*, Vol. 43, pp. 335–64. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bradford, N. (1999). The policy influence of economic ideas: interests, institutions and innovation in Canada. *Studies in Political Economy*, 59, 17–60.
- Braun, D. (1999). Interests or ideas? An overview of ideational concepts in public policy research. In A. Busch and D. Braun (eds), *Public Policy and Political Ideas*, pp. 11–29. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Briassoulis, H. (2005). Analysis of policy integration: conceptual and methodological considerations. In H. Briassoulis (ed.), *Policy Integration for Complex Environmental Problems: The Example of Mediterranean Desertification*, pp. 81–116. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Brint, S. (1990). Rethinking the policy influence of experts: from general characterizations to analysis of variation. *Sociological Forum* 5(3), 361–85.
- Buckman, G., & Diesendorf, M. (2010). Design limitations in Australian renewable electricity policies. *Energy Policy* 38(7), 3365–76.
- Campbell, J.L. (1998). Institutional analysis and the role of ideas in political economy. *Theory and Society* 27(5), 377–409.
- Campbell, J.L. (2002). Ideas, politics and public policy. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28(1), 21–38.
- Carlsson, L. (2000). Policy networks as collective action. *Policy Studies Journal* 28(3), 502–20.
- Carstensen, M.B. (2010). The nature of ideas, and why political scientists should care: analysing the Danish jobcentre reform from an ideational perspective. *Political Studies* 58(5), 847–65.
- Carstensen, M.B. (2015). Bringing ideational power into the paradigm approach: critical perspectives on policy paradigms in theory and practice. In J. Hogan and M. Howlett (eds), *Policy Paradigms in Theory and Practice*, pp. 295–318. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cashore, B., & Howlett, M. (2007). Punctuating which equilibrium? Understanding thermostatic policy dynamics in Pacific Northwest forestry. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(3), 532–51.
- Chadwick, A. (2000). Studying political ideas: a public political discourse approach. *Political Studies* 48, 283–301.
- Cochran, C.L., & Malone, E.F. (1999). *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Cohn, D. (2004). The best of intentions, potentially harmful policies: a comparative study of scholarly complexity and failure. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 6(1), 39–56.
- Considine, M. (2012). Thinking outside the box? Applying design theory to public policy. *Politics & Policy* 40(4), 704–24.
- Dahl, R.A., & Lindblom, C.E. (1953). *Politics, Economics and Welfare: Planning and Politico-economic Systems, Resolved into Basic Processes*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- del Río, P. (2010). Analysing the interactions between renewable energy promotion and energy efficiency support schemes: the impact of different instruments and design elements. *Energy Policy* 38(9), 4978–89.
- DeLeon, P. (1992). Policy formulation: where ignorant armies clash by night. *Review of Policy Research* 11(3–4), 389–405.
- Dobuzinkis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (eds) (2007). *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Dror, Y. (1969). The prediction of political feasibility. *Futures* 1(4), 282–8.
- Dryzek, J. (1983). Don't toss coins in garbage cans: a prologue to policy design. *Journal of Public Policy* 3(4), 345–67.
- Dunn, W.N. (2008). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Durr, R.H. (1993). What moves policy sentiment? *American Political Science Review* 87, 158–72.
- Falkner, G. (2000). Policy networks in a multi-level system: convergence towards moderate diversity? *West European Politics* 23(4), 94–120.
- Feindt, P., & Flynn, A. (2009). Policy stretching and institutional layering: British food policy between security, safety, quality, health and climate change. *British Politics* 4(3), 386–414.
- George, A.L. (1969). The 'operational code': a neglected approach to the study of political leaders and decision-making. *International Studies Quarterly* 13, 190–222.
- Givoni, M., Macmillen, J., Banister, D., & Feitelson, E. (2013). From policy measures to policy packages. *Transport Reviews* 33(1), 1–20.
- Goldstein, J., & Keohane, R.O. (eds) (1993). *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gormley, W.T. (2007). Public policy analysis: ideas and impact. *Annual Review of Political Science* 10, 297–313.
- Grabosky, P.N. (1994). Green markets: environmental regulation by the private sector. *Law and Policy* 16(4), 419–48.

- Grant, W. (2010). Policy instruments in the Common Agricultural Policy. *West European Politics* 33(1), 22–38.
- Gunningham, N., Grabosky, P., & Sinclair, D. (1998). *Smart Regulation: Designing Environmental Policy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Haasnoot, M., Kwakkel, J.H., Walker, W.E., & ter Maat, J. (2013). Dynamic adaptive policy pathways: a method for crafting robust decisions for a deeply uncertain world. *Global Environmental Change* 23(2), 485–98.
- Hajer, M.A. (2005). Setting the stage: a dramaturgy of policy deliberation. *Administration & Society* 36(6), 624–47.
- Halfman, W., & Hoppe, R. (2005). Science/policy boundaries: a changing division of labour in Dutch expert policy advice. In S. Maasen and P. Weingert (eds), *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-making*, pp. 135–51. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hall, P.A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning and the state: the case of economic policy making in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25(3), 275–96.
- Heinrichs, H. (2005). Advisory systems in pluralistic knowledge societies: a criteria-based typology to assess and optimize environmental policy advice. In S. Maasen and P. Weingart (eds), *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-making*, pp. 41–61. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hoffmann, M.J. (2011). *Climate Governance at the Crossroads: Experimenting with a Global Response after Kyoto*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hood, C. (1986). *The Tools of Government*. Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.
- Hood, C. (2007). Intellectual obsolescence and intellectual makeovers: reflections on the tools of government after two decades. *Governance* 20(1), 127–44.
- Hou, Y., & Brewer, G. (2010). Substitution and supplementation between co-functional policy instruments: evidence from state budget stabilization practices. *Public Administration Review* 70(6), 914–24.
- Howlett, M. (2000). Managing the ‘hollow state’: procedural policy instruments and modern governance. *Canadian Public Administration* 43(4), 412–31.
- Howlett, M. (2004). Beyond good and evil in policy implementation: instrument mixes, implementation styles and second generation theories of policy instrument choice. *Policy & Society* 23(2), 1–17.
- Howlett, M. (2009). Governance modes, policy regimes and operational plans: a multi-level nested model of policy instrument choice and policy design. *Policy Sciences* 42, 73–89.
- Howlett, M. (2011a). *Designing Public Policies: Principles and Instruments*. New York: Routledge.
- Howlett, M. (2011b). Revisiting policy design: the rise and fall (and rebirth?) of policy design studies. Paper prepared for the General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Section 63. Available at <http://ecpr.eu/filestore/paperproposal/777bba9e-7de8-423d-9c1d-1c4362c0e92a.pdf> (accessed 2 November 2016).
- Howlett, M. (2014). Policy design: who, what, how and why? In C. Halpern, P. Lascoumes, & P. Le Galès (eds), *L'instrumentation de l'action publique: controverses, résistances, effets*, pp. 281–316. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Howlett, M., & Cashore, B. (2009). The dependent variable problem in the study of policy change: understanding policy change as a methodological problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 11(1), 33–46.
- Howlett, M., & Lejano, R.P. (2013). Tales from the crypt: the rise and fall (and rebirth?) of policy design. *Administration & Society* 45(3), 357–81.
- Howlett, M., & Mukherjee, I. (2014). Policy design and non-design: towards a spectrum of policy formulation types. *Politics and Governance* 2(2), 57–71.
- Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2016). Achilles’ heels of governance: critical capacity deficits and their role in governance failures. *Regulation & Governance*.
- Howlett, M., & Rayner, J. (2007). Design principles for policy mixes: cohesion and coherence in ‘new governance arrangements’. *Policy & Society* 26(4), 1–18.
- Howlett, M., & Rayner, J. (2014). Patching vs packaging in policy formulation: assessing policy portfolio design. *Politics and Governance* 1(2), 170–82.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Howlett, M., Mukherjee, I., & Woo, J.J. (2015). From tools to toolkits in policy design studies: the new design orientation towards policy formulation research. *Policy & Politics* 43(2), 291–311.
- Ingraham, P. (1987). Toward more systematic considerations of policy design. *Policy Studies Journal* 15(4), 611–28.
- Jacobsen, J.K. (1995). Much ado about ideas: the cognitive factor in economic policy. *World Politics*, 47, 283–310.
- Jones, C.O. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, 3rd edn. Monterey, CA: Brookes/Cole.
- Kingdon, J.W. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: Whittlesey House.
- Linder, S.H., & Peters, B.G. (1990). The design of instruments for public policy. In S.S. Nagel (ed.), *Policy Theory and Policy Evaluation: Concepts, Knowledge, Causes, and Norms*, pp. 103–19. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Lindquist, E. (1998). A quarter century of Canadian think tanks: evolving institutions, conditions and

- strategies. In D. Stone, A. Denham, & M. Garnett (eds), *Think Tanks Across Nations: A Comparative Approach*, pp. 127–44. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lindvall, J. (2009). The real but limited influence of expert ideas. *World Politics* 61(4), 703–30.
- MacRae, D., & Whittington, D. (1997). *Expert Advice for Policy Choice: Analysis and Discourse*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Majone, G. (1975). On the notion of political feasibility. *European Journal of Political Research* 3, 259–74.
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Maley, M. (2000). Conceptualising advisers' policy work: the distinctive policy roles of Ministerial Advisers in the Keating government, 1991–96. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 35(3), 449–470.
- Mayntz, R. (1983). The conditions of effective public policy: a new challenge for policy analysis. *Policy & Politics* 11, 123–43.
- Meijers, E. (2004). Policy integration: a literature review. In D. Stead, H. Geerlings, & E. Meijers (eds), *Policy Integration in Practice: The Integration of Land Use Planning, Transport and Environmental Policy-making in Denmark, England and Germany*, pp. 9–24. Delft: Delft University Press.
- Meltz, A.J. (1976). *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Merton, R.K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *The Antioch Review* 8(2), 193–210.
- Montpetit, É. (2002). Policy networks, federal arrangements, and the development of environmental regulations: a comparison of the Canadian and American agricultural sectors. *Governance* 15(1), 1–20.
- Oikonomou, V., Flamos, A., Gargiulo, M., Giannakidis, G., Kanudia, A., Spijker, E., & Grafakos, S. (2011). Linking least-cost energy system costs models with MCA: an assessment of the EU renewable energy targets and supporting policies. *Energy Policy* 39(5), 2786–99.
- Oliphant, S., & Howlett, M. (2010). Assessing policy analytical capacity: comparative insights from a study of the Canadian environmental policy advice system. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 12(4), 439–45.
- Page, E.C. (2010). Bureaucrats and expertise: elucidating a problematic relationship in three tableaux and six jurisdictions. *Sociologie du Travail*, 52(2), April–June, 255–73.
- Peled, A. (2002). Why style matters: a comparison of two administrative reform initiatives in the Israeli public sector, 1989–1998. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 12(2), 217–40.
- Rayner, J. (2013). On smart layering as policy design: tackling the biofuels policy mess in Canada and the United Kingdom. *Policy Sciences*, Special issue on policy design.
- Roch, C., Pitts, D., & Navarro, I. (2010). Representative bureaucracy and policy tools: ethnicity, student discipline, and representation in public schools. *Administration & Society* 42(1), 38–65.
- Salamon, L.M. (1989). *Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Salamon, L.M. (2002). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2008). Discursive institutionalism: the explanatory power of ideas and discourse. *Political Science* 11(1), 303–26.
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review* 87(2), 334–47.
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1994). Social constructions and policy design: implications for public administration. *Research in Public Administration* 3, 137–73.
- Schneider, A.L., & Ingram, H.M. (1997). *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Sidney, M.S. (2007). Policy formulation: design and tools. In F. Fischer, G.J. Miller, & M.S. Sidney (eds), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods*, pp. 79–87. New Brunswick, NJ: CRC Taylor & Francis.
- Skodvin, T., Gullberg, A.T., & Aakre, S. (2010). Target-group influence and political feasibility: the case of climate policy design in Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(6), 854–73.
- Stimson, J.A. (1991). *Public Opinion in America: Moods Cycles and Swings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stimson, J.A., Mackuen, M.B., & Erikson, R.S. (1995). Dynamic representation. *American Political Science Review* 89, 543–65.
- Stone, D.A. (1989). Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104(2), 281–300.
- Stone, D.A. (1998). *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Surel, Y. (2000). The role of cognitive and normative frames in policy-making. *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(4), 495–512.
- Suzuki, M. (1992). Political business cycles in the public mind. *American Political Science Review* 86, 989–96.
- Swanson, D., Barg, S., Tyler, S. et al. (2011). Seven tools for creating adaptive policies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 7(6), July, 924–39.

- Teisman, G.R. (2000). Models for research into decision-making processes: on phases, streams and decision-making rounds. *Public Administration* **78**(4), 937–56.
- Thelen, K. (2004). *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thelen, K., Mahoney, J., & Rueschemeyer, D. (2003). How institutions evolve: insights from comparative historical analysis. In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer (eds), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, pp. 208–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, H.G. (2001). Towards a new higher education law in Lithuania: reflections on the process of policy formulation. *Higher Education Policy* **14**(3), 213–23.
- Vedung, E. (1998). Policy instruments: typologies and theories. In M.L. Bemelmans-Videc, R.C. Rist, & E. Vedung (eds), *Carrots, Sticks & Sermons: Policy Instruments and their Evaluation*, pp. 21–58. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Walker, W.E., Marchau, V.A.W.J., & Swanson, D. (2010). Addressing deep uncertainty using adaptive policies: introduction to Section 2. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **77**(6), 917–23.
- Warwick, P.V. (2000). Policy horizons in West European parliamentary systems. *European Journal of Political Research* **38**(1), 37–61.
- Webber, D.J. (1986). Analyzing political feasibility: political scientists' unique contribution to policy analysis. *Policy Studies Journal* **14**(4), 545–54.
- Weber, E.P., & Khademian, A.M. (2008). Wicked problems, knowledge challenges and collaborative capacity builders in network settings. *Public Administration Review* **68**(2), 334–49.
- Wilder, M., & Howlett, M. (2014). The politics of policy anomalies: bricolage and the hermeneutics of paradigms. *Critical Policy Studies* **8**(2), 183–202.
- Williams, R.A. (2012). The limits of policy analytical capacity – Canadian financial regulatory reform. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* **25**(6/7), 455–63.
- Wilson, J.Q. (1974). The politics of regulation. In J.W. McKie (ed.), *Social Responsibility and the Business Predicament*, pp. 135–68. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Yee, A.S. (1996). The causal effects of ideas on policies. *International Organization* **50**(1), 69–108.