P08 / Policy Actors and Instruments

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Carole Clavier (Université du Québec à Montréal)

Second Chair : Maya Jegen (Université du Québec à Montréal)

Third Chair : Romain Lecler (UQAM)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

The study of policy instruments has offered a new starting point for the study of policy-making, outside of a more traditional focus on policy content or policy actors. As tools of government (Hood, 1986), they allowed to focus on policy styles and policy design, questioning the coherence between policy objectives and the means to achieve them (Howlett, 2001; Rayner & Howlett, 2009). As technologies of government embodying particular ideas about problems and the role of the State, they also offered a different lens to make sense of policy change (Lascoumes & Le Galès, 2007). For all its shift in perspective, though, the focus on policy instruments inexorably brings research back to the usual suspects, i.e. actors, interests, ideas and broader institutions, as instruments are inherently political. The most salient case in point is the emergence of the concept of “instrument constituencies” in recent literature. Concerned with the “supply side of policy-making” (Simons & Voß, 2018), instrument constituencies are the communities of actors existing for and because of particular policy instruments. Instrument constituencies could provide answers to how solutions are matched to policy problems (Béland & Howlett, 2016).

This panel proposes to question the nexus between policy instruments and policy actors in the policy-making process, including but not limited to instrument constituencies. The puzzle here is that of how the practices of a set of actors influence and are influenced by instruments. This calls for an exploration of, for instance, how sets of actors shape, manipulate, or are constrained by instruments; the debates that occur among sets of actors promoting an instrument; the conflicts between sets of actors promoting different instruments; the resources and power relationships underlying such disputes; the transformations of instruments and their actors across time or along the stages of the policy process; the practices of collaboration between state and private actors working with a particular instrument.

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel also welcomes international perspectives that could focus on the transnational circulation of policy instruments across countries or policy sectors, via the sets of actors that promote them; on the building or enhancement of global instruments; or on international sets of actors sharing a common interest for certain instruments (Gaidet & Fouilleux, 2018). The nexus between policy instruments and policy actors may be explored from both directions: starting from the sets of actors, communities or constituencies that promote a specific instrument; or starting from a policy instrument moving towards the actors involved.

Panel organizers expect three types of papers: theoretical papers, exploring the concepts underlying the nexus between policy actors and instruments; methodological papers, exploring ways to study interactions between policy actors and instruments; empirical papers, including papers with a socio-historical or long-term approach questioning the effects of time on the interactions between policy actors and instruments. For the last two types of papers, we welcome single case studies, comparative studies, and studies focusing on international instruments or actors.

P08 / Policy Actors and Instruments

Chair : Carole Clavier (Université du Québec à Montréal)

Second Chair : Maya Jegen (Université du Québec à Montréal)

Third Chair : Romain Lecler (UQAM)

Session 1

Friday, June 28th 08:00 to 10:00 (MB 6.425)

Discussants

Maya Jegen (Université du Québec à Montréal)

The ecology of transfer agents in the circulation of Brazilian policy instruments to fight against hunger

Osmany Porto de Oliveira (Universidade Federal de São Paulo)

The purpose of this article is to address the issue of the transnational circulation of Brazilian public policy instruments to fight against hunger. Between 2003 and 2018 Brazil gained international recognition as one of the global references for social policies, especially on what concerns reducing poverty, hunger and inequality. The country came out of the Hunger Map in 2014. Policies as Conditional Cash Transfers and Food Security were part of projects led by the international organizations, such as the World Bank (Morais, 2017; Howlett, Ramesh and Saguin, 2018) and Food and Agriculture Organization (Sabourin et al. 2019). Brazil became a policy “exporter” in this area, engaging in transfers of instruments to fight against hunger in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa. This article analyses Brazilian policy transfers by tackling three main questions: Which agents were engaged in policy transfer? What instruments were transferred? How transfers were produced? The literature on policy transfer have focused in empirical backgrounds that considered, especially, the circulation of instruments between countries in the Global North and from these ones to the South. This article advances a new frontier of research, by analyzing in depth the role of Brazil as a policy exporter, taking into account the relationship between agents (Stone, 2004), instruments (Halpern, Le Galès, 2011) and translations (Hassenteufel, Maillard, 2013). The main argument is that a coordinated ecology of agents (both governmental and non-governmental, national and international) was proactive in policy transfer, increasing the potential and scale of diffusion of Brazilian instruments to fight against hunger. The article presents a process-tracing of this policy transfer by analyzing the role of different agents and the instruments they promote, a specific case is used to provide detail of the translation of such instruments from Brazil to Chile. The article is based on a qualitative methodology, which includes different field researches missions (Milan, 2015; Brasília; 2014, 2018; Santiago, 2018) and 50 in-depth interviews.

When policy instruments (dis)inhibit economic and collective strategies. The case of varietal wines in the Languedoc-Roussillon region.

Romain Blancaneaux (Sciences Po Bordeaux)

Denomination of Origin (DO) has constitued a quality standard in France for wines based on their geographical inscription (terroir) since the first half of the 20th century, and have set up a model of excellence. However, it has been competing with another type of production for more than two decades: varietal wines (VW). In some wine-growing areas, production and trade organizations have met success in producing and selling VW. Such as in Languedoc-Roussillon, an area formerly dominated by type of vines closely related to the production of overproduced, mass wine. As of 1970, Paris transfered to Brussels its wine policy, placing its southern vineyards under the EEC supervision. A reconversion of the production gradually took place, by means of vines of “international standards” (Cabernet-Sauvignon, Merlot…) (Garcia-Parpet, 2004), and the emergence of innovative professional practices. What has been the link between this new (collective and economic) strategy with policy change? Works undertaken on the sectoral transformation in Languedoc-Roussillon, in political science and sociology of the economy, bring partial, but

complementary answers. Instead of dissociating their prospects, this presentation will articulate public policies, economic and collective strategy to address the hegemony of VW.

In order to highlight the role of public policies in this evolution, a key mechanism can be sought after in the role of the sectoral instruments set in place by public policies (national, then “communautaires”), which constrain, and organize economic and collective strategies. An interdependence first took place as of the pre-EEC period. Neocorporatists have shown that, within a national framework, interest groups collaborated advantageously – with the services of the State – in the institutionalization of the sectoral regulation, which they depended on (Muller, 1984; Keeler, 1987; Jobert, Muller, 1987, Fouilleux, 2003). Sectoral instruments reinforced their members economically, attracted new ones, but involved overproduction and refractoriness to policy change (Fouilleux, 2003). The European integration, however, started exerting new constrains (Muller, 2004) on sectoral instruments, and upset traditional production and trade oragnizations. This grid can be applied to the French wine sector.

This presentation shows, relying on semi-structured interviews, the professionnal press and the literature, that the policy instruments set by the EEC have paved the way for VW. First, before the EEC, (mass) wine production and trade organizations were tightly binded to the interventionism of the State. The transfer of its wine policy towards Brussels accentuated their dependence, inhibiting almost completely the emergence of alternatives to mass wine, sustained by Community instruments. Second, the modification of the EEC policy instruments in the middle of the 1980’s reversed the economic order of the wine sector, and altered the productions and trade organizations which were bound to them, to the benefit of VW.

The analysis highlights, through the case of VW, how public policies (national, then “communautaire”) and their instruments play a pivotal role in the inhibition, then the disinhibition of new economic and collective strategies. It illustrates the conditions of their subversion, and instrumental mechanisms at stake.

Brought together by the implementation process of an instrument. The bicycle activist, the bus driver, the politician and the Mobility Law in Mexico City.

Audrey Cherubin (CNRS- CREDA, Université Paris 3/CEMCA)

This proposal seeks to interrogate the nexus between policy instruments and policy actors through the case of study of the Mobility Law promulgated in 2014 in Mexico City. Placed under the official sign of the local fulfillment of a global transition to sustainable mobility, this new legislative instrument imposes a hierarchy favorable to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport at the expense of cars. It organizes the concentration of the concessionary transport within a few number of companies operating under the control of a regulatory body. It also contains disincentives to real estate projects in areas not covered by this network. Finally, it seeks to guarantee all these transformations through an elaborate planning and monitoring process based on the expertise and participation of civil society. Questioning a cultural appreciation of the automobile as a symbol of belonging to the middle and upper classes (Pérez López, 2013) as well as the relations of political exchange (Combes et Vomarro, 2012) established for almost a century between public authorities and economic actors involved in construction and concessionary transport for almost a century (Davis, 1994), the implementation of this legal framework brought about a deep change of instrumentation giving rise to strong conflicts.

By taking these conflicts for entry point and relying on a long-term survey combining interviews, observations and the consultation of different sources (biographic sources; Assembly’s, administrations’, activists’ or experts’ reports; journalistic sources), the presentation will highlight how, in this context, the process of elaboration and imposition of the law brought closer actors coming from different fields, for whom the new law represents an opportunity to improve their respective positions: (1) actors coming from activism and professional consultancy, combining a distinctive high level of academic education, specializing in urban and/or environmental politics, and a set of resources that can be summarized as international capital (Wagner et Réau, 2015), who developed their knowledge on the international instruments of sustainable mobility into advocacy networks; (2) actors from politico-administrative spheres, from both left and right-wing sensibilities but sharing relative marginality vis-à-vis the networks of political parties, for both the reason that they belong to the generations of the 1970s and 1980s, thus starting their careers in a political environment marked by the destabilization of the PRI’s regime, and that they include a high number of women; (3) actors from concessionary transport who occupy a dominated position in power relations, based on seniority and number of concessions, within informal groups of operators. The analysis will point out how the different operations of the shaping and imposition of the law gradually gave rise to a new network between this heterogeneous set of actors, bringing about professional (collaboration and multi-positionality) and personal (friendly and matrimonial) relations. This process occurs through the joint participation of these actors to ad hoc institutions such as advocacy platforms, technical committees and legislative and administrative commissions, as well as through the practices established in these institutions, such as the arriving to a staged consensus or the invisibilization of statutory and hierarchical boundaries.

Davis, Diane E.. 1994. Urban Leviathan. Mexico City in the Twentieth Century. Philadelphia, Temple

University Press.

Pérez López, Ruth. 2013. « El sistema de bicicletas públicas “Ecobici”: del cambio modal al

cambio social », Espacialidades, 3, 2 : 104-124.

Vomarro, Gilles et Hélène Combes. 2012. « Relations clientélaires ou politisation : pour dépasser certaines limites de l’étude du clientélisme », Cahiers des Amériques Latines, 69 :17-35.

Wagner, Anne-Catherine et Bertrand Réau. 2015. « Le capital international : un outil

d'analyse de la reconfiguration des rapports de domination », dans Johanna Siméant (dir.). Guide de l'enquête globale en sciences sociales. Paris, CNRS éditions : 35-48.

The model of the work integration social enterprises as a policy instrument from social and economic to environmental policies

Muriel Sacco (Political science departement/ Université Libre de Bruxelles)

In the region of Brussels and in Wallonia in Belgium, since the beginning of the 2010’s, work integration social enterprises of the reuse, repair and recycling through their different federations and policy entrepreneurs tend to profile themselves as a relevant policy instrument in several policy sectors from professional integration policies to environmental policies and local economic development. By doing so, the social economy model is built as a policy instrument and the actors promoting it transform the social economy into an instrument constituency. The used arguments depend on the policy sector but refer to the original aims of the social economy (Defourny, 2009; Demoustier, 2013). This strategy has been adopted in a changing policy context and is not specific to the French-speaking Belgian policies. Indeed, several policy changes in social policies are reforming the traditional public financial support provided to work integration social enterprises, which was long-run and very sure. Indeed, the public financial support to civil society organizations working has been progressively contractualized and merchandised (Hély, 2009) and thus based on calls for application, competitions, and evaluations. In this context, work integration social enterprises try to sell their services to public authorities in order to guarantee their financial equilibrium and prospect in several policy sectors (Coney et al. 2016).

Through this case study, this paper aims to highlight that the social economy model as a policy instrument is promoted by actors who believe that the social economy should improve their financial performance and show that they are not dependent of public funding. These actors come from the work integration social enterprises but are also working in the governmental and administrative institutions. The theoretical framework of this paper combines the literature on policy instruments (Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2004; Halpern, Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2014; Béland and Howlett, 2016) and the literature on the policy networks (Rhodes, 1997). This paper will be based on several in-depth interviews and the analysis of policy documents coming from the different actors involved in the different policies analyzed.

Social Innovation Labs: A Neoliberal Austerity Driven Process or Democratic Intervention

Siu Mee Cheng (Toronto Metropolitan University)

Meghan Joy (Concordia University)

John Shields (Toronto Metropolitan University)

Social Innovation Labs (SILs) are a recent policy instrument development that are spreading rapidly in many different countries. SILs are said to address difficult and complex social policy problems that have been resistant to solutions. To date, there has been limited scholarly analysis of SIL development with many questions in need of critical policy assessment. This panel will seek to conceptualize SILs in the Canadian context. A study was undertaken which identified Canadian-based SILs using a literature-based criteria: 1) a diverse engagement of all stakeholders who share an interest in the problem, including the public, private and non-profit sectors, as well as citizens; 2) physical space that separates these stakeholders from their usual environment; and 3) facilitation and design processes that provide direction on how solution-finding will be undertaken. As a result, 59 SILs were identified from among four sectors: academic, public, not-for-profit and private sectors. These SILs reveal that there is a strong focus on solution-finding for social policy issues, and the undertaking of projects to address public issues that include environmental challenges, urban living, employment, health and food security, to name a few. The panel will explore emerging conceptual issues against the map of Canadian SILs. As a result of the Canadian-based findings, these findings suggest that the SIL trend speaks to a dual and contradictory desire on the part of states for more participatory policymaking and cost cutting. The latter references the move towards shifting policymaking and solution-finding outside of government, in order to reduce internal costs and enhance efficiencies. Thus, while SILs open up the possibility for a democratization of policy, they are also motivated

by efforts to do more with less in an environment shaped by austerity and neoliberalism, particularly in light of the 2008 global financial crisis, and its impact on Canada's economic stability. This suggests that SILs may result in the marketization and depoliticization of social policy, while adopting a rationalist approach to policymaking and solution-finding within a complex systems lens. This panel will highlight these tensions conceptually with the purpose of guiding empirical studies that explore how these contradictions manifest in policy practice and perhaps offer openings for policy that addresses both the roots and symptoms of complex policy problems.