(Virtual) P04 / Global Public Policy and Governance: Theories, Methods, and Cases

Topic : GLOBAL POLICY

Chair : Yijia Jing (Institute for Global Public Policy)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Since the 1980s, the speedup of flows and exchanges (of capital, products and information) all over the world, well known as globalization, has made national economies, societies and cultures more interconnected and integrated than ever before. This change brought both opportunities and challenges to public policy and governance. As for the positive consequences, globalization facilitates international cooperation in various domains, such as business investments, cross-culture communication and technology sharing. However, as for the negative consequences, on the one hand, many regional and national governance problems that are endemic for centuries have taken on a new look. For example, although the frequency of military conflicts between countries declines, the number of conflicts in economic exchanges and international organizations increases in recent years. On the other hand, globalization also raises new problems for decision-makers. For example, traditional ideas and practices may no longer be efficient and costless to deal with newly-emerging transnational problems in a globalized world. This suggests that decision-makers need to adopt a global and comparative perspective to develop strategies and solutions. Furthermore, in more recent time, marked by a series of shocking events (e.g. 2008 international financial crisis, 2020 Covid-19 global pandemic), globalization is entering into a new era in which de-globalization is accelerating and gains supports in several regions and countries. Although this rollback may not lead to a fundamental collapse of current integration trend, it probably poses major challenges to existing global governing systems.

Against this background, there are an increasing number of studies which focus on the issues regarding global public policy and governance. While offering valuable insights, current discussions still require further elaboration and improvement:

As for theoretical advancements, many classic theories regarding public policy and governance are developed at the national or regional level. Despite this, we still know little about the situations at the global level.

As for research methods, current studies rely more on traditional quantitative (e.g. regression) and qualitative (e.g. comparative case study) techniques. However, the development of computational social science equips social scientists with more efficient tools to build huge cross-national datasets and make comparative analysis. Considering that the lack of good quality data is still a major obstacle to scholars who are interested in cross-national comparative studies, it is significant to promote methodological advancements in the field of global public policy and governance.

As for cases, there still remains many new governing phenomena with global relevance to be explored. Providing more cases covering comparative public policy and governance, domestic public policy and governance with global relevance, public policy diffusion across national borders will deepen our understanding of the complexity of public policy and governance in the increasingly globalized world.

By offering theoretically informed and empirically sound studies, this panel aims to fill the abovementioned research gaps and contribute to the current discussions on global public policy and governance in the aspects of theories, methods and cases.

Institute for Global Public Policy (IGPP), Fudan University, China plans to host this panel. IGPP aims to advance research on global public policy and build up an international platform of policy studies and degree education with a genuine global and multidisciplinary perspective. For more details, please see: https://igpp.fudan.edu.cn/igppen/main.htm

CALL FOR PAPERS

The panel welcomes theoretical, empirical and methodological research that explores public sector reforms

and developments in an increasingly globalized world.

In terms of the theoretical advancements, many classic theories regarding public policy and governance are developed at the national or regional level. Despite this, we still know little about the situations at global level. For example, policy diffusion has been widely identified by policy process scholarship as a major mechanism for subnational governments to learn from the success. However, few studies explore whether it is still the case for countries? If the answer is yes, how does the recent resurgence of de-globalization affect the diffusion process?

In terms of the methodological advancements, to what extent will the newly-emerging computational and experimental methods empower the cross-national comparative studies? For example, the burst of social media data and advancements of machine learning text analysis techniques (e.g. topic model) seems to make it possible for scholars to collect data regarding the feelings, emotions and opinions of citizens in different countries and conduct comparative analysis. Will they be good supplements to previous comparative methods, such as using cross-national social surveys (e.g. European social survey, Euroborameter)? If the answer is yes, is there any best research practice?

In terms of the cases advancements, what are the broad implications of de-globalization to global public policy and governance in the post-Covid19 era? For example, international organizations have long been expected to play the key roles in international coordination in the past decades. However, in responding to the global pandemic of Covid19, international organizations experienced a hard time in coordinating countries around the world into one community to collaborate with each other and fight together. In what ways and to what extent are de-globalization affecting international organizations' policy formulation, implementation and outcome?

Acceptances are not limited by areas of public policy and preference is given to topics of widespread significance to the advancements of theories, methods and cases of global public policy and governance. After the panel meeting, authors will be invited to submit the accepted papers to the Global Public Policy Journal (GPPG) and go through the peer review process. GPPG is an English academic journal hosted by IGPP. GPPG focuses on issues regarding global public policy and governance which is in line with the theme of this panel. The journal home page is https://www.springer.com/journal/43508/

(Virtual) P04 / Global Public Policy and Governance: Theories, Methods, and Cases

Chair : Yijia Jing (Institute for Global Public Policy)

Session 1AFTERNOON SESSION, VIRTUAL

Tuesday, July 6th 16:30 to 18:30 (Virtual 15)

(Virtual) Updating Innovation and DIffusion Theory: Incorporating Global Governance, Structure and Context for Unified Theories

Frances Berry (Florida State University)

JING HE (Florida State University, USA)

In 1969. Professor Walker provided a definition of innovation and in 1990 Professors Berry and Professor Berry introduced a new method—event history analysis-- to boost the empirical studies of innovation and diffusion. Since then hundreds of innovation and diffusion studies have been completed using new methods, additional variables and new contexts. Still, we do not have one or more unified theories of policy innovation and diffusion field. In this paper, we update the definition of policy innovation and diffusion, add additional important variables (open government, technology, citizen engagement and others) and develop several competing theoretical policy models. Our goal is to make these models flexible so that they can be made context (country, cultural) specific, level of policy (macro, meso and micro) as well as broadening the elements required to fully explain the mechanisms of innovation and diffusion (e.g., learning, competition, coercion, imitation)

If we consider time, space and actors as three dimensions, we briefly divide 8 regions to contain the existing model and future directions of policy innovation and diffusion (Figure 1). We will develop the theories and then try to map them with schema that demonstrate their options for expansion and versatility, using a number of short cases and examples of policy in different country contexts..

2. Scope

The study of innovation and diffusion across countries can be divided into three strata --- macro-level, meso-level, and micro-level. Macro-level includes comparative studies with different countries. Global governance may be bringing the macro level related to policy and innovation towards some convergence, but we don’t have a unified model. The meso-level contains the specific innovation practices in each specific country or different kinds of policies, making context and additional internal factors important. While in the micro-level, scholars start to pay attention to individual and intra-organizational levels. So, the framework about the whole policy innovation and diffusion field can be illustrated in Figure 2 We will develop this framework further and work towards several unified models of innovation and diffusion taking account global governance, market and technology patterns to point towards some directions for future study.

(I'm sorry but I can't get the figures pasted in this abstract platform. Fran B)

(Virtual) Cross-national convergence of school autonomy and accountability policies. An analysis based on waves 2000-2018 of OECD-PISA

Gerard Ferrer-Esteban (Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona)

Antoni Verger (Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona)

Policy convergence, in the framework of globalization processes, has triggered an important debate in global policy studies - and in global education policy studies in particular. World Culture theorists observe that policy convergence is internationally advancing in many school systems’ domains (curriculum, national assessments, etc.), and in relation to policies articulated around governance principles such as accountability and decentralization. Both school autonomy and performance-based accountability policies are in fact at the center of current global reform agendas and tend to be conceived as inseparable.

Governments are willing to give more autonomy to schools to the extent that schools accept stricter supervision via external evaluation and test-based accountability measures. In a competitive international education environment, education reform advocates, including the OECD and other international organizations, see both school autonomy and accountability as the most appropriate policies to modernize and strengthen the effectiveness of national educational systems. Nonetheless, despite the strong international emphasis behind such policies, it is not clear yet to what extent they have penetrated the domestic policy domain and the everyday work of schools. Political economy perspectives, combined with quantitative research methods, can contribute to understand ongoing dynamics of policy convergence and divergence in the field of global education policy

The main objectives of this paper are to analyze the international convergence of school autonomy and accountability policies across OECD countries, and to explore the contextual and institutional factors associated with higher levels of convergence. The database resulting from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) offers a unique source to measure, in a longitudinal way, covering a time span of almost 20 years, not only the formal adoption of policies but also their appropriation and implementation at the school level. We employ both ?-convergence tests and endogenous clustering methods to identify convergence clubs of countries. First, we test convergence hypothesis by dividing the units of analysis into subgroups based on some prior information (i.e., OECD vs non-OECD countries, type of testing and accountability policies, institutional framework). Second, we adopt a data-driven method to identify clusters of convergence subgroups of countries and run probit models to find factors playing a role in determining the formation of convergence clubs among the OECD countries. The main source of information is the OECD PISA database, from wave 2000 to wave 2018. Our analysis considers data for 55 educational systems. We test the convergence hypothesis for three indices of school autonomy (staffing, budgeting, and curriculum) and a variable related to autonomy in the management of school admission (selection according to academic records). We also analyze the convergence of market-driven accountability policies (achievement data are posted publicly).

This research provides preliminary evidence on the convergence of certain policies of school autonomy and accountability. We find evidence on the convergence of school autonomy policies, with respect to staff, school budget and curriculum. We also find robust evidence on the lack of dispersion regarding the school admission policies according to the student’s academic records, which is an indicator of schools’ organizational autonomy. Last, there is no evidence on the convergence in the enactment of market-driven accountability policies, such as the publication of the students’ academic results. We finally reflect on the contextual and institutional factors behind the different levels of convergence identified in our study.

(Virtual) When Leviathan Encounters Unicorns: National Governance Challenges in the Context of Emerging New Technologies

Dancheng LI (Shanghai Jiaotong University)

The use of new technologies represented by the Internet, artificial intelligence, big data, and cloud computing has not only completely changed the production and management systems, but also subverted almost all industries, and profoundly changed the way social resources are allocated and the operating modes of social organizations. The promoters and masters behind this are the large new technology companies that are accelerating their rise. Such companies and the new technological revolution they promoted have spawned “new political space” and formed a “technical rule” that may have a subversive impact on government governance and political operations. Tensions between governments and technology companies are increasing worldwide. The accelerated rise of new technology giants and the widespread application of emerging technologies may have a disruptive effect on government governance and political operations. When Leviathan encounters unicorns, how does the rise of a large new technology company affect national governance state capacity? Is it weakened or strengthened? Based on dataset from 50 countries in the world in 2018, this paper uses exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to construct a three-dimensional "enterprise technology power" and a three-dimensional "national capability" measurement tool. Through empirical analysis, this research finds that: First, with the expansion of the online users, market power and intervention capability of large new technology companies, the state capacity with the core of absorptive capacity, coercive ability and administrative capacity has been weakened; second, the new technology turns out to be both a hidden danger of political security and an important partner for consolidating state capacity. When the government and new technology companies cooperate, the weakening of state capacity caused by power struggles can be avoided.The results of the study reveal that the expansion of new technologies has enabled the state's power to move into a whole new field, providing forward-looking ideas for how the existing political system and bureaucratic administrative system can cope with the development of new technology companies.

(Virtual) The New Terrain of Glob
Across Formal and Informal IOs

Charles Roger (Institut Barcelona d'E

The world of international organizations is vast and diverse. However, much of our knowl- edge about international institutions draws from studies of a particular subset, namely formal international organizations,

as measured by the Correlates of War dataset. This arti- cle presents an analysis that uses a new dataset of state membership in informal international organizations–IOs founded with non-binding instruments–which have come to constitute roughly one-third of all operating IOs. In this paper, we explain how we conceptualize informal IOs as a distinct sub-type within a larger category of IOs. We then use this new dataset to revisit several longstanding questions in the field of international organization: First, who participates in IOs and how has participation changed over time? Second, what are the determinants of state membership in IOs? Third, and more generally: is the IO network becoming more or less fragmented over time? In each case, we find that our new dataset often validates conjectures from existing research that could not have been tested with existing data, demonstrating both the value and validity of our measure. We conclude by outlining a research program that takes seriously how considering informal IOs can reshape our understanding of international affairs and we suggest new avenues for research.

(Virtual) P04 / Global Public Policy and Governance: Theories, Methods, and Cases

Chair : Yijia Jing (Institute for Global Public Policy)

Session 2MORNING SESSION, VIRTUAL;

Wednesday, July 7th 10:00 to 12:00 (Virtual 15)

(Virtual) Drivers of the legitimacy of global governance organizations: a sentiment big data study

Angel Saz-Carranza (Esade - Ramon Llull University)

Global governance organisations (GGOs) contribute to global policy-making through both hard and soft functions, including coordination, rulemaking and nom-setting, execution, standard-setting, information-sharing, intelligence-sharing, agenda-setting, and capacity-building. They address challenges that are global in nature, like climate change, trade governance, poverty reduction, regional tensions, cyber-security, and so on and so forth. GGOs range from Treaty-based, multilateral international organisations (IOs) to looser forms of organised international cooperation within the global governance architecture (Börzel & Risse, 2005; Slaughter & Hale, 2011).

The legitimacy of global governance and GGOs is thought to be fundamental for the global governance architecture to be effective. The legitimacy of GGOs has been defined in both sociological and normative perspectives. In sociological matters, what matters the most are “the beliefs of audiences that a [GGO]’s authority is appropriately exercised” (Tallberg & Zürn, 2019), thus separating it from both actual authority or support for how that authority is conducted. Legitimacy can be given through legitimation processes and taken away through de-legitimation processes. These are processes of justification and contestation intended to shape beliefs of legitimacy that will alter the intensity, tone and narratives associated with a given GGO, both in discursive and in behavioural terms (Tallberg & Zürn, 2019).

Our research question is What are the main factors driving global governance organisations’ legitimacy across different countries? We specifically test three hypotheses: H1: Legitimacy of GGOs decreased between 2015 and 2021, in line with the increase in nationalism; H2: General-purpose GGOs are more susceptible to de-legitimation than specific-purpose GGOs; H3: Domestic perceptions of legitimacy depend on the country’s level of democratic maturity, their human development, and the political agenda of the political party in charge of policy.

The paper uses big data to study the legitimacy of GGOs. So far, legitimacy has been studied mostly in qualitative terms and, whatever little quantitative analysis there has been, has unfortunately had results with very little impact. Schmidtke’s (2019) study, arguably the closest one to this project within existing literature, only analyses three general purpose GGOs, using a very limited number of media sources (two mainstream newspapers per country), only covers four countries, and is coded by hand (Schmidtke, 2019).

We use sentiment big data provided by Global Database of Events, Languages, and Tone, GDELT. Sentiment big data is characterised mainly for representing the underlying sentiment in large corpora of texts, which are coded using algorithmic processes. GDELT is probably the most ambitious sentiment database is the, also known as GDELT, which in 2018 had over 3.2 trillion datapoints (GDELT, 2020).

In addition to the global sentiment per GGO, we will also focus on the perceptions of ten specific countries who represent different regions and development levels of the world: Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Russia, South Africa, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This will ensure that the project’s country-by-country analysis offers sufficient extrapolation across the world, while enhancing comparability across comparable Western countries.

(Virtual) The landscape of E-government research: a knowledge graph-based analysis

Meijun Liu (Fudan University)

E-government provides an innovative approach to address traditional government services in the digital age,

which has attracted considerable attention in recent decades. However, there are limited investigations on the landscape and dynamics of E-government research. Based on the publication data extracted from the Web of Science, this study quantifies knowledge mapping, interdisciplinarity, hotspots and international collaboration networks in the E-government field using knowledge graph-based and social network analysis. Especially, this study focus on how newly emerging data science techniques are applied in E-government research. This study not only presents the status quo and international efforts of E-government research in the global context but also provides discussions on how researchers in the field embrace methodological advancements.

(Virtual) Policy conflicts in local implementation of international climate policy: a case study of Clean Development Mechanism in China

Jingyuan Xu (Fudan University)

Conflict is one of the most important phenomena underlying studies of politics and public policy. In a globalized world with increasingly diverse international effort have been made to address newly-emerging transnational problems, political scientists focus more on the nature of the politics underlying international conflicts in a horizontal perspective, keeping vertical conflicts in policy implementation far less-discussed. Policy Conflict Framework (PCF) proposed by Weible and Heikkila (2017) provides a lens to investigate conflicts in policy implementation at three levels of action — political systems, policy subsystems and policy action situations — and its impact on policy outputs. This research takes the Clean Development Mechanism in China as a case study to explore the questions that how did policy conflicts emerge at multiple scales of governance and in what way did policy conflicts bring about the end of CDM implementation in China. A dataset of 4429 CDM projects hosted in China from 2004-2015, together with whose Program Design Documents, government regulations and policies and UNFCCC annual reports, provide a time-series data for empirical analysis of policy process over ten years. The results indicate that policy conflicts between the international level and national level contributed most to the recession of CDM in China; and as suggested by the PCF, the internal components of a policy conflict setting do have interactive effects (e.g. levels of action are interactive in their polycentric structure). The empirical analysis sheds light on the impact of policy conflict on policy output, especially for those international climate policies implemented in a top-down approach. This research enriches the concept of "levels of action" in PCF by bringing the international political system into consideration. It also adds value to the global public policy and governance literature by applying a cutting-edge framework for theoretically understanding the international policy process.

(Virtual) P04 / Global Public Policy and Governance: Theories, Methods, and Cases

Chair : Yijia Jing (Institute for Global Public Policy)

Session 3MORNING SESSION, VIRTUAL;

Thursday, July 8th 10:00 to 12:00 (Virtual 15)

(Virtual) Surveillance or social support? The role of communities in national lockdown admits Covid-19 pandemic

xiaohui zhong (Sun-Yat-sen University)

Bingqin Li (ANU)

Abstract
Lockdown has become the main public health measure around the globe in order to contain the pandemic, and its effects have varied largely across countries. Explanations about effects of lockdowns have adopted the thesis of state capacity (Capano et al., 2020). How the states implemented lockdown measures depend on the governments' policing apparatus, administrative system and economic power, and the states with low capacities lack of effective control on the communities. Other studies highlight the role of civil society and community participation in the implementation of lockdown, from civic compliance with lockdown to the mobilization of volunteering for social support (Marston, Cicely et al, 2020; Wan et al, 2020). This paper compares the responses of communities in China and Australia, and it explores the role of communities played in a nationwide lockdown. We found that before the Covid-19 China had built up a tight community-level governance structure of which main purpose was to enforce control while providing limited social services. This pre-existing governing structure is able to diversify its roles, i.e., social control and social support in time to function when a crisis hit. We argue that China presents us a hybrid case of dealing with a national lockdown. It also discusses whether emergency responses sow the seeds for service-centred in urban communities that have potential post-Covid-19 implications for the state-NGO relations in China.

Keywords: community actions; the local state agent-NGOs relationship; lockdown in Covid-19; China; Australia;

(Virtual) Agenda setting in the Chinese local governments' executive meetings: public priorities, problem status and policy signals from the upper-authorities

Ziteng Fan (Institute for Global Public Policy, Fudan University)

Agenda setting is important to the well-functioning of institutional systems. Putting or prioritizing a policy issue on government agenda can be seen as a necessary step for subsequent policy adoption and implementation. Existing studies have done much in revealing how policy agendas of governments in western democracies respond to the public priorities, legislative preferences, political leaders' initiatives and problems' status. For example, with the expectation of re-election, policymakers in western democracies usually have motivations to align government delivers and public wants. With regard to the situation in China, while scholarship in government responsiveness offers some insights, their explorations mainly focuses on a certain policy domain and have limitations in revealing the general patterns of agenda-setting across various policy domains. Following this, further large N studies are required to test the agenda-setting theories in China. Furthermore, due to data access limits, they usually rely on data such as Government Working Reporting. Little academic attention was paid to the governments' executive meetings. The governments' executive meetings in China are formal venues for setting the policy agenda on high politics. On the local levels, the governors/mayors, vice governors/mayors and parts of directors of government agencies are the members of executive meetings. The executive meetings are usually host 2-4 times a month. During the executive meetings, the meeting members discuss, scrutinize and review bills from various policy domains.

This study makes a meaningful step forward in quantitative research of agenda setting in China by exploring

the research question: What determines the policy agenda of Chinese local governments' executive meetings? We first introduce a novel dataset on the agendas of Chinese governments' executive meetings from 2013 to 2020. Then, we trace the policy attention of executive meetings over time and shed light on its dynamic patterns. Finally, by drawing upon the theories of agenda-setting, we empirically explore the potential effects of public priorities, problem status and policy signals from the central state on policy attention of the executive meetings at the provincial levels. Theoretically, this study aims to contribute to the agenda-setting theories by adding new evidence on transitional contexts. Methodologically, we introduce a new dataset regarding policy agendas in China by adopting a coding procedure similar with Comparative Agenda Project (CAP), which may allow for various empirical applications.

(Virtual) A multidimensional approach to state capacity in a covid world

Fernando De la Cruz

The COVID-19 multidimensional crisis poses a formidable challenge for human society as it is simultaneously and globally damaging the public health, the economic activity and the social wellbeing. The complexity and severity of this crisis has revealed the weaknesses and heterogeneities of States' capacities to respond to the pandemic. Our research proposes a hierarchical cluster analysis of countries based on three dimensions (the health, the economic and the social crises) and their inputs and outputs. The analysis considers the capacity of the States to deal with the effects of the COVID-19 emergency. We classify 99 countries worldwide into four groups in 2020. Our results reveal that there is no simple 'linear' representation of the COVID-19 multi-crises in terms of state capacity (SC) (each cluster of countries has its own and specific SC characteristics and crisis effects). We reject the hypothesis that strong SC is a sine qua non condition for tackling the negative effects of the pandemic

(Virtual) The evolution of global governance architecture(s)

Hanzhi YU (School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University)

The evolution of global governance architecture(s) is a research frontier in global governance. Previous studies have developed some macro-level theories and also conducted many empirical case studies. However, most of them ignored how different natures of global governance issues could make a difference on the evolution. Based on the theories in public economics, this research inductively identifies three kinds of global governance issues, each of them is embedded with different natures and could lead to different interaction modes among multi-actors in global governance. A theoretical framework is further developed to explain the diversified evolution patterns of global governance architectures. This research has substantive theoretical contribution to the global governance literature, and also provides policy implications.