Theorizing policy capacity of stakeholder organizations

Martina Vukasovic

Department of Administration and Organization Theory, University of Bergen

martina.vukasovic@uib.no

ICPP, 26-28 June 2019, Montreal

Panel: Knowledge Policy Dynamics in the Global Context

Work in progress. Please do not cite!

Introduction

Whether or not the public sector performs well depends to a large extent on the capacity of the various actors involved in its governance (Moe & Wiborg, 2016; Wu, Ramesh, & Howlett, 2018). This is why significant research efforts have been dedicated to analysing capacity of governments to solve problems by developing effective policies and ensuring their implementation (see e.g. Lodge & Wegrich, 2014b), safeguarding input, throughput and output legitimacy (Scharpf, 1999; Schmidt, 2013), and enabling administrative and political coordination (Braun, 2008).

Two distinct yet related concepts have so far been in focus: (a) governance capacity and (b) policy capacity. Both concepts concern skills and competences of, primarily, state actors to steer the public sector and perform public functions. At the same time, both strands of research are also characterized by similar conceptual and empirical gaps. Their focus is rather narrowly on the state and its agencies, while non-state actors – various stakeholders and their organizations – are mostly treated as secondary, either seen as counterparts to the state in collaborative governance (e.g. Torfing, 2019) or as means for improving policy capacity of the state (e.g. Peters, 2015). Despite the fact that the most recent conceptualization of policy capacity allows for expanding the focus to stakeholder organizations as well (Wu, Ramesh, et al., 2018, p. 4), research is at the moment lagging behind the practice concerning a more detailed conceptualization and operationalization of the stakeholder organizations' policy capacity, as well as theorization of its antecedents and consequences. In other words, conceptual and theoretical tools for understanding the skills, competences and resources stakeholder organizations possess and how this affects their contributions to policy outputs is underdeveloped, which in turn affects the potential for robust empirical analysis (Daugbjerg, Fraussen, & Halpin, 2018).

The aim of this paper is to strengthen this conceptual and theoretical toolbox. This will be done in two steps:

1. deepening the existing conceptualization of policy capacity of stakeholder organizations (Daugbjerg et al., 2018) and providing a detailed operationalization, and
2. providing a set of theoretically based expectations concerning antecedents policy capacity (i.e. what characteristics of these organizations affect how much policy capacity they will have) and what are the consequences for the ability of these organizations to influence policy outputs.

Concerning the second step, which is the key contribution of the paper, a novel approach to theorization is adopted. Instead of analysing various roles of stakeholder organizations individually, relying on literature that is often too fragmented into disciplinary silos (see e.g. discussion in Halpin, 2014), the paper takes stakeholder organizations and the roles they play in policy as the point of departure and integrates three distinct theoretical perspectives – organization studies, comparative politics and sociology of professions – into one theoretical framework.

The paper is structured as follows. First, a conceptual disambiguation is presented, explaining the rationale for using the term 'stakeholder organization'. This is followed by literature review concerning: (a) governance capacity and policy capacity, and (b) stakeholder organizations as policy actors is presented. The review provides the backdrop for the conceptualization operationalization of stakeholder organizations' policy capacity, as well as an elaboration of its antecedents and consequences. The concluding remarks summarize the research potential of the theoretical approach presented in the paper.

Stakeholder organizations, non-state actors and interest groups – a disambiguation

Before exploring the role of stakeholder organizations in the policy process, it is necessary to discuss three inter-related concepts – stakeholder organizations, non-state actors and interest groups.

Stakeholders are all those who have an interest in how a sector performs (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008). Stakeholders have three key attributes that determine their salience – power, legitimacy, urgency of demands (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997; Wood, Mitchell, Agle, & Bryan, 2018). This also means that stakeholders are not created equal and that stakeholders can act strategically to boost their salience. One way of doing this is through organizing into stakeholder organizations, in particular in terms of boosting power and legitimacy (Vukasovic, 2018). While the term itself originated from business studies, being related to the narrower idea of 'shareholder', it has travelled further and taken hold in public policy analysis, indicating various groups who have an interest in how a particular public sector performs. It is sometimes more or less explicitly linked to the rise of NPM approaches and the increasing role of market coordination approaches in the public sector,

and the related commodification and corporatization of public sector organizations (for an example related to higher education, see Jongbloed et al., 2008).

Non-state actors, a term that seems to originate from international relations studies, are generally understood as individuals or organizations who are entirely or partially independent from state governments but try to influence decision-making at various governance levels. When the focus is on organizations, the term encompasses a rather varied set of entities – from multinational corporations and media organizations, through various lobby groups, (I)NGOs, aid agencies, to paramilitary forces. As such, it is a much wider concept than stakeholder organizations. However, it does not really subsume it, given that some authors consider state to be a stakeholder too (e.g. Jongbloed et al., 2008).

Interest groups is a term that originates from comparative politics literature and concerns formally organized groups which have a political interest to influence policy outcomes through direct lobbying or public pressure, e.g. via demonstrations, media (Beyers, Eising, & Maloney, 2008). As such, they are by default non-state actors. There are several ways of classifying interest groups, depending on what kind of interests they are representing and what kind of membership structure they may have (see e.g. Beyers, 2008; Dür & Mateo, 2016; Greenwood, 2011). One of them concerns a distinction based on the breadth of group policy engagement, distinguishing between (1) public interest groups active on issues of general concern, such as the environment (e.g. Greenpeace), and (2) sectoral interest groups active on issues of immediate concern for a more narrowly defined group, specific profession, consumers, workers or businesses (Binderkrantz, 2009). Very often, the 'stakeholders' label is used in this strand of literature too, specifically for sectoral interest groups (for recent examples, see e.g. Baldwin, 2019; Beyers & Arras, 2019; Brès, Mena, & Salles-Djelic, 2019; Bunea & Ibenskas, 2017; Crow, Albright, & Koebele, 2019; Mewhirter, Coleman, & Berardo, 2017). Interest groups studies are primarily interested in the role these organizations play in agenda-setting and policy formation, focusing on what Halpin terms their 'policy wins' and, to a far lesser extent their 'policy work' – i.e. activities and resources of these organizations dedicated to developing their policy agendas (Halpin, 2015). This means that the 'interest group' concept does not cover the entirety of the policy process, as this literature is not focused on the role these organizations play in policy implementation and policy evaluation.

Having this in mind, this paper will utilize the term 'stakeholder organization' to refer to formal organizations seeking to influence the entirety of the policy process in a particular public sector on behalf of their members. In the context of education – that is the focus of this paper –

stakeholder organizations can be e.g. staff trade unions, professional associations, student and pupil organizations, associations of schools or higher education institutions, and employers' associations.

Literature review

Capacity for governance and policy

Governance capacity is a multi-faceted concept that concerns structural and procedural characteristics of governments and how these characteristics work in practice. It comprises four distinct dimensions: (1) capacity to coordinate, (2) capacity to analyse information and provide policy relevant advice, (3) capacity to regulate, and (4) capacity to deliver public services (Lodge & Wegrich, 2014b). Such understanding reflects linkages with consistency, impartiality and predictability of Weberian bureaucracy, quality of government considerations, as well as the various manners – including quasi-markets and collaborative networks – through which specific public goals can be achieved. As such, it is often equated with administrative capacity, i.e. *"set of skills and competences that are expected of public bureaucracies so that they can facilitate and contribute to problem-solving"* (Lodge & Wegrich, 2014a, p. 27). Given the increasing importance of governance beyond the state level (e.g. the EU), analysis of governance capacity has recently been extended to include supra-national, intergovernmental and transnational arrangements, as well as collaborations between public and private actors (see e.g. Part III of Lodge & Wegrich, 2014b).

Policy capacity can be considered a somewhat narrower concept, given that it concerns set of skills and resources required to perform policy functions, thus specifying the focus to one specific element of governance – policies. This includes both the capacity to formulate effective policies as well as the capacity to efficiently implement them. Similar to governance capacity, it has also been linked to quality of government / good governance discussions (Holmberg & Rothstein, 2012). Responding to the diversity of definitions and operationalizations, a more recent understanding of policy capacity sees it as comprising three categories of skills and resources – (1) analytical, (2) operational and (3) political – which can be analysed at individual, organizational and system level (Wu, Ramesh, et al., 2018). This understanding allows also a closer look into the capacity to acquire and use knowledge in the policy process (i.e. policy analytical capacity), thus linking this strand of research with analysis of the role of individuals and organizations in policy advisory systems (Howlett, 2018).

These two closely inter-related concepts – governance capacity and policy capacity – have been the focus of scholarly studies in relation to exceptional governance challenges, e.g. climate change, ageing, financial crises, environmental disasters, security threats (incl. terrorism), often under a more general label of 'wicked problems', as well as in relation to more day-to-day concerns related to policy successes and failures (see e.g. Lægreid & Rykkja, 2019; Lodge & Wegrich, 2014b; Wu, Howlett, & Ramesh, 2018). While there may be nuanced differences with regards to definitions and operationalizations, both concepts concern skills and competences of, primarily, state actors to steer the public sector and perform public functions. That said, the concept of policy capacity specifically points the attention to the various 'stages' of the policy process, from agenda-setting and policy formation to policy implementation and evaluation.

With that in mind, the next section will explore the state-of-the-art concerning stakeholder organizations as policy actors.

Stakeholder organizations as policy actors

In a democratic society, various stakeholders have an interest in how a certain public sector is performing. This includes users of public sectors services, workers, professions and organizations involved in their delivery. These stakeholder and their organizations, in particular in consensus-oriented trust-based public sectors, are involved in the policy process, both concerning agenda setting and policy formation, as well as implementation and evaluation (Jann & Wegrich, 2007).

As previously indicated, the role of stakeholder organizations in agenda-setting and policy formation has been predominantly the purview of interest group studies, which see these organizations as an increasingly important channel for articulation of public interest in modern democracies, in particular between elections (Richardson, 1995). The aforementioned exchange perspective on their role postulates that, on the demand side, policy-makers seek interest groups involvement because they can provide valuable policy resources, such as information, expertise and political support (Bouwen, 2004). On the supply side, interest groups are given the mandate by their members to represent them towards policy-makers at various levels of governance and lobby for their policy preferences (Beyers et al., 2008). The literature distinguishes between 'insider' and 'outsider' organizations (Dür & Mateo, 2016). Insiders are organizations that have been recognized by policy-makers to possess the relevant policy resources, while outsiders are still vying for that recognition. However, whether an organization will be recognized as an

insider or an outsider does not depend only on its capacity to supply the necessary policy resources. It also reflects the predominant mode of interest intermediation in a specific political system, reflecting two ideal types: pluralism (many stakeholder organizations) and neo-corporatism (few organizations).

Not all organizations have the capacity to provide policy goods necessary for insider status and lobbying. Interest groups literature has specifically identified professionalization of staff and availability of material resources as important aspects of organization's ability to provide the necessary information and expertise (Klüver, 2012). Such differences in resources can potentially lead to representational bias, in the sense that only resource rich organizations get to engage in agenda-setting and policy formation. However, another source of potential bias lies within the organizations themselves, namely which policy issues they choose to advocate for and how their positions on these issues are developed (Halpin, 2015), which in turn brings forward the issue of membership. Thus far, the interest groups literature has primarily focused on breadth of membership, highlighting that organizations that have an encompassing membership – e.g. associations of employers or umbrella organizations of trade unions – may have significant political clout because they *"speak for the many and not just a few"* (Beyers, 2008, p. 1201). From a more dynamic perspective, very few studies belonging to this strand of literature have focused on how various elements of policy capacity of stakeholder organizations (albeit not necessarily using these labels) develop over time, including the focus on the role of the state (Fraussen, 2013; Halpin, Daugbjerg, & Schvartzman, 2011). Related to this is the rather recent (attempt of) organizational turn, that stresses organizational forms and identities as being relevant for interest groups approach to and success in influencing agenda-setting and policy-formation (see e.g. Halpin, 2014; Halpin & Daugbjerg, 2015).

Overall, and in light of the focus of this paper, there are two challenges with this strand of literature. One, its analysis of capacity of stakeholder organizations to deliver the desired policy goods to policy-makers is fragmented and static, focusing on few organizational characteristics (membership, resources) often analysed in isolation with each other at one particular point in time. Two, as indicated earlier, this strand of literature analyses just one part of the policy process, not recognizing that many of these organizations also play a role in policy implementation and policy evaluation.

With regards to the role of stakeholder organizations in <u>policy implementation</u>, the actors this strand of literature recognizes (apart from the state), are various state level regulatory agencies, local level public entities and bureaucrats (Knill & Tosun, 2011b; Pollitt, Talbot, & Caulfield,

2004). This is in particular the case for top-down approaches to policy implementation, in which other actors – including stakeholders and their organizations – come to the fore primarily in the analysis of implementation problems, i.e. instances in which achieved policy outcomes differ from intended ones (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984; Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980). Bottom-up approaches to policy implementation have a more fluid take on the process, including abandoning the idea of implementation as a distinct and completely separate stage, moving away from the focus on intended vs. achieved outcomes, and recognizing that the interests of various actors also plays a role (Schneider & Ingram, 1997). However, even in this approach, the focus is primarily on street-level bureaucrats (i.e. state actors at the local level) and not so much on other actors who are targets of a policy and who might be, in various ways, in the position to affect policy outcomes. Private (non-state) actors are mentioned as possible suspects, but they do not seem to be the central focus of most of the implementation studies (Knill & Tosun, 2011b). Studies that seek to combine the top-down and bottom-up approach to analysing policy implementation (Lenschow & Knill, 2000; Pülzl & Treib, 2007) have given a bit more recognition to *"resources and actors present in the micro-implementation level"*, *"preferences of actors' groups"* and differences in their training (Knill & Tosun, 2011b, p. 157). In the analysis of policy implementation success, non-state actors are mentioned in relation to various ways governments attempt to positively or negatively incentivize them or persuade them to comply with policy (Anderson, 2010; Knill & Tosun, 2011b). The challenge here is that this essentially puts these actors in a passive position, focusing more on the capacity of governments and the characteristics of the incentives and persuasion attempts, and not on the characteristics of non-state actors themselves that may shape how they respond to incentives and persuasion and how their response affects policy implementation. Moreover, while policy ambiguity is in the focus in policy implementation studies as one of the factors determining policy implementation success (in particular when said success is assessed in relation to stated policy goals), this strand of literature does not recognize that some of the stakeholder groups are directly involved in implementation, e.g. academic staff. This puts them in the position to respond to policy ambiguity by interpreting vague policy instruments and cues both in ways that do go in line with the overall policy objectives, as well as in ways that go against them, but do reflect stakeholders' own policy preferences.

When it comes to policy evaluation, general policy analysis literature does recognize the political character of the process, both with regards to what kind of information about the success of policy is produced as well as with regards to how that information is used by various

actors (Knill & Tosun, 2011a; Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 2004). However, it is primarily the strategic use of evaluation by policy-makers, and not by stakeholder organizations, which is highlighted. Some authors use the label 'political evaluation' of public policy not for a process in which information about policy success is produces, but rather for an attempt by various political actors, including stakeholder organizations, to frame a certain policy in a positive or negative way (Howlett, Ramesh, & Perl, 2009, pp. 189-191). This understanding of 'political evaluation' relates back to the role of stakeholder organizations in agenda-setting and policy formation, given that the claim that a particular policy had good or bad results in the past can be used to put new issues on the agenda and develop new policies (or keep some issues away from policy focus). Similar to analysis of policy implementation, it is also important here to consider whether and in what way are stakeholder organizations involved in the process of evaluation and to what extent they are persuaded that the goal and the process of evaluation is in line with their own preferences. Finally, while this strand of literature recognizes that some stakeholder organizations do engage in policy evaluation themselves, in particular if they were the target group a certain policy (Knill & Tosun, 2011a), there is not much research that puts policy evaluation by stakeholder organization in the centre. This means we also know very little about why some stakeholder organizations engage in policy evaluation and others do not, and how their policy capacity affects their engagement.

Conceptualizing policy capacity of stakeholder organizations

Given the interest of this paper, the narrower focus on policy capacity discussed above, specifically the identification of analytical, political and operational skills and resources (Wu, Ramesh, et al., 2018) – seems suitable. Moreover, this strand of literature has recently recognized the potential and the necessity of analysing the capacity of non-state actors in policy processes (Wu, Ramesh, et al., 2018). Specifically, Daugbjerg et al. (2018) specify what these elements of policy capacity in the case of stakeholder organizations may be. Their specification is based on the idea that stakeholder organizations are in an exchange relationship with the state, i.e. they are expected to provide important policy goods or policy resources in exchange for access to decision-makers and opportunity to directly lobby them (for a demand-supply perspective on interest groups and lobbying, see e.g. Bouwen, 2004). These policy goods and resources include legitimacy, expert knowledge, assistance in implementation and, depending on the type of the organization, services and information to the citizens (in case of public

interest organizations dealing with broad issues such as the environment) or services, information and disciplining of membership (in case of sectoral organizations, such as trade unions).

This paper takes the Daugbjerg et al. (2018) conceptualization, adapt it to the case of stakeholder organizations and provide operationalizations of the different elements of policy capacity (see below). However, in order to explore how various elements of policy capacity may be developed and may influence the policy processes,

Antecedents and consequences of policy capacity of stakeholder organizations

In order to understand their contribution to policy, the theoretical framework combines three distinct but complementary theoretical perspectives.

Instead of a fragmented and incomplete analysis characterizing the current state-of-the art, this approach takes stakeholder organizations and the roles they play in policy as the point of departure and integrates several theoretical perspectives related to these roles. The foundation of the framework are organization studies, including the acknowledgement of the nested character of many stakeholder organizations, e.g. a national level student union has regional or local unions as its members. In this way, the approach simultaneously addresses the multi-level and the multi-actor aspects of contemporary governance arrangements (Chou, Jungblut, Ravinet, & Vukasovic, 2017; Piattoni, 2010) by acknowledging that stakeholder organizations are meta-organizations, i.e. organizations that have other organizations as members (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2008). The framework is extended with two complementary perspectives, which reflect different roles stakeholder organizations play in policy. One, the framework relies on political science / comparative politics literature, which sees stakeholder organizations as interest groups, thus recognizing the expectations both their members and the state have when it comes to their role in agenda setting and policy formation. This is complemented with insights from sociology of organizations and professions (March & Olsen, 1989; Muzio, Brock, & Suddaby, 2013), here applied as indication of recognition of the potential of stakeholder organizations to act as sites of (professional) socialization into shared norms and values, which may facilitate or impede policy implementation and evaluation.

Organizational perspective

First, the approach focuses on key organizational characteristics of stakeholder organizations. As other organizations, stakeholder organizations are established to pursue a set of goals. They maintain clear distinctions between those that are members and those that are not, and codify these distinctions in membership criteria, rights, benefits and duties (Aldrich & Ruef, 2006). Organizations structure activities of their members through decision-making bodies and procedures. Members bring resources, material (e.g. membership fees), human (e.g. staff) and symbolic (e.g. legitimacy through numbers). Related to this is the consideration of meta-organizational aspects of stakeholder organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2008), specifically how their nested organizational structure affects participation of members, effectiveness and legitimacy of decision-making bodies and procedures, and development of shared norms and beliefs. All these organizational characteristics are considered as potentially supporting or impeding the different policy roles of stakeholder organizations.

Given the different dimensions of policy capacity, the following expectations can be formulated: *(1) Stakeholder organizations with high proportion of members from the relevant population will have high political capacity. (2) Stakeholder organizations with high number of members and/or members capable of investing significant resources into the organization will have high analytical and operational capacity. (3) Stakeholder organizations with a nested internal structure will have high political capacity only if such nested structure is accompanied with democratic and transparent decision-making procedures.*

Interest group perspective

To highlight their role in agenda setting and policy formation, the approach relies on the well-established comparative politics literature that sees stakeholder organizations as interest groups. As indicated earlier, interest groups are formal organizations which (try to) influence decision-makers at various levels of governance, through participation in public consultations, direct lobbying and negotiations (e.g. concerning work conditions in the case of trade unions), as well mobilization of their members to exert pressure through media or protests (Beyers et al., 2008). Specifically concerning agenda-setting and policy formation stakeholder organizations are expected to supply important policy goods – information, expertise and political support (Daugbjerg et al., 2018), in exchange for access to decision-makers and, consequently, opportunity to exert influence. The comparative politics literature recognizes that organizations

with professionalized staff with significant expertise are more likely to have access and thus also influence (e.g. Klüver, 2012), but also warns that focusing resources primarily on exerting influence may come at a cost in the form of member alienation (Albareda, 2018). This tension between logic of influence and logic of membership (Schmitter & Streeck, 1999) suggests that stakeholder organizations may face trade-offs between different dimensions of policy capacity.

Given the nature of policy goods necessary for agenda-setting and policy formation, and that the locus of these processes is on the system level, the following expectations can be formulated: *(4) In relation to their role in agenda-setting and policy formation, stakeholder organizations are expected to focus on developing and strengthening the analytical and political dimensions of their policy capacity. (5) These dimensions of policy capacity are expected to be accumulated on the system (i.e. national) level. (6) Stakeholder organizations with higher analytical and political capacity are expected to have a stronger impact on agenda setting and policy formation.*

Socialization perspective

Concerning the role of stakeholder organizations in policy implementation and evaluation, the approach presented here extends organization studies and sociology of professions literature (March & Olsen, 1989; Muzio et al., 2013) and postulates that stakeholder organizations can also act as sites of (professional) socialization into shared norms and values. Socialization relies on persuasion and argumentation, which requires communication, which in turn requires existence of communication platforms and venues that can sustain such persuasion and argumentation. This is precisely what stakeholder organizations, through their statutory meetings, workshops, seminars, publications, online discussion platforms, projects, trainings etc. constitute for their members. While all stakeholder organizations provide such socialization opportunities, professional associations have an added value and task of maintaining professional identity, roles and standards of practice (Muzio et al., 2013). The socialization aspect of stakeholder organizations is of particular importance for policy implementation and evaluation. Implementation is likely to be smoother if those expected to implement specific decision on the grass-root level find such decisions appropriate and in line with their own norms and values (Cerych & Sabatier, 1986). In addition, norms and values promoted by the stakeholder organizations will also affect their positioning and positioning of their members

towards the criteria, process and outcomes of policy evaluation (Bovens, 't Hart, & Kuipers, 2006).

Given the nature of policy implementation and evaluation, and that the locus of policy implementation is primarily on the local level, these expectations can be formulated: *(7) In relation to their role in policy implementation and evaluation, stakeholder organizations are expected to focus on developing and strengthening the analytical and operational dimensions of their policy capacity. (8) These dimensions of policy capacity, and socialization processes they enable, are expected to be accumulated on the local level. (9) Stakeholder organizations with high analytical and operational capacity are expected to have a stronger impact on policy implementation and evaluation.*

The socialization perspective is also relevant for understanding the role of individuals – specifically employees – in developing/strengthening policy capacity of stakeholder organizations. Their educational qualifications as well as the length and nature of their experience in stakeholder organizations constitutes the essence of the analytical dimension of policy capacity of these organizations (see above). These individuals are not only socialized within their own organizations, but they also regularly communicate with their counterparts in other organizations given their joint involvement in policy processes, and specifically more general communication platforms, such as national policy commissions, joint projects and events. As such, they constitute a network of policy brokers which, in particular in situations of staff mobility between stakeholder organizations or low staff turnover, may facilitate cooperation, including formation of advocacy coalitions (Sabatier, 1988).

Thus, the following is expected: *(10) A stakeholder organization with lower staff turnover will have stronger analytical capacity. (11) Two or more stakeholder organizations with lower staff turnover or with staff mobility between the organizations will form advocacy coalitions more often than other stakeholder organizations.*

Concluding remarks

The main aim of the theoretical approach presented in this paper is to enable a systematic analysis of the capacity of stakeholder organizations to contribute to all aspects of policy development, from agenda-setting and policy formation, to policy implementation and

evaluation. The approach recognizes both the organizational characteristics of these actors as well as the various roles they are playing in the policy process.

The approach is also inherently comparative. It allows comparison between stakeholder organizations within one system, both those focusing on the same stakeholder type as well as across types of stakeholders. Moreover, it allows for analysis across levels of governance. This is particularly suitable for analysis of agenda-setting and policy formation in multi-level governance contexts, including federal states and the European Union. Analysis across levels of governance is necessary for understanding the role of stakeholder organizations in policy implementation, given the separation of decisions and most of the implementation activities at two or more governance levels. Finally, the approach presented provides the basis for comparison across systems, though for these purposes specificities of these systems, their governance approaches etc. need to be taken into account.

References

Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2008). *Meta-organizations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Albareda, A. (2018). Connecting Society and Policymakers? Conceptualizing and Measuring the Capacity of Civil Society Organizations to Act as Transmission Belts. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. doi:10.1007/s11266-018-00051-x

Aldrich, H. E., & Ruef, M. (2006). *Organizations evolving*. London: Sage.

Anderson, J. (2010). *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Baldwin, E. (2019). Exploring How Institutional Arrangements Shape Stakeholder Influence on Policy Decisions: A Comparative Analysis in the Energy Sector. *Public Administration Review, 79*(2), 246-255. doi:doi:10.1111/puar.12953

Benneworth, P., & Jongbloed, B. W. (2010). Who matters to universities? A stakeholder perspective on humanities, arts and social sciences valorisation. *Higher Education, 59*(5), 567-588. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9265-2

Beyers, J. (2008). Policy Issues, Organisational Format and the Political Strategies of Interest Organisations. *West European Politics, 31*(6), 1188-1211. doi:10.1080/01402380802372654

Beyers, J., & Arras, S. (2019). Who feeds information to regulators? Stakeholder diversity in European Union regulatory agency consultations. *Journal of Public Policy*, 1-26. doi:10.1017/S0143814X19000126

Beyers, J., Eising, R., & Maloney, W. (2008). Researching Interest Group Politics in Europe and Elsewhere: Much We Study, Little We Know? *West European Politics, 31*(6), 1103-1128. doi:10.1080/01402380802370443

Bouwen, P. (2004). Exchanging access goods for access: A comparative study of business lobbying in the European Union institutions. *European Journal of Political Research, 43*(3), 337-369. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2004.00157.x

Bovens, M., 't Hart, P., & Kuipers, S. (2006). The politics of policy evaluation. In M. Moran, M. Rein, & R. E. Goodin (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (pp. 319-335). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Braun, D. (2008). Organising the political coordination of knowledge and innovation policies. *Science and Public Policy, 35*(4), 227-239. doi:10.3152/030234208x287056

Brès, L., Mena, S., & Salles-Djelic, M.-L. (2019). Exploring the formal and informal roles of regulatory intermediaries in transnational multistakeholder regulation. *13*(2), 127-140. doi:10.1111/rego.12249

Bunea, A., & Ibenskas, R. (2017). Unveiling patterns of contestation over Better Regulation reforms in the European Union. *Public Administration, 95*(3), 589-604. doi:10.1111/padm.12335

Cerych, L., & Sabatier, P. A. (1986). *Great expectations and mixed performance: the implementation of higher education reforms in Europe*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Chou, M.-H., Jungblut, J., Ravinet, P., & Vukasovic, M. (2017). Higher education governance and policy: an introduction to multi-issue, multi-level and multi-actor dynamics. *Policy and Society, 36*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1080/14494035.2017.1287999

Crow, D. A., Albright, E. A., & Koebele, E. (2019). Evaluating Stakeholder Participation and Influence on State-Level Rulemaking. *Policy Studies Journal, 0*(0). doi:doi:10.1111/psj.12314

Daugbjerg, C., Fraussen, B., & Halpin, D. R. (2018). Interest Groups and Policy Capacity: Modes of Engagement, Policy Goods and Networks. In X. Wu, M. Howlett, & M. Ramesh (Eds.), *Policy Capacity and Governance: Assessing Governmental Competences and Capabilities in Theory and Practice* (pp. 243-261). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Dür, A., & Mateo, G. (2016). *Insiders versus outsiders : interest group politics in multilevel Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fraussen, B. (2013). The visible hand of the state: On the organizational development of interest groups. *Public Administration, 92*(2), 406-421. doi:10.1111/padm.12056

Halpin, D. R. (2014). *The Organization of Political Interest Groups: Designing Advocacy*. London: Routledge.

Halpin, D. R. (2015). Interest Group 'Policy Agendas': What are They? And How Might We Study Them? In A. J. Cigler, B. A. Loomis, & A. J. Nownes (Eds.), *Interest Group Politics*. London: SAGE.

Halpin, D. R., & Daugbjerg, C. (2015). Identity as Constraint and Resource in Interest Group Evolution: A Case of Radical Organizational Change. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations, 17*(1), 31-48. doi:10.1111/1467-856X.12016

Halpin, D. R., Daugbjerg, C., & Schvartzman, Y. (2011). Interest-group capacities and infant industry development: State-sponsored growth in organic farming. *International Political Science Review, 32*(2), 147-166. doi:10.1177/0192512110372435

Holmberg, S., & Rothstein, B. (2012). *Good Government : The Relevance of Political Science*. Cheltenham: Cheltenham, Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar Publishing, Incorporated.

Howlett, M. (2018). Policy Analytical Capacity: The Supply and Demand for Policy Analysis in Government. In X. Wu, M. Howlett, & M. Ramesh (Eds.), *Policy Capacity and Governance: Assessing Governmental Competences and Capabilities in Theory and Practice* (pp. 49-66). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying public policy : policy cycles & policy subsystems* (3rd ed. ed.). Don Mills, Ont: Oxford University Press.

Jann, W., & Wegrich, K. (2007). Theories of the policy cycle. In F. Fischer, G. Miller, & M. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods* (pp. 43-62). New York, NY: CRC press.

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education, 56*(3), 303-324. doi:10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2

Klüver, H. (2012). Informational Lobbying in the European Union: The Effect of Organisational Characteristics. *West European Politics, 35*(3), 491-510. doi:10.1080/01402382.2012.665737

Knill, C., & Tosun, J. (2011a). Evaluation. In C. Knill & J. Tosun (Eds.), *Public Policy: A New Introductoin* (pp. 174-198). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knill, C., & Tosun, J. (2011b). Implementation. In C. Knill & J. Tosun (Eds.), *Public Policy: A new introduction* (pp. 148-173). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lægreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (Eds.). (2019). *Societal Security and Crisis Management: Governance Capacity and Legitimacy*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Lenschow, A., & Knill, C. (2000). *Implementing EU environmental policy : new directions and old problems*. New York: Manchester University Press.

Lodge, M., & Wegrich, K. (2014a). Administrative Capacities. In H. S. o. Governance (Ed.), *The Governance Report 2014* (pp. 27-48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lodge, M., & Wegrich, K. (2014b). *The Problem-solving Capacity of the Modern State: Governance Challenges and Administrative Capacities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: the organizational basis of politics*. New York: Free Press.

Mewhirter, J., Coleman, E. A., & Berardo, R. (2017). Participation and Political Influence in Complex Governance Systems. *Policy Studies Journal*, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/psj.12227

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886. doi:10.5465/amr.1997.9711022105

Moe, T. M., & Wiborg, S. (2016). *The comparative politics of education: teachers unions and education systems around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muzio, D., Brock, D. M., & Suddaby, R. (2013). Professions and Institutional Change: Towards an Institutionalist Sociology of the Professions. *50*(5), 699-721. doi:10.1111/joms.12030

Peters, B. G. (2015). State failure, governance failure and policy failure: Exploring the linkages. *Public Policy and Administration, 30*(3-4), 261-276. doi:10.1177/0952076715581540

Piattoni, S. (2010). *The theory of multi-level governance: conceptual, empirical, and normative challenges*. Oxford: OUP.

Pollitt, C., Talbot, C., & Caulfield, J. (2004). *Agencies : how governments do things through semi-autonomous organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: how great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland, or, Why it's amazing that federal programs work at all : this being a saga of the economic development administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes*. Berkeley, Calif.: California University Press.

Pülzl, H., & Treib, O. (2007). Policy Implementation. In F. Fischer, G. Miller, & M. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods* (pp. 89-108). Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (2004). *Evaluation : a systematic approach* (7th ed. ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Sabatier, P. A. (1988). An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Sciences, 21*(2/3), 129-168.

Sabatier, P. A., & Mazmanian, D. (1980). THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC POLICY: A FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS*. *Policy Studies Journal, 8*(4), 538-560. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.1980.tb01266.x

Scharpf, F. W. (1999). *Governing in Europe: effective and democratic?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, V. A. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. *Political Studies, 61*(1), 2-22. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00962.x

Schmitter, P. C., & Streeck, W. (1999). The Organization of Business Interests. Studying the Associative Action of Business in Advanced Industrial Societies. *MPIfG discussion paper, 99*(1).

Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H. M. (1997). *Policy design for democracy*. Lawrence, Kan: Univ. Press of Kansas.

Torfing, J. (2019). Collaborative innovation in the public sector: the argument. *Public Management Review, 21*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1080/14719037.2018.1430248

Vukasovic, M. (2018). Stakeholder organizations and multi-level governance of higher education. In B. Cantwell, H. Coates, & R. King (Eds.), *Handbook on the Politics of Higher Education* (pp. 413-430). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Wood, D. J., Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Bryan, L. M. (2018). Stakeholder Identification and Salience After 20 Years: Progress, Problems, and Prospects. *Business & Society, 0*(0), 0007650318816522. doi:10.1177/0007650318816522

Wu, X., Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Policy Capacity and Governance: Assessing Governmental Competences and Capabilities in Theory and Practice*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Howlett, M. (2018). Policy Capacity: Conceptual Framework and Essential Components. In X. Wu, M. Howlett, & M. Ramesh (Eds.), *Policy Capacity and Governance: Assessing Governmental Competences and Capabilities in Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-25). Cham: Springer International Publishing.