T10P01 / Power, Communication and Legitimacy: Challenges, Choices, and Opportunities in Contemporary Policy-Making

Topic : T10 / Methodologies

Chair : Loo-See Beh (IMU University)

Second Chair : Volker Schneider (University of Konstanz)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

This stream calls for papers that offer theoretical and empirical analyses of functioning and outcomes of state capacity which may be explained in terms of distinct institutional frameworks, historical trajectories and power relations. What are the implications for legitimacy when public institutions make policies and at times, (un)able to control and monitor those individuals/public servants/leaders who act in the name of the state? What kind of leaders or state is legitimate to ensure appropriate capacity and generate more trust in the pursuit of public interests both internally and externally? These questions focus on actors (who is doing what), institutions (how strategies and tactics of government use policies/policymaking) and the ecology of power relations and forces involving laws, institutions and entities coming together in a policy domain to better shape the decay and eroding ability of governments to govern with regards to state capacity and legitimacy.

Analysis of the contribution of various actors in public policy process can be strengthened by employing various analytical models including power relations, policy network relations, policy learning and persuasive communication. Existing literature on these analytical models fall short of using empirical data from various countries to demonstrate the utility of the models. It is important to demonstrate the utility of these models by using empirical data based on specific countries in developing countries majority of which experience serious challenges with their public policy process. The overall objective of this panel is therefore to increase our knowledge and skills in the use of these models. Specific objectives include to enable policy analysts and researchers to deepen their understanding of the influence of power relations in public policy process; different types and influence of networks in public policy process; the critical role of policy learning and its typologies in public policy process; and the use of language, discourse, argument and inter-communicative approach in public policy process. The focus of each model is briefly explained below.

Power relations involve power-holders, actual employment or threat to use force and resistance all played out in different spaces and levels. Power relations are dynamic, to understand them one needs to do a power analysis. Power analysis is important for understanding the context in which public policy process happens. A more nuanced and relational power analysis can provide insights to the contexts in which public policy decision and delivery process happens.

Policy networks involve a pattern of formal and informal contacts and relationships which shape agenda and decision-making as opposed to the interplay within and between the formal policy-making organisations and institutions. A policy network approach conceptualizes policy-making as the result of interactions between policy-actors, and assumes that the structure of these interactions explains policy outcomes. A large number of structural characteristics are taken into account in the analysis and explanation of policy networks, but the most prominent one is the notion of centrality

Policy Learning involves relatively enduring alterations of thought or behaviour intentions that result from experience and which are concerned with the attainment or revision of the precepts of the belief system of individuals or collectives. In a general way, policy learning refers to a structured, conscious change in thinking about a specific policy issue. The learning may consist of a rethink but most often will be something with an existing frame such as a better understanding of the effects of certain policy instrument

Persuasive communication involves the act of making someone agree to do or believe that something is of benefit by giving them good reasons for doing it or believing it. It involves the use of argumentation and effective communication to move a policy maker into action. Persuasiveness of the policy analyst is part of the dialectic of the policy process.

State capacity is multidimensional. We might define it as the degree to which a state is able to conduct the public affairs of a given polity, or even a complex of complementary state capacities. These include (but are not limited to) extractive capacity (the state's ability to secure and mobilize resources sufficient to carrying out its purposes), coercive capacity (the state's ability to control behavior through the threat or use of legal

sanctions or force), administrative capacity, defensive capacity, and constitutive capacity (the state's ability to deploy symbols and narratives to facilitate national consciousness, public consensus, and the like).

Institutional theory would argue that administrative reform creates new institutional structure which ought to perpetuate policy changes and legitimacy in state capacity. The social systems of production (Hollingsworth, Boyer) and historical institutionalism (Crouch, Streeck) approaches emphasize broad historical trajectories, social norms and idiosyncratic power relations while regulation theory (Boyer) focus on a broad set of institutions.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The third International Conference on Public Policy organised by the International Public Policy Association will be held in Singapore at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, from 28th-30th June 2017. The organisers and panel chair are pleased to invite you to submit papers that reflect the best thinking in the discipline informed by theory, research and practical application. The panel on Application of power relations, policy networks, policy learning and persuasive communication models in public policy analysis welcomes papers that highlight areas where public policy analytical models have made distinctive methodological contributions.

We invite interested researchers and policy analysts to present papers that have used any of the following analytical models. The papers should be empirical studies that have employed one or two of the following models or any other related model in the analysis.

- Power relations analytical model: We welcome papers that demonstrate power relations involving power-holders, actual employment or threat to use force and resistance all played out in different spaces and levels.
- Policy networks analytical model: We welcome papers that aim to explain the role of formal and informal contacts and relationships which shape agenda and decision-making as opposed to the interplay within and between the formal policy-making organisations and institutions.
- Policy learning analytical model: We invite papers that examine variations in policy learning in diverse contexts and how these variations impact public policy process.
- Persuasive communication analytical model: We welcome papers that aim to explain the role of persuasive communication and argumentation in public policy process.

This stream calls for papers that offer theoretical and empirical analyses of state capacity which may be explained in terms of distinct institutional frameworks, historical trajectories of policymaking and power relations. What are the implications for legitimacy when public institutions make policies and at times, (un)able to control and monitor those individuals/public servants/leaders who act in the name of the state? What kind of leaders/state is legitimate to ensure appropriate capacity and generate more trust in the pursuit of public interests both internally and externally? These questions focus on actors (who is doing what), institutions (how strategies and tactics of government-use in policymaking) and the ecology of power relations and forces involving laws, and institutions coming together in a policy domain to better shape the ability of governments to govern with regards to state capacity and legitimacy.

State capacity is multidimensional. Policymakers use various policy interventions to tune the landscape in dealing with complex policy challenges. Institutional theory would argue that administrative reform creates new institutional structure which ought to perpetuate policy changes and legitimacy in state capacity. The key question is whether the state's capacity is at a juncture of legitimacy resulting in a more complex administrative reform driven by a more overarching ideological reorientation of government which may or may not be effective. Is there institutional quality? To what extent policies contribute to institutional quality and its impact on government effectiveness? What are the challenges, the available choices and opportunities in the contemporary developments with respect to the effectiveness of public policies on the state of accountability, service delivery, and broadly on state capacity?

T10P01 / Power, Communication and Legitimacy: Challenges, Choices, and Opportunities in Contemporary Policy-Making

Chair : Loo-See Beh (IMU University)
Second Chair : Volker Schneider (University of Konstanz)

Session 1

Thursday, June 29th 10:30 to 12:30 (Block B 5 - 3)

Policy Networks as Power Structures

Volker Schneider (University of Konstanz)

State Capacity and Legitimacy: Challenges in Policy-making and Contemporary Developments in Malaysia

Loo-See Beh (IMU University)

Air-Pollution and the Korean Public: Understanding the Effects of Responsibility-Attribution and Emphasis Frames

Matthew Shapiro (Illinois Institute of Technology)

Building State Capacity and Executive Governance: the case of Center of Government framework

Pedro Cavalcante (Brazilian Institute of Education, Development and Research (IDP))
Karam Ricardo Antônio de Souza (Instituto Brasileiro de Museus/BRASIL)

State capacities and public policy implementation: a proposal for an integrated framework of analysis

Marizaura Camões (National School of Public Administration)
Ciro Fernandes (National School of Public Administration)
Natalia Koga (Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA) and ENAP)

Judicialization of Armed Forces Special Powers Act, 1958 in Northeast India: Policy Approaches and way forward

BHABANI SONOWAL (INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR, INDIA)