Robert Schuman Centre

The Role of Cognitive
and Normative Frames
in Policy-Making

YVES SUREL

RSC No. 98/45

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

European University Institute

3 0001 0032 8972 7

EUI Working Paper RSC No. 98/45

**Surel: *The Role of Cognitive and Normative Frames
in Policy-Making***

WP
321.0209
4 EUR

The Robert Schuman Centre was set up by the High Council of the EUI in 1993 to carry out disciplinary and interdisciplinary research in the areas of European integration and public policy in Europe. While developing its own research projects, the Centre works in close relation with the four departments of the Institute and supports the specialized working groups organized by the researchers.

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE

ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE

**The Role of Cognitive and Normative Frames
in Policy-Making**

YVES SUREL

RSC, 1996-98

EUI Working Paper RSC No. 98/45

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)

All rights reserved.
No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form
without permission of the author.

© 1998 Yves Surel
Printed in Italy in November 1998
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I – 50016 San Domenico (FI)
Italy

INTRODUCTION¹

There has been an increasingly important shift in the analysis of public policy in recent years, with the development of an approach which emphasises the influence of ideas, general precepts and representations, over and above social evolution and state action. This approach is based on the belief that cognitive and normative elements play an important role in how actors understand and explain the world, and has stimulated a variety of works from various approaches. However, what these have in common, be it more or less explicit, is the goal of establishing the importance of the dynamics of the social construction of reality in the shaping of historically-specific and socially legitimate frames and practices (Berger and Luckmann 1966).

Such a presupposition has long fed research in social psychology inspired by the cognitive sciences. Those who study individual behaviour seek to bring to the fore the decisive role of “mental maps” understood as a collection of normative and cognitive elements which function as heuristic devices for individuals confronted with social complexity. The processes of coding and decoding, socially constructed and differentially incorporated by individuals, allows us to comprehend social ‘reality’ and at the same time determine the nature and forms of social behaviour. Symbolic interactionism, as defined by Erving Goffman, is particularly representative of this approach, oriented to the identification of “models” or “frames of experience” which give rise to specific modes of the presentation of the self, for example (Goffman 1974).

This questioning, which is more or less present in most sociological approaches, does not nevertheless give rise to the same theoretical perspectives. Indeed, the different research traditions can be distinguished according to the differential value they place on the autonomy of actors in relation to social determinants, in the usage and modification of these “frames”, in other words, the structure/agency dialectic. Thus, in the work of Bourdieu, the notion of habitus seeks to describe the internalised models of social agents. As such, habitus constitutes, “a system of dispositions acquired by implicit or explicit learning which functions as a system of generative schemes, generates strategies which can be objectively consistent with the objective interests of their authors without having been expressly designed to that end” (Bourdieu 1993, 76). This incorporation, as illustrated notably by mechanisms of reproduction (Bourdieu

¹ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Yves Mény, Patrick Le Galès, Pierre Muller, Bruno Palier and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on earlier versions of this article. I would like to address special thanks to Dawn Lyon for what was much more than a translation.

and Passeron 1970), remains fundamentally determined by the conditions of social structures and downplays the consciousness of agents. On the other hand, Touraine highlights the influence of agents on structures, especially on cognitive and normative models which underlie their practices. Touraine makes this position very clear in *Production de la Société* where he comes to define the notion of historicity in the following way : “Historicity is the action of a society on itself, but society itself is not an actor ; it has neither values nor power. It is only actors, and social classes, who can have values and norms, and who are able to act in the ‘field of historicity’ (*champ de l'historicité*)” (Touraine 1993, 67).

Such positions, as well as their counter-positions, have also been applied at the macro-social level, to analyse the role of values and more generally, “ideological” factors in the determination of the practices of social groups, organizations, and the State itself. The considerable contribution of anthropology here has emphasised the role of cognitive and normative processes in social exchanges which are not solely inter-individual. In an article written some time ago now, Clifford Geertz revived the concept of “ideologies” as cultural systems, defining “maps of problematic social reality and matrices for the creation of collective conscience” (Geertz 1964, 64). Transcending the traditional divide in debates about ideology, where it is sometimes considered to be the instrumental expression of distinct social interests, at others a way of resolving more or less rational social tensions, Geertz also considered that such culturally determined systems have a double function; both to offer a sense of identity, accompanied by certain ways of making sense of the world, to groups and social communities, and to establish a series of legitimate practices.

This perspective has proven fruitful for research, in particular in the study of forms of State action. Ahead of his time, Murray Edelman (1976) was thus able to establish the importance of symbolic and rhetorical elements in policy development and in politics more generally. Other authors, notably Giandomenico Majone (1989), are equally interested in the intrinsic dynamics of argumentation and the symbolic exchanges around State practices. Several closely related works have come to focus on the role of cognitive learning dynamics in establishing the scope and development of the mechanisms of public policy-making (Heclo 1974; Wildavsky 1979; Rose 1990, 1991). Within public policy analysis, they contribute to the development of a research perspective alongside those which had previously prevailed, that is approaches based on a rational conception of interests as an independent variable, indeed a rational and scientific vision of public policy analysis, especially marked in the first policy evaluation studies.

This new research orientation, emphasising the importance of cognitive and/or normative elements, has itself been the object of attempts at modelling,

with a view to systematising and conceptually constructing the role of these logics of the social construction of knowledge and meaning in State action. Amongst numerous works, three approaches can be identified, informed by a recognition of the importance of values, ideas and representations in the study of public policy. Developed separately in the course of the 1980s, albeit informed by quite different perspectives, these conceptual models are primarily based on notions of paradigm (Hall 1993), of *advocacy coalition* (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993, 1998), or on the notion of the *référentiel*, as defined by Bruno Jobert and Pierre Muller (Jobert and Muller 1987; Faure et al. 1995). According to Peter Hall, recourse to such conceptualisations is especially well-suited to the analysis of political phenomena, and in particular to public policy insofar as “politicians, officials, the spokesmen for social interests, and policy experts all operate within the terms of political discourse that are current in the nation at a given time, and the terms of political discourse generally have a specific configuration that lends representative legitimacy to some social interests more than others, delineates the accepted boundaries of state action, associates contemporary political developments with particular interpretations of national history, and defines the context in which many issues will be understood” (Hall 1993, 289).

In spite of what are at times important differences, these conceptualisations all share a macro-level questioning which aims to shed light on the influence of global social norms on social behaviour and public policy, and to integrate into the analysis at times previously neglected normative variables (cf in particular the voluminous literature which focuses exclusively on cognition and expertise, Radaelli 1995). Drawing on micro-sociology, such conceptualisations establish the existence and the relevance, as objects of research, of global “mental maps” which fuel collective mechanisms of the production of knowledge and identity, and define orientations for action.

Cognitive and normative frames, which as a general expression brings together paradigms (Hall), belief systems (Sabatier) and *référentiels* (Jobert and Muller), are also intended to refer to coherent systems of normative and cognitive elements which define, in a given field, “world views”, mechanisms of identity formation, principles of action, as well as methodological prescriptions and practices for actors subscribing to the same frame. Generally speaking, these frames constitute conceptual instruments, available for the analysis of changes in public policy and for the explanation of developments between public and private actors which come into play in a given field.

The main purpose of this article is therefore to offer a critical review of these different models, by isolating their internal characteristics, and to see what type of

research orientation they give rise to, explicitly or implicitly, for the analysis of public policy.

ELEMENTS OF COGNITIVE AND NORMATIVE FRAMES

The three notions discussed below include very similar elements, albeit grouped differently. Within each grouping we can make an analytical distinction between three or four elements which may be located on a hierarchical scale (table no. 1) established with reference to the original definition of the notion of paradigm (Kuhn 1970; Chalmers 1987; Surel 1995). These different elements which combine to produce a coherent paradigmatic frame, include: (a) metaphysical principles, (b) specific principles, (c) forms of action, and (d) instruments.

Table no. 1: Elements of cognitive and normative frames

	Paradigm	Advocacy Coalition Framework	Référentiel
Metaphysical principles	Policy paradigm	Deep core	Values Images
Specific principles		Policy core	Norms
Forms of action	Choice of instruments		Algorithms
Instruments	Specifications of instruments	Secondary aspects	

(a) Metaphysical principles

The different models evoked here are first built on the belief that values and metaphysical principles exist, which define what is sometimes called a “world view”. We are talking here about abstract precepts circumscribing what is possible in a given society, identifying and justifying the existence of differences between individuals and/or groups, and locating various social processes on a hierarchical scale. For Sabatier, for example, the *deep core* includes “basic ontological and normative beliefs, such as the relative valuation of individual freedom versus social equity, which operates across virtually all policy domains” (Sabatier 1998, 103). In this model, there is a grid of principles structured by contradictory pairs, where the unequal valuing of each confers the particularity of the *deep core*, characteristic of a period or a people. This first grouping of elements can therefore be located in the normative stratum where we also find

elements which condense values specific to a given frame, in the form of representations, beliefs etc. In a symbolic way, the notion of the “images” used by Pierre Muller is defined as “noteworthy bearers of values, norms and even algorithms. They make sense to us immediately without a lengthy explanation” (Muller 1995, 159).

In his study of the macro-economic policies pursued in Great Britain in the 1970s and 1980s, Peter Hall identifies a shift from Keynesian-inspired principles to neo-liberal or monetarist ones. Underlying each of these models was a different world view. In the neo-liberal model, the rational and responsible individual was placed to the fore, the model thereby allying itself to a simplistic form of social Darwinism (“the beneficial effect of the market will ensure that the best come out on top, who will thus enhance the prosperity of all”). On the other hand, the Keynesian paradigm recognised the existence of collective duty to cure the ills of modern society, starting from a vision of economic processes which challenge the necessary and beneficial nature of the free hand of the market.

(b) Specific principles

In second place, these cognitive frames comprise specific principles, which in various ways follow from the most general and abstract principles. Drawing on Kuhn, this second layer includes elements, notably hypothetical-deductive statements, which allow the operationalisation of values in one domain and/or particular policy and/or subsystem of public policy, in the sense that Sabatier intends. That is, a group of actors “from a variety of public and private organizations who are actively concerned with a policy problem or issue, such as agriculture, and who regularly seek to influence public policy in that domain” (Sabatier 1998, 99).

It is undoubtedly at this level that the differences between the models are the greatest. Whilst the work of Peter Hall implicitly rests on a hierarchy of degrees of abstraction (even if the normative and cognitive elements are both covered by the general notion of policy paradigm) Sabatier argues that the principles which allow us to make distinctions are very closely connected to differences in diffusion and social embeddedness. For Sabatier, there is a difference between the *deep core* and the *policy core* which is not only linked to their position in the hierarchy (the deepest and most general beliefs appearing in the *deep core*) but also concerns their scope: the *deep core* affects the whole of society (or at least a sizeable community) whereas the *policy core* refers only to a subsystem of public policy. Lastly, the notion of the *référentiel*, perhaps because it is the least clearly defined, tends to encompass both dimensions. For Jobert and Muller, *référentiels* effectively constitute cognitive and normative frames which are found, in different

forms, as much at the global as at the sectoral level. Whilst the global *référentiel* brings together the most general values characteristic of a given society, sectoral *référentiels* are a kind of application of these general prescriptions in a limited social arena, contributing to the definition of “an image of the sector, the discipline or the profession” (Muller 1994, 48). Pierre Muller (1984) was thus able to show how in France, regarding the 1965 law on the modernisation of the agricultural sector, what was at stake was the need to manage the adaptation of the agricultural sector to the “*référentiel modernisateur*” which dominated the context and form of public action at that time.

To put it more generally, taking the original conceptualisation of Kuhn, we have, above all, a cognitive component which defines legitimate strategies with respect to objectives more or less explicitly prescribed by general principles. Peter Hall thus shows that the differences between Keynesian and monetarist paradigms hinge on distinct macro-economic policy objectives (the fight against unemployment in the first case, against inflation in the second).

(c) Forms of action

The above-mentioned grouping of cognitive and normative elements is linked to practical considerations of the most appropriate methods and means to achieve the defined values and objectives. Again, by analogy with Kuhn's work, for scientific methods to be inextricably linked to metaphysical principles and hypothetical-deductive models specific to a particular paradigm, it is necessary to identify forms of action appropriate for the trajectories sought, with respect to the values which characterise a frame. In other words, cognitive and normative frames not only construct “mental maps” but also determine practices and behaviours. In the case of the State, they delimit the choice of instruments to implement a particular strategy.

Peter Hall, using the same example as before of macro-economic policy, shows that the techniques employed vary considerably according to the paradigm adopted. The mechanisms used to boost consumption through an expansive budgetary policy characteristic of Keynesian approaches, contrast, for example, with the monetarist's emphasis on control of the money supply and the more systematic use of monetary policy instruments. The mobilisation of instruments is therefore by no means a neutral decision; rather it matches certain normative and practical imperatives laid out by the previous elements.

(d) Instruments

Finally, the last level is concerned with the specification of instruments which is shaped by the whole of the frame, to ensure their congruence with the other elements. In Paul Sabatier's analysis of the role of secondary aspects within belief systems characteristic of an "advocacy coalition", he includes for example minor decisions which may, within a particular program, be concerned with budgetary allocations, administrative regulations and so on. The cognitive and normative frame therefore delimits the scope of the necessary and potential instruments and the relative importance of each of them (legislative or regulatory mechanisms, interest rate level etc.).

Overall, it is the combination of these elements, which gives rise to particular mental maps. The definition of a "societal paradigm" offered by Jane Jenson sums up well what underpins the specificity of these cognitive and normative frames, that is to say, "a shared set of interconnected premises which make sense of many social relations. Every paradigm contains a view of human nature, a definition of basic and proper forms of social relations among equals and among those in relationships of hierarchy, and specification of relations among institutions as well as a stipulation of the role of such institutions. Thus, a societal paradigm is a meaning system as well as a set of practices" (Jenson 1989, 239). Beyond their differences, these distinct conceptualisations all in fact posit the existence of an ensemble of general principles and values defining the relations and identities of actors, in particular through forms of thought which delimit, hierarchically rank and legitimate social distinctions, all the while setting priorities for action in a given community. In addition, the consequences of these different cognitive and normative societal frames are to legitimate some groups rather than others, mark out the terrain for public action, as well as to define the possibilities for change in a particular subsystem. They thereby determine as much the world views themselves as the practices that follow from them.

These different components emerge from one of the fundamental questions of sociology, commonly underpinning extremely diverse research, which is that of the articulation between thought and action. We could go as far as to say that in each of the models referred to here, the "upper" levels lay out the normative and cognitive context in which the actions and practices of actors subscribing to the same frame fit. The heuristic interest of distinguishing these different components is not insignificant insofar as identifying them allows us to analytically deconstruct the processes through which representations, beliefs, practices and so on, are produced and legitimated, notably in the form of particular public policies in the case of the State.

Beyond general questions which will be raised later on, we can already point out that such models raise different problems linked to the different allocation of the elements making up a cognitive and normative frame. Thus, the articulation between the different layers is at times ambiguous, at others, deterministic. Far from always clarifying the relations between metaphysical principles, forms of action and practical elements, in fact these models most often posit an internal coherence and a hierarchical ordering which enhance the normative elements. In addition, the models offer few indications of the possible modifications to the frame which could result from anomalies in the lower layers. Put another way, is it the most abstract part which determines the "lower" elements, or are there modifications and tensions at the level of methods and instruments which justify a normative shift? Furthermore, the links between these cognitive and normative variables and the institutional context are rarely made explicit, the problem made all the worse by the semantic imprecision in the terms at times introduced by the various tendencies of neo-institutionalism (ideas forming an explanatory variable of institutions in one case are themselves institutions in others, cf. Hall and Taylor 1996). Such problems appear especially when the dynamics (not to mention the functions) bound up with these cognitive and normative frames, as well as the conditions and forms of their evolution, are explored.

THE FUNDAMENTAL DYNAMICS OF COGNITIVE FRAMES

Certain authors (cf. notably Mériaux 1995, regarding the *référentiel*) have underlined the more or less explicit functionalist perspective present in these different approaches. Beyond the particular inspirations and origins of each model, it is in fact possible to see that cognitive frames all sustain several fundamental processes which act as the social functions of integration in a given community. In setting up a view of the world and determining legitimate practices, they seem in particular to be shaped by the production of identity mechanisms and the distribution of power (1), as well as by their capacity to manage social tensions (2).

(1) The production of identity and the allocation of power

As in the cultural conception of ideology put forward by Geertz, one of the principal "functions" of a cognitive and normative frame shared by a certain number of actors, is effectively to develop a "collective consciousness" in them, in other words, a subjective sense of belonging, producing a specific identity. Cognitive and normative frames allow actors to make sense of their worlds, and to locate themselves and develop in a given community, by defining the field for exchange, by allowing meaning to be conferred on social dynamics, and by

determining the possibilities for action. They thereby contribute to the construction of individuals or groups as social actors in a particular field.

The management of the connection between values, representations, global norms etc and their “counterparts” at the level of the subsystem always underlies a paradigm or a *référentiel* (the global/sectoral relationship, in Jobert and Muller’s terms), this articulation resulting in identity production. The existence of a cognitive and normative frame is therefore both a source of boundaries, which constitute a group and/or an organisation and/or a subsystem in itself, and a source of forms of articulation and the overlapping of these boundaries, allowing the adherents of a particular paradigm or *référentiel* to view themselves in relation to a wider whole. The configuration of the medical profession is a good example of this, in the way it has established the norms and principles of its constitution which in turn define the legitimate boundaries of the profession itself, as well as the nature of its relations with other actors; patients, the State, social security agencies (Hassenteufel 1997).

Similarly, cognitive and normative frames are fundamentally constituted and modified by the interplay of actors. Far from being simple “revelations”, paradigms are, on the contrary, the product as well as the determinant, of exchanges between individuals, groups and the State in a given society. From this point of view, Sabatier, as well as Jobert and Muller, underline the privileged role of certain actors in public policy-making, both in producing and diffusing cognitive and normative frames. As such, the notion of the *policy broker* in Sabatier’s work refers to a category of actors characterised by their capacity to make the link between one subsystem and another, and to facilitate the integration of subsystems of public policy in the global public sphere. For Jobert and Muller, these mediators, genuine organic intellectuals in the Gramscian sense, “hold a strategic decision-making position insofar as they construct the intellectual context in which negotiations and conflicts take place, and alliances are created, which lead to the taking of decisions” (Muller 1994, 50).

Beyond a concern with identity, cognitive and normative frames also shape power relations. As Muller (1995) reminds us, such an approach requires us to take everything into consideration at once, the production of meaning and the structuring of power relations. In these different models of analysis, cognitive frames confer legitimacy and “power” in the Weberian sense (“the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which the probability rests”, Weber 1978, 53) on actors who initiate and/or support and/or identify with them. In the case of the agricultural reforms in France in the 1960s, the subsequent influence of the young farmers can be understood as depending, at

least in part, on their capacity to produce representations and principles of action which fit well with the modernising *référentiel* of the time, which then allowed them to take over the leadership of their professional organisation (Muller 1984).

What the modification of such a paradigm or global *référentiel* leads to is a decentring of sites of power, more than the substitution of one elite for another (Hall 1993). As a paradigm shift occurs, it is the nature and stability of social exchanges which are transformed through the reallocation of power. In the case of the macro-economic policies analysed by Hall, the shift to a monetarist paradigm, whilst being based on a change in the political elite with the return of the Conservatives to power under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher, above all brought about a transformation of the relationships between the Treasury and other government departments (in a particularly long-lasting and significant way for the conduct of policy-making). In a similar way, we can identify groups whose intrinsic capacities, in terms of their positioning, resources etc., can be more easily converted to new paradigms with the implicit idea of retaining power. This type of strategic shift is evident in the evolution of the corps of the *Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées*, a segment of the French administrative elite. Its current development is clearly fuelled, at least in part, by an almost continuous effort to accommodate itself to the new legitimate principles guiding the action of the State and its relationships to other social actors (Thoening 1973). Similar dynamics have been seen to shape the development of the *Conseil Constitutionnel* in France over the last years, where legal decisions have mirrored patterns of cognitive and normative global change, affecting the whole of the political and institutional sphere (Stone 1992).

For these different reasons, the analysis of cognitive and normative variables at times constitutes a conceptual grid for the identification of elites, characteristic of a particular social system or subsystem. Such an approach is at the heart of Paul Sabatier's model of *advocacy coalition* where the analysis of belief systems goes hand in hand with that of the power relations and elites of a given subsystem (Sabatier and Zafonte 1997).

Still, such approaches leave to one side or marginalize other basic variables which focus primarily on the interests of actors, partially because of the conditions under which such forms of understanding public policy came into being. As Radaelli (1995) reminds us, the placing to the fore of cognitive and normative variables dates primarily from the work of Lindblom which, since the 1960s, has tended to question traditional approaches focused on the nature of interests and power relations in the shaping of decision-making and public policy. On the other hand, several studies more or less directly inspired by Lindblom's works have emphasised the importance of ideas and learning mechanisms. Hecla

has argued since 1974 that “politics finds its sources not only in power but also in uncertainty - men collectively wondering what to do” which explains that “policy-making is a form of collective puzzlement on society’s behalf... Much political interaction has constituted a process of social learning expressed through policy” (Heclo 1974, 305-6). Consequently, even if the logics of power relations are present in most of these works, they are subordinate to the focus on the identification of actors sharing the same cognitive and normative frame.

The relationship between interests and cognitive and normative variables has recently been made clearer in a response by Paul Sabatier to certain critiques of his *advocacy coalition framework*. More or less “summoned” to locate himself in relation to supporters of rational choice models, a dominant trend of contemporary political science in the United States, Sabatier clarified that from his point of view, actors are only rational at the instrumental level, maximising exclusively at this “lower” level the resources available to them, according to defined objectives. Yet the determination of these objectives is fundamentally linked to cognitive and normative frames specific to a given subsystem. Sabatier therefore considers that “actors always perceive the world through a lens consisting of their preexisting beliefs” (Sabatier 1998, 109).

If we accept this position on the relationship between values and interests (which many do not), this last variable can serve to clarify certain important processes. How can the structure of interests, for example, influence the production of cognitive and normative frames? Is there not an asymmetry in resources and positions which explains why a particular category of actors succeeds in playing the role of mediator or *policy broker*? Furthermore, what is the degree of internal homogeneity of a subsystem identified by the sharing of the same cognitive and normative frame? What are the internal and external conflicts of a subsystem? Where do they come from? How can they be resolved? Lastly, how can we explain that the same global belief system can give rise to a multiplicity of forms, as we shall see later on?

(2) The management of tension and conflict

To answer these different questions we need to explore the second basic dynamic isolated above to describe the “functioning” of cognitive and normative frames. This is how a frame is able to manage social tensions and to contain conflict through the double process of decoding and recoding. The coherence of cognitive and normative factors in the same frame is successively characterised by the setting up of a causal explanation of the ongoing processes (Stone 1988), then by defining principles and particular practices for action. It is usually necessary to manage the tensions inherent in “anomalies” in the social organism in seeking not

so much the means to resolve them (political activity is not interested in solutions to enigmas), as a way to deal with their effects and consequences. Each subsystem thus succeeds, through the cognitive and normative frame which characterises it, in managing the conflicts and tensions arising from its location in global society.

The management of social tensions does not, however, mean the disappearance of all forms of conflict, given the multiplicity of paradigms in each subsystem. Most of the models evoked here recognise the existence of competing paradigms in any context, each sustained by distinct configurations of actors. Such dynamics appear in Sabatier's model, which shows clearly that "within the subsystem, [...] actors can be aggregated into a number (usually one to four) of 'advocacy coalitions', each composed of actors from various governmental and private organizations who both (a) share a set of normative and causal beliefs and (b) engage in a non-trivial degree of co-ordinated activity over time" (Sabatier 1998, 103).

Instead of unifying and homogenising the social sphere where it "functions", the paradigm consequently acts more as a bounded space for conflict, between the subsystem and the global community, as inside the subsystem itself (Jobert makes a distinction here between "debates which take place within the same *référentiel* and controversy about the *référentiel* itself", Jobert 1992, 221). A cognitive and normative frame thus marks out the terrain for social exchanges and disagreements, rather than simply supporting an unlikely consensus.

We can conclude at this stage that a dominant paradigm is by no means an exclusive one. This also explains how certain political and/or social actors more or less identified with a particular sector, can, nevertheless, with varying success and durability, claim an identity for themselves and justify their practices, in the name of a relatively marginal paradigm in global terms (cf actors whose interests are served by the current logics and structures of the Social security system).

Table no. 2: The dynamics of cognitive and normative frames

The appropriateness of these cognitive and normative frames, notably for understanding transitional phases where social tensions are revealed which require new adjustments based on new principles, is best represented visually in a simplified form (see table no. 2). General changes such as in the social division of labour generate tensions in structures and entrenched social values, which in turn lead to new definitions of basic assumptions and to certain behavioural changes. These also imply a new conception of the individual defined as a producer, and the adaptation of different social spaces (cf for example the need to manage the rural exodus caused by the industrial revolution in France, the symbol of the collapse of agricultural activity and the sector itself). Such approaches are located in a developmental, indeed an evolutionary, perspective, which explains why the notion of change is one of their fundamental attributes.

PARADIGM CHANGE

The processes discussed above beg a level of questioning, beyond that concerning their components and their dynamics, as to the elements which provoke a break and thereby characterise a shift from one frame to another. If we consider this more closely, what these different models primarily aim to explain are the ways in which change comes about in public policy, and alongside this, the evolution of power relations in a given subsystem of public policy-making. By so doing, they have helped 'relativise' classical approaches to understanding policy-making based on individual rationality, both theoretically and in terms of their explanatory power. Indeed, recognition of the importance of cognitive and

normative logics has led to a reconsideration of the traditional conclusions of incrementalist theories (Lindblom 1959; cf. Muller and Surel 1998, chapter 6). Centred on the idea of a paradigm shift as the bearer of “extraordinary” changes in public policy, these approaches are therefore interested in a complex host of social processes, which oblige most social actors to make radical normative and cognitive adaptations, going beyond the simple and marginal adjustments required by incrementalism. Two tendencies dominate here: that which looks for causes or bearers of change, and the analysis of the various forms of these changes.

Bearers of change

In the identification of ‘elements of rupture’ which can instigate a paradigm change, different approaches highlight particular dynamics capable of modifying felt cognitive and normative stability. Two general elements seem able, separately or together, to prompt the development of new global norms, namely, transformations of economic conditions (i), and/or a serious crisis affecting the subsystem under consideration (ii).

(i) Transformations of socio-economic conditions.

A more or less substantial modification of economic dynamics and structures seems to be one of the principal triggers of crisis, adjustment or production of cognitive or normative frames. Sabatier’s model, in part presented in terms of ‘systems’, thus considers socio-economic variation as one of the possible elements of these “exogenous shocks” which comprise “changes in socio-economic conditions, public opinion, system-wide governing coalition, or policy outputs from other subsystems” and which are “a *necessary, but not sufficient*, cause of change in the *policy core* attributes of a governmental program” (Sabatier 1998, 118, emphasis in original).

To take an example, neo-liberalism may be conceived as a form of response to the economic oil crises of the 1970s, and to more recent economic transformations (the internationalisation and expansion of financial and goods markets, and the appearance of new actors, be it through new types of producers or new countries competing in international trade). At the end of the 19th century, Emile Durkheim identified the phenomenon of anomie, resulting from transformations caused by ruptures to traditional socio-economic structures, in his analysis of the consequences of the social division of labour (Durkheim 1964). Similarly, we can hypothesise that the industrial revolution was gradually able to modify the underlying assumptions and contexts of social exchanges and public policy. However, beyond its detrimental effects, the consequences of the industrial revolution also obliged social actors to rethink the contexts and

assumptions of their actions in order to confer meaning and legitimacy on a set of processes which would otherwise have been perceived as problematic. This has, for example in the French case, produced what Jane Jenson calls "the republican paradigm" (Jenson 1989).

(ii) A serious crisis.

Another event or series of events which may spark a particularly serious political crisis is war; either with a foreign power or a civil war. This kind of a shock can provoke a trauma leading most political actors to more or less consciously try to make a clean slate of the past, in order to solve the problems perceived as provoking the crisis, and to argue for different institutional frameworks and principles for action. Thus the wars experienced by France in the 19th century can be understood as catalysts, if not the direct triggers, of important re-evaluations of the fundamental principles upon which socio-political stability was built at the time. In particular, the shock of the defeat of 1940 was a genuine trauma for the French, signalling a change in the way France was viewed in the world, in the guiding principles of state action and in the perception of social hierarchies and legitimate social exchanges.

Elements of the above theories may be used in conjunction with those developed in the work of John Kingdon and John Keeler on "political windows" (Kingdon 1984; Keeler 1993). Analysing the different processes which traditionally characterise public policy, John Kingdon was able to show that the culmination of favourable dynamics may allow the opening of a political window, that is "an opportunity for advocates of proposals to push their pet solutions, or to push attention to their special problems" (Kingdon 1984, 173). Whilst suspending the ordinary conditions of politics, such situations not only permit greater input into agenda-setting but also offer the actors concerned a wider scope for action, which effectively allows them to modify public policy in a non-incremental way. As a result, changes in public policy paradigms are achieved, such as in the French case of the "Loi Lang" of 10 August 1981 (Surel 1997b).

Different ways of achieving change

Whilst the analysis of different ways of achieving policy change is at the heart of Peter Hall and Paul Sabatier's work, it is a more marginal consideration for Jobert and Muller. Peter Hall (1993) clearly articulates the main orientations of this shift in the analysis in policy-making which seeks to challenge the conclusions traditionally drawn by public policy analysis. Following Lindblom's work on the contexts of decision-making, which are revealed to be complex to the point of allowing only marginal (incremental) changes in public policy, most research in

this area has concluded that the state is relatively unchanging. In practice, political and administrative actors can only advance public policy through what they learn from the environments they are located in, or from their own capacity for action (for a review of the literature on learning, see Bennett and Howlett 1992).

All the approaches to public policy discussed here acknowledge the relevance of these ways of achieving change. This is particularly so for the *advocacy coalition framework* model which, whilst accepting a priori the possibility of change in the *deep core* of belief systems, nonetheless considers this to be extremely rare, Sabatier going as far as to coin it a "religious conversion". The notion of learning appears in the recent works of Bruno Jobert (1994) as a means of modifying the coherence and the degree of generality which formerly characterised the notion of the *référentiel*. More systematically, the theme of learning is also found in two of the ways of achieving a change in public policy isolated by Peter Hall. Here, learning remains a pertinent notion to describe occasional adjustments which affect the "lower" levels of cognitive and normative frames. Speaking of first and second order changes, Hall shows that it is learning which explains instrumental changes in the first order, second order changes mainly concerning "the development of new policy instruments" (Hall 1993, 280).

However, Peter Hall adds the possibility of third-order changes to these traditional mechanisms, which he describes as processes through which "not only were the settings of policy changed but the hierarchy of goals and set of instruments employed to guide policy shifted radically as well" (Hall 1993, 283-4). This is analogous to Kuhn's conceptualisation of a paradigm crisis, such processes thus primarily referring to the growing incapacity felt by actors to view changing social relations according to previous frames, a situation currently familiar to certain social groups (especially trade unions), and indeed some areas of the State (eg, Plan, Datar in France), faced with the growing influence of market norms.

Concerning public policy programs, a political crisis can consequently come about, characterised by "a phase of public policy-making during which dominant representations no longer succeed in interpreting the development of a social field in a way that satisfies the actors concerned, and can therefore no longer successfully structure and legitimate the action of the State. It is in this sense that a 'political crisis' produces problems [...]" (Muller and Surel 1996, 93). This last notion is close to that of "anomaly" used by Hall with reference to Kuhn's work, which describes the growing incapacity of a given paradigm to manage social tensions or to offer satisfying and/or legitimate public policy solutions, thus

reaching a "critical juncture" (Collier and Collier 1991) which itself creates favourable conditions for the more or less substantial re-evaluation of the general or specific principles of the subsystem under consideration. Taking the example of macro-economic policies pursued by the British government in the 1970s in response to the oil crises, Hall shows that the Keynesian strategies employed for counter-cyclical economic revival (primarily boosting demand) produced unintended consequences, due to the combination of inflation and unemployment. The resulting loss of confidence in the Keynesian paradigm as the dominant reference point of macro-economic policy opened the way for the neo-liberal paradigm to take hold (Hall 1992, 1993).

THE MULTIPLICITY OF COGNITIVE AND NORMATIVE FRAMES

These different elements, relating to the components, the "functions" as well as to the forms of a change of cognitive and normative frames, constitute the principal features of these different conceptualisations. An increasing number of empirical studies informed by these models testifies to their success, which can undoubtedly be explained by their capacity to integrate certain long-standing questions in political science into the field of public policy analysis. In particular they seek an articulation within the antagonistic pairing of conflict and cooperation, which, according to Jean Leca (1997), is the Janus' face of political science. Similarly, such modelling has attempted, more or less explicitly, to construct certain dynamics associated with the dialectical oppositions between thought and action, past and present, continuity and change, order and disorder, unity and division, and so on. Lastly, from the viewpoint of public policy analysis, it has been possible to develop models, separate from those informed by a rationalist position, which are capable of explaining the processes of "extraordinary" change in public policy.

A number of critiques have nonetheless emerged recently, pointing to the problematic implications of these approaches for both empirical and theoretical research. The excessive emphasis on cognitive and cognitive variables as well as the methodological problems they pose (How are cognitive and normative frames to be identified? To what extent are they appropriate to describe the practices of actors and the development of public policy?) have sometimes led to the purely rhetorical use of these notions, underestimating the forms of mobilisation, of diffusion, indeed of instrumentalisation, that these frames have at times been subject to. Isolating the role of cognitive and normative macro-frames effectively poses a problem of identification and explanation of the multiplicity of these principles, values and global representations within different units of analysis, as well as of the hierarchical co-existence of societal paradigms, both old and new.

Rather than going no further than the falsely naive statement that the same frame produces varied social usages, it may be more useful to question these differences through the construction of spatial, temporal and even intersectoral comparisons, whilst also seeking to integrate certain variables which have hitherto been neglected or marginalized: the interests of actors, and the role of institutions.

Constructing a comparative analytical grid

If, for example, we suppose that a nation is a subsystem, each country being subjected to a similar meta-norm (neo-liberalism in the recent past), it may effectively be possible to isolate discrepancies in the diffusion of these societal paradigms. The particular reception of the same societal paradigm in each country allows us to identify and compare the dynamics of the operationalisation of these norms, in part linked to the specific structure of interests and institutional configuration in each national context.

In the course of the 1980s, the same meaning has not been accorded to neo-liberal ideology in France, Britain, the United States and Germany for instance. The particular instrumentalisation and usage of very similar normative inputs has not produced the same cognitive and normative frame in each country. To put this very simply, we could say that the neo-liberal norm was taken on board with relative ease and in full, in the United States and Britain, while it was more strongly contested in France and Germany (Jobert 1994). Likewise representations of Europe vary from one country to another, beyond the presumed unity of the ideas promoted by EU agencies. The usage of the concept of "Europe", notably in government speeches which seek to legitimate current reforms in monetary policy, varies strongly from one Member State to another, in some in an attempt to justify the status-quo (Britain), others building on it to push forward significant public policy changes (Italy).

The same kind of hypotheses can equally be applied to research based on temporal comparisons (Bartolini 1993). Taking the nation state as the basic unit of analysis, we can seek to construct relatively simple indicators (number of privatisations, financial market reforms etc. where variations reveal the mechanisms of time-lag between the different countries in the 1970s and 1980s. Alongside the different modes of adaptation in each country, we find different rhythms, first in the uptake of a new frame, with some countries ahead and others behind, as well as in their diffusion and development. Equipped with such an array of hypotheses, we can for example, draw attention to the relatively early embracing of neo-liberal ideas in the United States, and attempt to isolate the pertinent variables which explain these different forms and sequences of adoption. The turning points, during which a shift seems to occur more quickly,

could equally be correlated with certain trigger factors such as a change of government, an “objective” and/or “subjective” worsening of a crisis, or external pressures.

This analytical grid can finally be used to explore intersectoral comparisons, showing how the same global dynamics produce a variety of outcomes according to the sector. Within the same country, certain socio-economic fields are found to be more or less in sync with new cognitive and normative frames. The different processes which result from this may be associated as much with a strategy of closure and/or resistance as with a partial adaptation to global logics, or even a total conversion of the sector to the new precepts, modes of action and instruments implied by the new global *référentiel*.

As far as the progressive spread of market norms alone is concerned, and restricting ourselves to the short-term, we can note that certain socio-economic sectors have very quickly become faithful disciples of neo-liberal ideas. The financial sector is a notably strong supporter of moves for market deregulation and liberalisation, unsurprisingly so given the emphasis of the monetarist paradigm on cashflow and monetary exchange. As a driving force of the transformations implied by this new societal paradigm, this particular social field has even become the producer/consumer of new representations of the individual, whilst prompting the spread of the new cognitive and normative frame to other social fields, including within the State (Hall 1992). On the other hand, whole sectors and/or subsystems have been constrained and marginalised by this new global frame, contributing to their progressive decline (cf traditional industries) or to their taking of defensive action (eg farmers, public services).

The modification of normative hierarchies thus obliges certain groups or individuals, especially those who are furthest from the expectations of the new frame, to modify their particular reference points (the sectoral *référentiel* for Jobert and Muller) to make them congruent, if not compatible, with the elements of the global paradigm. The example of French publishers, conscious of the crisis in their sector in the 1970s and of the pressures that gave rise to the cognitive spread of market principles, is symptomatic of such mechanisms, these actors feeling the need to (re)formulate their self-images to make them compatible with market norms. Books were transformed from a cultural object, closely tied to the channels of production and distribution established since the 19th century, to become a product on which the logic of the market was imposed. Yet they remained a “product unlike any other”, justifying the continued existence of traditional actors (literary publishers and small bookshops) protected through state intervention. Bridging the gap between the practices of their sector and those dictated by the market norm, the actors concerned succeeded in finding

compensatory mechanisms to advocate their cause, formalised and legitimated by a paradigm of the exceptional nature of books (Surel 1997a).

We can also envisage such processes of adaptation on a regional scale. Thus the upheavals of the oil crisis and the ensuing change in international industrial stability provoked socio-economic crises in entire regions, where structures had previously been defined, in part at least, with reference to a particular type of industry (Mény, Wright and Rhodes 1987). The example of identity and social changes associated with the iron and steel crisis, in regions such as the north of France or the Lorraine, is particularly revealing of this obligation to adapt, necessitated by such a crisis of traditional reference points.

A number of comparative studies, inspired by this research perspective, have already been undertaken, notably to explore recent transformations in the mechanisms of the Welfare state. Paul Pierson (1994) whose work deals with the process of reform of the Welfare state in several western countries (United States, Britain, Germany) shows how the same collection of normative principles and forms of action have met with much more limited success than was previously imagined, whilst also being subject to different "translations" within each country. Far from fulfilling the promises of the warlike rhetoric of certain political leaders of the complete dismantling of the mechanisms of social protection, the reforms undertaken by governments inspired by neo-liberal thinking have readily led to some substantial adjustments but ultimately to little fundamental change in the general characteristics of Welfare states, in the short-term at least. Perhaps of greater interest is that the reforms undertaken follow distinctive paths and timing in each country (Myles and Pierson 1997).

Such studies thereby shed light on the socio-political dynamics of a paradigm, showing that the spread of new ideas, principles of action and forms of action does not come about in a "revolutionary" way from scientific development, but rather from a more or less radical re-evaluation of ways of legitimising groups and social exchanges, as well as through more or less substantial modifications to legitimate frameworks and forms of public policy. In practice, the penetration of neo-liberal ideas has provoked strong resistance from mechanisms intrinsic to the system of social security, in particular due to the mobilisation of interest groups who identify with and/or benefit from the main policies of the Welfare state. Furthermore, such an analysis also reveals the existence of institutional and normative grids specific to each country, which play a part in modifying the substantial content of dominant cognitive and normative frames to ensure their compatibility with the previous structures of exchange and action characteristic of that country.

In seeking to understand the factors which explain these specificities and the various forms of resistance to the same general principles in different countries, Pierson (1997) shows the importance of the influence of the past in the structuring of institutional and normative configurations in each country. He makes use of the notion of "historical causality" developed by Stinchcombe (1968) to shed light on the existence of a logic of "path dependency". This logic includes the processes of the progressive sedimentation of normative and institutional frames of social exchange and public policy-making, a sedimentation which is then able to determine mechanisms of resistance and/or "translation". The implanting of customs within bureaucracies and the enmeshing of interests and values between the groups concerned and administrative departments therefore appear amongst the constitutive factors of institutional, relational and cognitive grids which have a bearing on the penetration of new global cognitive and normative frames. From this point of view, Patrick Hassenteufel (1997) has been able to show in a comparative study of recent social policy reforms in France, Germany and Britain, to what extent the modes of structuring of the medical profession have led to transformations in public policy.

Factors underpinning the variation in frames

We can attempt to isolate certain elements which account for spatial and/or temporal and/or sectoral differences, arising from the mechanisms of variation of a similar global cognitive and normative frame. Several factors are relevant here, namely (1) the extent and the nature of the previous paradigm, and (2) the institutional configurations specific to each country which act as filters to the dominant paradigm.

(1) The importance of the previous societal paradigm

The emergence of a new frame is not a case of the substitution of one paradigm for another, as Kuhn posits for the natural sciences, but rather occurs through associations and new hierarchical rankings of elements that may already exist. Far from making a clean slate of the past, a new societal paradigm must in effect be composed of previous cognitive and normative structures, which explains possible re-translations of the elements of the frame, possible "delays" from one subsystem to another in the adoption of these new elements, and above all, the mechanisms of resistance a new frame gives rise to. Neither does a dominant paradigm "destroy" previously legitimate frames, rather it comes to constitute the reference point in relation to which these older structures must adapt.

Consequently, the diffusion of a new paradigm gives rise to complex and at times contradictory mechanisms of adaptation. The "logics of exceptionalism"

already referred to, are perhaps the clearest illustration of this, insofar as they describe the existence of dynamics of integration of new normative and cognitive models, which, in spite of everything, attempt to retain the legitimacy of traditional representations and values. The French case of the "Loi Lang" of 10 August 1981 on the single pricing policy of books is once again emblematic here, having resulted in the production of a belief that "books are a product unlike any other". This belief tried to combine the traditional conception of the sector, centred on the image of the publisher as artist and businessman, with the growing influence of commercial logics on the practices of the sector (Surel 1997a). In the same way, the GATT negotiations, defined as a European "cultural exception", have legitimated the integration of new commercial constraints resulting from market liberalisation, whilst trying to safeguard and/or construct a European cultural specificity.

(2) Specific institutional configurations

In this general expression, which seeks to integrate interests and institutions in the analysis of cognitive and normative frames, we can bring together the particular political and administrative structures of a country or a sector, the forms of organization of social exchanges in a particular field, or the judicial framework determining the rules of the game and the hierarchies between actors, the instruments etc. The modes of structuring social exchanges, sometimes institutionalised even within political or administrative departments, comprise a host of factors able to explain both variations in the translation of a particular cognitive and normative frame, and its diverse rhythms of diffusion. Indeed, several authors have underlined the importance of coalitions, arenas and forums, constituted around precise public policies, and formed around a particular paradigm, which are thus able to act as centres of resistance and/or grids modifying the content as well as the progress of a new set of cognitive and normative models (Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Sabatier 1993; Jobert 1994; Radaelli 1998).

Defining the arena as a group of actors sharing particular "orders of comprehension" (taking up this idea from Dunsire 1978), Dudley and Richardson (1996) were able to show how this was so in policies on the development of trunkroads in Britain. The structuring of policies around a number of mechanisms mastered and legitimated by the transport department, engineers, and lorry-drivers' union representatives, allowed the establishment of a kind of protective shield against any outside influence for many years. The enmeshing of the dominant normative and cognitive structures, the institutionalisation of social exchanges in a specific context, and a number of public programs operated as screens to new paradigms, if the "institutions" themselves were not challenged. In

the precise case of British trunkroads, it seemed that a transformation of dominant values (increased value placed on the protection of the environment) in conjunction with economic crisis (increase in the cost of fuel, decrease in public investment) contributed to the undoing of the existing coalition and at the same time the displacement of the logics of exchange (integration of new actors, notably environmental groups) and the legitimate cognitive and normative models. Such an example shows the possible succession of forms of change: an incremental logic, when the entrenched institutional and normative grids continue to function; a change of paradigm, associated with internal and/or external destabilisation of these same legitimate grids.

Generally speaking, these notions arise out of the hope to isolate the sites of mobilisation of cognitive and normative frames and to see how the interests of actors and the variable institutionalisation of their relationships tends to modify the content and the scope of a societal paradigm. However, it is not only a question of occasional adjustments to original theorisations, essentially centred on the dynamics of diffusion, as these still leave to one side the question of the modes of production of cognitive and normative frames. How do they emerge in a given field? According to what power relations and what balance of power? Do cognitive and normative frames not sometimes constitute the post-hoc rationalisations for institutional transformations or changes in power relations (cf on this point, Majone, 1996)?

These sets of problems are undoubtedly less a basis for the rejection of the analytical models discussed here than a starting point for complementary research, as well as a warning against the sometimes excessive use of cognitive approaches. In certain cases in France, such notions have tended to fuel an invasion of erudite discourse (similar to that concerning the "social construction of reality", cf de Lara 1997) which has sometimes created the illusion of a conceptual hegemony (Fontaine 1996). This undoubtedly relates once again to their aptitude for questioning the processes which underpin the dialectics of structure/agency, micro/macro, continuity/change and so on. However, it is perhaps time to make use of the plethora of case studies already conducted to achieve a certain conceptual precision and greater methodological rigour, whilst seeking to integrate previously neglected variables; a step which some authors have already undertaken, modifying and clarifying the content and the scope of their own conceptualisations (cf Sabatier 1998; and especially, Hall 1997, 1998).

REFERENCES

- Bartolini, S. (1993) "On Time and Comparative Research", *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 5, 2, 131-67.
- Baumgartner, F. and Jones, B. (1993) *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, C. and Howlett, M. (1992) "The Lessons of Learning. Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change", *Policy Sciences*, 25, 3, 275-94.
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966), *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, London, Penguin.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993), *Sociology in Question*, London, Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1970), *La reproduction*, Paris, Minuit.
- Chalmers, A. (1987) *Qu'est-ce que la science ?*, Paris, La Découverte.
- Collier, D. and Collier, R. (1991), *Shaping the Political Arena*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- de Lara, P. (1997) "Un miracle sociologique. La 'construction sociale de la réalité'", *Le Débat*, 97, 114-29.
- Dudley, G. and Richardon, J. (1996) "Why Does Policy Change over Time? Adversarial Policy Communities, Alternative Policy Arenas, and British Trunk Roads Policy 1945-95", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 3, 1, 63-83.
- Dunsire, A. (1978) *Implementation in a Bureaucracy*, Oxford, Martin Robertson.
- Durkheim, E. (1964) *The Division of Labor in Society*, New York, The Free Press.
- Edelman, M. (1976) *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Faure, A., Pollet, G. and Warin, P. (eds.) (1995) *La construction du sens dans les politiques publiques*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

- Fontaine, J. (1996) "Public Policy Analysis in France: Transformation and Theory", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 3, 3, 481-98.
- Geertz, C. (1964) "Ideology as a Cultural System" in Apter, D.E. (ed.) *Ideology and Discontent*, New York, The Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, New York, Harper and Row.
- Hall, P. (ed.) (1989) *The Political Power of Economic Ideas*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Hall, P. (1992) "The Movement from Keynesianism to Monetarism: Institutional Analysis and British Economic Policy in the 1970s" in Steinmo, S., Thelen, K. and Longstreth, F. (eds) *Structuring Politics*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 90-113.
- Hall, P. (1993) "Policy Paradigm, Social Learning and the State", *Comparative Politics*, 25, 3, 275-96.
- Hall, P. and Taylor, R. (1996), "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms", *Political Studies*, XLIV, 936-57.
- Hall, P. (1997) "The Role of Interests, Institutions and Ideas in the Comparative Political Economy of the Industrialized Nations" in Lichbach, M. and Zuckerman, A. (eds) *Comparative Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, P. (1998) "The Political Economy of Europe in an Era of Interdependence" in Kitschelt, H. *et al*, (eds) *Change and Continuity in Contemporary Capitalism*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Hassenteufel, P. (1997) *Les médecins face à l'État*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po.
- Heclo, H. (1974) *Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden: From Relief to Income Maintenance*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Jenkins-Smith, H. and Sabatier, P. (1993) "The Study of Public Policy Process" in Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. (eds) *Policy Change and Learning*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1-9.

Jenson, J. (1989) "Paradigms and Political Discourse: Protective Legislation in France and the United States before 1914", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 22, 235-58.

Jobert, B. (1992) "Représentations sociales, controverses et débats dans la conduite des politiques publiques", *Revue française de science politique*, 42, 2, 219-33.

Jobert, B. (ed.) (1994) *Le tournant néo-libéral en Europe*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

Jobert, B. and Muller, P. (1987) *L'État en action*, Paris, PUF.

Jones, C. O. (1970) *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, Belmont, Duxbury Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Leca, J. (1997) "The Enduring Dialogue of Conflict and Order in a Changing World: Political Science at the Turn of the Century", unpublished manuscript.

Majone, G. (1989) *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Majone, G. (1992) "Ideas, Interests and Policy Change", EUI Florence, SPS Working Paper n° 92/21.

Mény, Y., Wright, V. and Rhodes, M. (eds) (1987) *The Politics of Steel. Western Europe and the Steel Industry in the Crisis Years (1974-1984)*, Berlin, De Gruyter.

Mériaux, O. (1995), "Référentiel, représentation(s) sociale(s) et idéologie" in Faure, A., Pollet, G. and Warin, P. (eds) *La construction du sens dans les politiques publiques*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 49-68.

Merrien, F.-X. (1993) "Les politiques publiques, entre paradigmes et controverses" in CRESAL *Les raisons de l'action publique*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 87-100.

Muller, P. (1984) *Le technocrate et le paysan*, Paris, Éditions Économie et humanisme.

Muller, P. (1994) *Les politiques publiques*, Paris, PUF.

Muller, P. (1995) "Les politiques publiques comme construction d'un rapport au monde" in Faure, A., Pollet, G. and Warin, P. (eds) *La construction du sens dans les politiques publiques*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 153-79.

Muller, P. and Surel, Y. (1996) "Crises de politiques et régulations cognitives: l'exemple des politiques du livre", *Pôle Sud*, 4, 92-106.

Muller, P. and Surel, Y. (1998) *L'analyse des politiques publiques*, Paris, Montchrestien.

Myles, J. and Pierson, P. (1997) "Friedman's Revenge: The Reform of 'Liberal' Welfare States in Canada and the United States", EUI Florence, RSC Working Paper n° 97/30.

Pierson, P. (1994) *Dismantling the Welfare States? Reagan, Thatcher and the Politics of Retrenchment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pierson, P. (1997) "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics", EUI Florence, RSC Jean Monnet Chair Paper n° 44.

Radaelli, C. (1995) "The Role of Knowledge in the Policy Process", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2, 2, 159-83.

Radaelli, C. (1998) *The Politics of Corporate Taxation in the European Union*, London, Routledge.

Rose, R. (1990) "Inheritance Before Choice in Public Policy", *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 2, 3, 263-91.

Rose, R. (1991) "What is Lesson-Drawing?", *Journal of Public Policy*, 11, 1, 55-78.

Sabatier, P. (1993) "Policy Change over a Decade or More" in Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. (eds) *Policy Change and Learning*, Boulder, Westview Press, 13-39.

Sabatier, P. (1998) "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Revisions and Relevance for Europe", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5, 1, 98-130.

Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. (eds) (1993) *Policy Change and Learning*, Boulder, Westview Press.

Sabatier, P. and Zafonte, M. (1997) "Who Do Policy Elites Look To for Advice and Information? Policy Networks in San Francisco Bay/Delta Water Policy", *Journal of Politics*, forthcoming.

Stinchcombe, A. (1968) *Constructing Social Theories*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World.

Stone, A. (1992) "Le 'néo-institutionnalisme'. Défis conceptuels et méthodologiques", *Politix*, 20, 156-68.

Stone, D. (1988) *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*, Glenview, Scott, Foresman.

Surel, Y. (1995) "Les politiques publiques comme paradigmes" in Faure, A., Pollet, G. and Warin, P. (eds) *La construction du sens dans les politiques publiques*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 125-51.

Surel, Y. (1997a) *L'État et le livre. Les politiques publiques du livre en France (1957-1993)*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

Surel, Y. (1997b) "Quand la politique change les politiques. La loi Lang du 10 août 1981 et les politiques du livre", *Revue française de science politique*, 47, 2, 147-72.

Thoenig, J.-C. (1973) *L'ère des technocrates*, Paris, Economica.

Touraine, A. (1993) *Production de la société*, Paris, Librairie Générale Française.

Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society. Volume I*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Wildavsky, A. (1979) *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, Boston, Little Brown.

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the
European University Institute, Florence

Copies can be obtained free of charge
– depending on the availability of stocks – from:

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Please use order form overleaf

Publications of the European University Institute

To The Publications Officer
 European University Institute
 Badia Fiesolana
 I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) – Italy
 Telefax No: +39/55/4685 636
 e-mail: publish@datacomm.iue.it
 <http://www.iue.it>

From Name
 Address.....

- ☐ Please send me a complete list of EUI Working Papers
- ☐ Please send me a complete list of EUI book publications
- ☐ Please send me the EUI brochure Academic Year 1999/2000

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No, Author
Title:
No, Author
Title:
No, Author
Title:
No, Author
Title:

Date

Signature

Working Papers of the Robert Schuman Centre

Published since 1998

RSC No. 98/1

Jonathan GOLUB

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy: An Overview*

RSC No. 98/2

Ian H. ROWLANDS

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *EU Policy for Ozone Layer Protection*

RSC No. 98/3

Marc PALLEMAERTS

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *Regulating Exports of Hazardous Chemicals: The EU's External Chemical Safety Policy*

RSC No. 98/4

André NOLLKAEMPER

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *Improving Compliance with the International Law of Marine Environmental Protection: The Role of the European Union*

RSC No. 98/5

Thomas HELLER

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *The Path to EU Climate Change Policy*

RSC No. 98/6

David VOGEL

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *EU Environmental Policy and the GATT/WTO*

RSC No. 98/7

Andrea LENSCHOW

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *The World Trade Dimension of "Greening" the EC's Common Agricultural Policy*

RSC No. 98/8

Nick ROBINS

Global Competition and EU Environmental Policy. *Competitiveness, Environmental Sustainability and the Future of European Community Development Cooperation*

RSC No. 98/9

Thomas RISSE (with Daniela

ENGELMANN-MARTIN/Hans-Joachim KNOFF/Klaus ROSCHER)

To Euro or Not to Euro? The EMU and Identity Politics in the European Union

RSC No. 98/10

Véronique PUJAS/Martin RHODES

Party Finance and Political Scandal in Latin Europe

RSC No. 98/11

Renaud DEHOUSSE

European Institutional Architecture after Amsterdam: Parliamentary System or Regulatory Structure?

RSC No. 98/12

Jonathan GOLUB

New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU. *New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU: An Overview*

RSC No. 98/13

Stephen TINDALE/Chris HEWETT

New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU. *New Environmental Policy Instruments in the UK*

RSC No. 98/14

Wolfram CREMER/Andreas FISAHN

New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU. *New Environmental Policy Instruments in Germany*

RSC No. 98/15

Duncan LIEFFERINK

New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU. *New Environmental Policy Instruments in the Netherlands*

RSC No. 98/16

Kurt DEKETELAERE

New Instruments for Environmental Policy in the EU. *New Environmental Policy Instruments in Belgium*

RSC No. 98/17

Susana AGULAR FERNÁNDEZ
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *New Environmental Policy
Instruments in Spain*

RSC No. 98/18

Alberto MAJOCCHI
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *New Environmental Policy
Instruments in Italy*

RSC No. 98/19

Jan Willem BIEKART
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *Negotiated Agreements in EU
Environmental Policy*

RSC No. 98/20

Eva EIDERSTRÖM
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *Ecolabels in EU Environmental
Policy*

RSC No. 98/21

Karola TASCHNER
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *Environmental Management
Systems: The European Regulation*

RSC No. 98/22

Jos DELBEKE/Hans BERGMAN
New Instruments for Environmental Policy
in the EU. *Environmental Taxes and
Charges in the EU*

RSC No. 98/23

Carol HARLOW
European Administrative Law and the
Global Challenge

RSC No. 98/24

Jørgen ELMESKOV
The Unemployment Problem in Europe:
Lessons from Implementing the OECD Jobs
Strategy

RSC No. 98/25

Paul ORMEROD
A Business Cycle Model with Keynesian
Micro-Foundations: The Policy Implications
for Unemployment

RSC No. 98/26

Richard CLAYTON/Jonas PONTUSSON
The New Politics of the Welfare State
Revisited: Welfare Reforms, Public-Sector
Restructuring and Inegalitarian Trends in
Advanced Capitalist Societies

RSC No. 98/27

Paul JOHNSON
The Measurement of Social Security
Convergence: The Case of European Public
Pension Systems since 1950

RSC No. 98/28

Claudio M. RADAELLI
Creating the International Tax Order:
Transfer Pricing and the Search for
Coordination in International Tax Policy

RSC No. 98/29

Wisla SURAZSKA
On Local Origins of Civil Society in Post-
Communist Transition

RSC No. 98/30

Louis CHARPENTIER
The European Court of Justice and the
Rhetoric of Affirmative Action

RSC No. 98/31

Arthur BENZ/Burkard EBERLEIN
Regions in European Governance: The
Logic of Multi-Level Interaction

RSC No. 98/32

Ewa MORAWSKA
International Migration and Consolidation of
Democracy in East Central Europe: A
Problematic Relationship in a Historical
Perspective

RSC No. 98/33

Martin MARCUSSEN
Central Bankers, the Ideational Life-Cycle
and the Social Construction of EMU

RSC No. 98/34

Claudio M. RADAELLI
Policy Narratives in the European Union:
The Case of Harmful Tax Competition

RSC No. 98/35

Antje WIENER
The Embedded *Acquis Communautaire*
Transmission Belt and Prism of New
Governance

RSC No. 98/36

Liesbet HOOGHE
Supranational Activists or Intergovernmental
Agents? Explaining the Orientations of
Senior Commission Officials Towards
European Integration

RSC No. 98/37

Michael J. ARTIS/Wenda ZHANG
Core and Periphery in EMU: A Cluster
Analysis

RSC No. 98/38

Beate KOHLER-KOCH
Territorial Politics in Europe -
A Zero-Sum Game?
*La renaissance de la dimension territoriale en
Europe : entre illusion et réalité*

RSC No. 98/39

Michael KEATING
Territorial Politics in Europe -
A Zero-Sum Game?
*The New Regionalism. Territorial
Competition and Political Restructuring in
Western Europe*

RSC No. 98/40

Patrick LE GALES
Territorial Politics in Europe -
A Zero-Sum Game?
*Urban Governance in Europe: How Does
Globalisation Matter?*

RSC No. 98/41

Liesbet HOOGHE
Territorial Politics in Europe -
A Zero-Sum Game?
*EU Cohesion Policy and Competing Models
of European Capitalism*

RSC No. 98/42

Burkard EBERLEIN
Regulating Public Utilities in Europe:
Mapping the Problem

RSC No. 98/43

Daniel VERDIER
Domestic Responses to Free Trade and Free
Finance in OECD Countries

RSC No. 98/44

Amy VERDUN
The Role of the Delors Committee in the
Creation of EMU:
An Epistemic Community?

RSC No. 98/45

Yves SUREL
The Role of Cognitive and Normative
Frames in Policy-Making