Jnl Publ. Pol., **20**, 3, 247–274
Printed in the United Kingdom
© 2000 Cambridge University Press

Policy Regimes and Policy Change

CARTER A. WILSON *Political Science, University of Toledo*

ABSTRACT

The evolution of public policies in the United States has been characterized as a process involving long periods of stability followed by abrupt episodes of substantial change. In this project, we identify strands in the literature and synthesize policy theories into a policy regime model useful in explaining both stability and change. This model focuses on power arrangements, policy paradigms and organization – factors that operate to maintain long periods of stability. We demonstrate how stressors – catastrophic events, economic crises, demographic changes, shifts in modes of production, and others – impact policy regimes and create pressures for change. We argue that the process of policy regime change – the abrupt episodes of substantial change – occurs with changes in the policy paradigm, alterations in patterns of power and shifts in organizational arrangements. The old policy regime disintegrates and the new one emerges with a new policy paradigm, new patterns of power and new organizational arrangements that operate to maintain long periods of stability.

Public policy making in the United States has been characterized as experiencing long terms of stability punctuated by periods of abrupt and episodic change (Baumgartner and Jones 1993). Recent public policy debates have raged over this single question: what explains these periods of abrupt change? The literature on public policy change is filled with controversies and contradictory findings over this question. Different studies focus on different dimensions of the change process, different aspects of state and political activities, and different types of policy changes. Some studies have focused on change within the same policy and reached opposite conclusions, as the debate between Domhoff and Skocpol over the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935 demonstrates.

The question – what explains periods of abrupt change – touches a host of related issues such as the nature of the state, the character of political power, and the process of public policy making. Since these related issues go well beyond the purview of this project, we attempt

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to accomplish two major tasks. First, we identify some important strands in the literature and discuss how each seeks to explain policy change. These are: 1) political process and decision making, 2) elitists and neo-Marxists, 3) postmodern and culture, and 4) state-centered. Our second task is to synthesize the literature into a policy regime model that can be used to explain abrupt periods of policy change and resolve some of the controversies in the literature. We draw from the regulatory regime and international regime literature to develop a definition and model of a policy regime. We use this construct to provide a clearer understanding of periods of policy stability and episodes of abrupt policy change. We comment on the regime model of policy change in relation to other theories of policy change.

Political Process and Decision Making Approaches

Political process and decision making approaches tend to focus on the role of interest groups, political leaders, policy makers, agendas and decisions in producing public policy change. Group theorists suggest that abrupt changes in public policies reflect alterations in power arrangements: the dissolution of old political coalitions and the formation of new ones, the decline of established interest groups and the emergence of new ones (Truman 1971). The agenda-building approach suggests that periods of abrupt change can be explained by the process in which issues get raised and placed high on the government's agenda. This process entails some sort of trigger event – a catastrophic accident, a depression, a war, etc. – which raises the visibility of an issue, precipitates public awareness of a situation, or dramatizes a problem. Policy initiators exploit this event and define the situation as a problem requiring government action. Policy entrepreneurs shepherd the proposed policy solutions through government and bring about the abrupt change. (Cobb and Elder 1983). Other agenda theorists such as Kingdon (1984) focus on policy actors within government and distinguish between policy agendas, which are problems, and policy alternatives, which are solutions that receive serious attention from policy makers. Kingdon sees policy change arising from the combination of right timing and skilful manipulation as policy entrepreneurs match policy solutions to policy problems, exploit opportunities, and promote change.

Decision theorists have long characterized decision making in the United States as incremental; that is, involving a fragmented political process in which decision makers have limited knowledge, respond to political pressures, engage in limited successive comparisons, and make small tentative adjustments in existing policies. Incrementalism

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

explains stability. It does not explain the episodes of abrupt change. Focusing on these episodes, Charles O. Jones (1976) uses the term speculative augmentation and policy escalation to identify forms of decision making involving substantial policy changes made with limited knowledge. Building on Jones and others, Hayes (1992) identifies two types of nonincremental episodes of abrupt shifts in policies: federal role breakthroughs and rationalized breakthroughs. The former occurs when the federal government assumes responsibility for a new problem and creates a new agency. The latter occurs when the federal government substantially changes existing policy goals and rearranges existing implementation structures.

Ripley and Franklin (1980) suggest that incremental decision making and long term stability arise out of the tendency of policies to move toward the distributive arena as policy makers avoid conflict, engage in bargaining, seek ways of cooperating and routinizing the decision making process. Abrupt change occurs when an event – a scandal, a catastrophe, or a shocking discovery – impacts policy makers, disrupts the policy community, and promotes the mobilization of counter groups. Change involves extensive media coverage, conflict, high levels or government, and the dissolution of subgovernments.

Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones originated the term punctuated equilibrium to describe public policy-making as characterized by long periods of stability interrupted by spurts of change. They offer the most comprehensive and persuasive theory of policy stability and policy change. Their focus on the dynamics of the creation and destruction of policy monopolies is instructive: 'These dynamics are driven by the changing allocation of attention by national political leaders, the media, and the public, and by the ability of policymakers to appeal to different institutional venues for decision making by raising new understanding of old issues (Baumgartner and Jones 1993, 59).' Their definition of a policy monopoly is the same as a policy community, iron triangle, or policy whirlpool with one exception; it includes the concept of a policy image or ideology. One of their most detailed examples of the creation and destruction of a policy monopoly is the case of nuclear energy. Originally nuclear energy policy operated in a closed system much like the iron-triangle in which 'corporate, political, and technocratic elites advocating nuclear power had privileged access to the most insulated and centralized interiors of the policy process (Baumgartner and Jones 1993, 66).' Several factors contributed to the dissolution of this policy monopoly and policy change: the defection of a few technical Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) staff members who questioned the safety of nuclear energy; the expansion of the issue as AEC scientists leaked information to other initially excluded organizations such as the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Union of Concerned Scientists; the dramatic increase of negative media attention; the change of the image of nuclear energy from positive to negative; and the creation of new venues as the number of congressional committees and subcommittees overseeing nuclear energy escalated. Eventually in 1974 the AEC was dismantled. Its regulatory functions were assigned to a new agency, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and its promotional functions were shifted to the Energy Research and Development Agency.

In *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics*, Bryan Jones (1994) identifies several factors that contribute to lurches in public policy making. These factors include the role of new participants and new ideas invading the policy arena and expanding and redefining the issues; the media defining the public problem; the policy entrepreneurs promoting ideas and shepherding new policy proposals through the policy process; and the public shifting its attention to new dimensions of a problem and new solutions. Jones also identified four factors which produce serial shifts from one set of policy solutions to another. These factors include two exogenous and two endogenous sources: 1) event driven changes, such as a war or the crash of the stock market; 2) process driven change, such as urbanization; 3) representational change, such as Congressional response to shifts in public opinion; and 4) conflictual change, such as members of a policy community leaking information to oppositional groups, changing venues, and expanding issues.

Advocacy Coalition Framework

Paul Sabatier develops the advocacy coalition framework to explain policy change within the policy process context. This framework suggests that studies of policy change should 1) require 'a time perspective of a decade or more,' 2) focus on policy subsystems, 3) include an intergovernmental dimension, and 4) conceptualize public policies in the same manner as belief systems. Sabatier maintains that public policy change within a subsystem can be explained by two factors. He says, 'First, advocacy coalitions within the subsystem attempt to translate the policy cores and the secondary aspects of their belief systems into government programs.' He adds, 'The second process is one of external perturbation, that is, the effects of system-wide events – changes in socioeconomic conditions, outputs from other subsystems, and changes in the system-wide governing coalition – on resources and constraints of subsystem actors (Sabatier 1993, 34).' He explains further that within a subsystem there is generally a dominant coalition and one or more minority coalitions. Each coalition operates under a different

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

belief system. Each attempts to gain advantages through policy-oriented learning and increased resources. Change occurs when some external perturbation or event impacts the subsystem in ways which give advantages to minority coalitions able to take advantage of policy learning and increased resources.

Elitists and neo-Marxists

Whereas the political process approach to explaining policy change focuses mostly on policy makers and interest group processes, neoMarxists focus on the dominant class, class conflict and economic arrangements. A number of studies divide neoMarxists into instrumentalists, structuralists and class conflict theorists. Although there are significant differences among neoMarxists, any classification scheme is problematic. Marxists such as Miliband are often mistaken for instrumentalists, theorists who see the state as the instrument of the dominant class (Skocpol 1980). Although Poulantzas underscores the relative autonomy of the state, he acknowledges the role of the dominant class and class conflict in shaping state behaviour. Most Marxists see the state constrained to respond to the needs of a capitalist economy. Of course, this point has also been noted by nonMarxists who acknowledge the positional advantage of the business sector in the policy making process (Lindblom 1978; and Stone 1989). Most Marxists acknowledge the role and capacity of state bureaucracies. Claus Offe (1984) sees this sector as crucial to managing crises arising out of the contradictions of capitalist production. Poulantzas (1978) sees bureaucrats representing class divisions as they are recruited from all classes, although they play a role in mediating class conflict. Most Marxists subscribe to some form of class conflict or structuralist perspective, although there are differences about the character of structures and the patterns of conflict. Some structuralists see changes in state behavior and public policy arising from alterations in modes and relations of production which affect social and political arrangements. Others see the contradictions of capitalism as the source of policy change. Class struggle theorists see policy changes arising out of the rising or ebbing powers of labor and the ways in which conflicts between labor and capital are mediated by the state. Most neoMarxists acknowledge the role of ideology in legitimizing the state, public policies, and arrangements favorable to the dominant class.

Offe (1984) explains policy changes in terms of the contradictions of capitalism and the role of the state. On the one hand, the state must promote commodification and the capital accumulation process. On the other hand, the privatized unregulated capitalist economy generates

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pollution, urban decay, poverty and other problems. This economy is inherently crisis prone. The state emerges to address these problems and regulate these crises. This dual role of the state is analogous to what O'Connor (1973) and others call the accumulation and legitimation functions of the capitalist state.

A more recent strand of neoMarxists studies explains changes in welfare policies in terms of the shift from Fordists structural arrangements to post-Fordists arrangements. The post-Fordist structure is characterized by flexible capital and more mobile production facilities. The state is committed to a greater 'subservience of social policy to the imperatives of economic competitiveness . . . (Pierson 1998, 62).' Post-Fordist policies emphasize privatization, welfare cuts, and a disciplined work force. Of course, most of the policy changes explained by the shift from Fordist to post-Fordist structural arrangements can also be explained by the substantial decline in the political power of labor unions and the increase in the power of the corporate sector.

William Domhoff (1998; 1996) claims he is not a Marxist but acknowledges similarities between his and Marxist views. Domhoff provides one of the most persuasive instrumentalist or elitist studies of policy change. Whereas Domhoff agrees with a number of the assumptions of political process and state centered explanations of policy change, he insists that these theorists grossly underestimate the extent to which the corporate sector dominates the state and the policy making process. Domhoff concludes that social security policy was shaped by a rival faction of the dominant class, corporate moderates, although it was opposed by ultraconservatives represented by the National Association of Manufacturers and southern plantation owners. Members of the dominant class also affect the policy making process through their direct involvement in policy making networks, their support for policy making foundations and research institutes, their presence in policy making positions in government, their complex connections with the media, their influence in the electoral process, and their ability to launch public relations campaigns.

Jack Bloom (1987) provides a class conflict and structural analysis of the civil rights movement. He contends that structural changes – mechanization in farming, the collapse of the sharecropping system, and the mass movement of blacks from rural areas to urban areas – created conditions favorable for a mass civil rights movement. Of course, these conditions alone did not produce the movement. Human agency factors created it, such as the ability of civil rights leaders to mobilize their members and 'to bring together a coalition of disparate social forces that ultimately included Southern business and middle classes, the Northern middle class, the National Democratic Party and the federal government (Bloom 1987, 5).'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Piven and Coward's (1971) study of protest movements and class conflict provides a neoMarxist perspective of long periods of stability and short bursts of policy change. They insist that social systems tend to be remarkably stable over time, as people conform to institutional arrangements which regulate their daily lives and which appear to be natural and inevitable (Piven can Cloward 1971, 6). Poor and oppressed people tend to accept their lot as they 'are led to believe that their destitution is deserved, and that the riches and powers that others command are also deserved (6).' Protest movements arise only under extraordinary circumstances: under periods of profound social dislocation followed by changes in social consciousness and behavior. The dislocation takes many forms: sudden increases in mass hardship, rapid institutional changes, breakdowns in daily routines or regulatory institutions, calamitous unemployment rates, rapid urbanization and others. These social changes must be followed by a new consciousness, as people lose their belief in the legitimacy of existing arrangements, and as people believe they can change those arrangements. Behavior changes as formal protest organizations emerge and articulate an alternative world view and promote new policy goals. Piven and Cloward insist that often during these extraordinary periods, members of the dominant class may shift positions and support some of those goals promoted by the lower classes, providing they are innocuous to the dominant class. These periods of change and social movements are then followed by long term stability.

Ideological and Cultural Approaches

Recently, policy analysts have paid more attention to shifts in culture or dominant ideologies as explaining periodic shifts in public policies. Within the context of the neoMarxist framework, the ideology of the dominant class once accepted by subordinate classes plays a major role in maintaining arrangements and policies favorable to the dominant class and in sustaining long periods of stability (Gramsci 1980; Miliband 1969; Poulantzas 1978; Jessop 1982; Boggs 1984). Major shifts in public policy are partially explained by ideological shifts resulting from political struggles in which subordinate classes attack the dominant ideology with a counter ideology supporting alternative arrangements and policies favorable to subordinate classes (Gramsci 1980; Miliband 1969; Poulantzas 1978; Jessop 1982; Boggs 1984). Dominant and subordinate classes aside, cultural approaches to the study of public policies explain stability and change in terms of the dominant culture sustaining existing policies over a long period and counter cultures disrupting the period of stability and promoting change. The new politics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of problem definition literature incorporates this cultural approach (Gusfield 1981; Rochefort and Cobb 1994). Deborah Stone explains the politics of problem definition and the construction of policy cultures in this way:

> Problem definition is a matter of representation because there is no objective description of a situation; there can only be portrayals of people's experiences and interpretations. Problem definition is strategic because groups, individuals, and government agencies deliberately and consciously design portrayals so as to promote their favored course of action (Stone 1988, 106).

In other words, groups and individuals create policy ideologies through the way they portray issues, promote images, tell stories, explain cause and effect, and describe situations as problems in ways that favor the policy solutions they are advocating. These ideologies legitimize and sustain existing policies and institutional arrangements. Shifts in these ideologies following legitimation crises explain periods of abrupt and substantial policy change.

Policy ideologies or policy cultures are quite similar to what Thomas Kuhn and some postmodernists refer to as paradigms. Public policy analyst Zachary Smith (2000) uses the term dominant policy paradigm.

The State Centered Approach

The state centered approach focuses on the state as the fulcrum of policy change. This approach examines the impact of state structures on the relative power of social classes, the role of state resources and capacity in independently developing public policies, and the ability of state leaders in putting together coalitions to change policy. James Q. Wilson's (1989) study of state bureaucracy insists that the state is not like a ball bounced around by interest groups or economic arrangements. He argues that often state administrators originate policy change and bring together the political interests essential to produce change. Wilson uses the deregulation of the airline industry as an example. He suggests that this policy change was led by the staff within the Civil Aeronautics Board, although supported by Congress, the President and other agencies. Wilson says:

> Deregulation was not accomplished until many other actors – two presidents, other federal agencies, several senators and representatives – had played their parts; but the decisive initial steps were taken by staff members who chose to act as if their agency was not in a clientele relationship with industry (Wilson 1989, 87).

In the edited volume *Bringing the State Back In*, Skocpol cites the role of professionals, state administrators and political party leaders in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accounting for the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935. She provides an interesting summary of the state centered approach. She insists that social movements, elites, corporate leaders had little to no influence over this policy change.

Regime Model

The problem of the policy change literature is that different studies focus on different dimensions of the change process. They highlight one dimension but ignore others. Political process and decision making studies highlight the role of policy makers and interest group processes but generally ignore the positional advantage of businesses, the impact of changing power arrangement, the influence of policy paradigm and the role of the dominant class. Most studies that focus on the state and institutional actors overlook exogenous factors like inflation, demographic changes, and urbanization. They ignore factors impacting institutions and acting as a catalyst for change. NeoMarxist studies focus on structure and class struggle, but tend to overlook processes inside institutions which produce policy change. Among social movement studies, only a few look at connections between the movements outside government and the policy making inside government. Sabatier's study of social movements is the exception (Sabatier 1995). Studies of policy ideology, policy culture or policy paradigms focus on the process in which policy leaders, policy researchers and the media create new policy narratives and images and provoke policy change. They focus on the construction of policy problems and solution sets, what we call policy paradigms, but ignore the exogenous factors that enable the emergence of new policy paradigms.

A policy regime model synthesizes the literature and combines a perspective on exogenous factors with a focus on political processes. It attempts to resolve some of the problems and controversies in the literature. It proposes to offer a clearer model of policy change. We review some of the regime literature, define policy regime, develop a model of regime change, and discuss the relationship between policy regimes and the policy literature.

Regime Studies and Regime Definitions

Regime models are prominent in the international relations literature, have a small place in the urban policy literature, and are quite new to the policy literature. In the international relations literature regimes are defined various ways. Kratochwil and Ruggie (1997:32) define regimes as follows:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Regimes are broadly defined as governing arrangements constructed by states to coordinate their expectations and organize aspects of international behavior in various issue-areas. They thus comprise a normative element, state practice, and organizational roles. Examples include the trade regime, the monetary regime, the oceans regime, and others.

Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff (1997) provide a comprehensive summary of the literature on international regimes. These regimes tend to be organized around specific issue areas: trade, monetary policy, food, defense, and others. Several dimensions of an international regime emerge from the literature. First, there is an organizational dimension made up of states, social or political institutions. Second, regimes consist of mutually accepted decision-making procedures and agreed upon rules for action. Third, regimes contain shared principles, norms, and beliefs. Finally, regimes are organized around a particular issue. Regimes may be formal, the result of an established international organization; or they may be informal, loose arrangements around a common interest and involving collaboration, agreed upon organizational arrangements, goals, and principles. The main criticism of international regimes is that they are imprecise and fuzzy. There is little agreement over the boundaries of these regimes; it is unclear where one regime begins and another ends or whether there are several mini-regimes nested in a meta-regime.

A few scholars apply the regime model to the urban policy process. Clarence Stone defines an urban regime as a coalition of key individuals who work together to make things happen, 'An urban regime may thus be defined as the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions (C. Stone 1989, 6).' Marion Orr and Gerry Stoker identify an urban human capital regime. The urban regime literature focuses on the central role of state officials in forming coalitions of private and public interests to develop and implement economic development projects.

Harris and Milkis define a regulatory regime 'as a constellation of (1) new ideas justifying governmental control over business activity, (2) new institutions that structure regulatory policies, and (3) a new set of policies impinging on business (Harris and Milkis 1996, 25).' Piven and Cloward (1997) note: 'Political regimes change. As new power blocs assume control of the state, they advance an ideology about the relation between state, society, and economy, and about the social policies to ameliorate poverty.' Other studies also define a policy regime in terms of power blocs, ideology, and institutional arrangements (Esping-Anderson 1993).

Esping-Anderson, who focuses on state level regimes, identifies three

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

types of state welfare regimes based on how states differ in terms of arrangements of power, the relative power of labor, and the relationship between the state and the market: liberal welfare, corporatist, and social democratic state regimes. The liberal regime has weak labor involvement, greater business influence, a strong emphasis on private markets, and less emphasis on the public sector and social rights. The democratic socialist regime has the strongest labor involvement and a commitment to promoting equality, guaranteeing social rights and crowding markets.

Policy Regimes: Definition and Components

We draw primarily from the international and regulatory regime literature to develop a model of a policy regime. (Harris and Milkis, Esping-Anderson, and Kratochwil and Ruggie and Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff.) As in the international regime literature, policy regimes are organized around specific issue areas: environmental protection, civil rights, education, job training, flood control, meat inspection, farm prices and many others. Of course some issue areas such as environmental protection or civil rights consist of smaller areas such as clean air, clean water, hazardous waste, pesticides, education, voting rights, employment, housing, and discrimination. Policy regimes consist of four dimensions.

The first dimension is power or the arrangement of power. These arrangements entail the presence of one or more powerful interest groups supporting the policy regime. There are many different patterns of power arrangements. These arrangements may involve a single interest group, a few professional associations or groups benefiting from the policy; a few competing interest groups or coalitions; a broad base coalition with little opposition; or a few well endowed interests with little opposition. Power arrangements may involve the state as a power broker or major actor. These arrangements may involve the direct role of members of the dominant class or the position of the business sector. It may also involve a state predisposed to favor business and upper class interests because of their positional advantages (Lindblom 1978).

The second dimension is the policy paradigm. The dominant policy paradigm shapes the way problems are defined, the types of solutions offered, and the kinds of policies proposed. A paradigm is like a lens that filters information and focuses attention. It embodies particular assumptions about the policy problem – its cause, its seriousness, its pervasiveness, those responsible for creating it or ameliorating it, and the appropriate governmental response (Gusfield 1981). It contains images of the target population – those affected by the policy

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Schneider and Ingram 1993). These images influence the development of public policies. The paradigm also embodies ways of seeing, talking and defining problems, which in turn shape policy solutions. Some theorists refer to aspects of this policy paradigm as structures of interpretation or discursive structures (Danziger 1995).

Policy paradigms are constructed by researchers and intellectuals who contribute to academic discourse which shapes the definition of the policy problem; by professionals and practitioners who are directly engaged with the issue; by interest group leaders and organizations who are promoting a particular policy agenda; and by policy makers who interact with academics, professionals, practitioners, and interest group leaders. Paradigms are disseminated through the media – books, magazines, journals, newspapers, television, and radio – and in every day speech – political campaign speeches, talks and debates on the floor of congress, discussions in the White House, and conservations in the work place, taverns, classrooms, street corners and individual homes.

The third dimension is the organization within government, the policy making arrangements and the implementation structure. The policy making arrangements include leaders of congressional committees, agencies, institutions, professional associations and organized interest involved in developing and maintaining the policy. These arrangements vary from closed iron triangles to more open issue networks. The implementation structure includes the implementing agency and in some cases, state and local agencies.

The fourth dimension is the policy itself. The policy embodies the goals of the policy regime. It also entails the rules and routines of the implementing agency. These goals, rules and routines legitimize the policy.

Toward a Theory of Policy Regime Change

Every aspect of the policy regime contributes to long term stability: power, paradigm, organization, and policy. Regardless of whether the policy making process is dominated by a dominant class, professionals, grassroot groups, a strong coalition or influenced by a constellation of diverse or competing interests, long-term stable power arrangements mean long periods of incremental policy making. Power arrangements tend to be stable. Moreover, even in redistributive policy areas marred by ideological disputes or competitive paradigms and conflicts between underprivileged groups arrayed against more powerful, privileged groups; there is still a tendency to move toward stability. This tendency comes from a form of incremental policy making that emphasizes bar-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gaining and compromise. This tendency is encouraged by state actors and by the brokerage role of the state.

The establishment of organizational arrangements to implement a public policy means the incorporation of rules, regulations and routines, the adoption of an organizational culture, and the enshrinement of goals and tasks which all operate to maintain stability. All that we know about organizational theory tells us that organizations are created to reduce uncertainty, routinize practices, and achieve stability. James Q. Wilson (1989,222) insists that organizations by definition resist change and innovation. He adds, 'Resistance to innovation is all the stronger when the members of the organization are endowed with a strong sense of mission that enjoys substantial support from political superiors who supply money and authority to the agency (Wilson 222).' The establishment of an agency to implement regime policy means the hiring of new public officials and a new cadre of professionals dedicated to protecting and promoting the policy. The careers of these officials and professionals depend on the preservation of the policy regime. For example, the implementation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 – a federal compensatory educational policy – required reading and maths specialists. These specialists became strong supporters of the policy (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983). The organizational and bureaucratic literature is full of examples of public officials who become defenders and advocates of the policies they implement. The implementation process operates to sustain the policy and becomes part of the policy regime (Skocpol 1992; Esping-Anderson 1993). The compelling appeal of incremental decision making contributes further to the stability of the policy regime – the avoidance of major errors as decision makers make small tentative decisions with limited knowledge and the strong desire to reduce the anxiety, uncertainty, and unpleasantness of conflict.

The policy paradigm plays a powerful role producing long term stability. It structures perception in ways that obstruct the emergence of alternative policy definitions and policy solutions. It promotes the belief that existing arrangements are rational and natural and alternatives are irrational or impossible. It legitimizes the regime and contributes to long term stability.

Regime Change

Regime changes do not occur spontaneously. Some sort of stressor or enabler impacts the policy regime and creates conditions favorable for change. For example, in the case of the CAB, even though change was initiated by state officials, double digit inflation had impacted the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S014381 4X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regime and liberal consumer interest groups such as Ralph Nader's organization had joined with conservative anti-regulatory groups in opposing airline and trucking regulations. Conditions had become favorable for change. Regime change seems to occur in stages although these stages do not necessarily occur in the same sequence and sometimes occur simultaneously: 1) stressors/enablers, 2) paradigm shifts, 3) power shifts, 4) legitimacy crisis, and 5) organizational and policy change.

Stressors/Enablers

The first stage involves external factors impacting the policy regime. These factors either impose stress (stressors) on the regime or enable (enablers) change. They weaken policy regimes, create conditions favorable for change, or act as catalysts for change. They generate stress on organizational arrangements, underscore anomalies in the prevailing or dominant policy paradigm, or raise the visibility of new problems. They help create strategic advantages for groups promoting an alternative policy agenda. They facilitate shifts in power. They often increase the ranks of the disaffected. Sometimes they disrupt daily routines and shatter the comfort and security of the status quo. Sometimes demographic changes, like the emergence of new classes or the aging of the population, strain and weaken the policy regime. Sometimes stressors produce enough strain to stimulate a rethinking of existing arrangements and a consideration of alternatives. They provoke questions about the legitimacy of current arrangements. In some cases such as urbanization, they create the structural foundation for shifts in power or protect movements. They create possibilities and opportunities for change. They are what Cobb and Elder refer to as trigger events, what Jones calls exogenous sources of change, what Sabatier points to as external perturbations, what Ripley and Franklin refer to as scandals or disturbing revelations, and what some neoMarxists may identify as structural changes or changes in modes or relations of production. There are many types of stressors and enablers.

Stressors and enablers include international events such as the cold war, the end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet Union, trade imbalances, wars, and others. For example, the cold war impacted the old racial segregation regime by dramatizing the contradiction of the United States professing a commitment to democracy and freedom as it combats communism on the international stage, while denying African Americans the right to vote and tolerating racial oppression on the domestic stage. World War II had a similar effect as African American

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

service men returning from a war against racism abroad found racism at home.

Stressors and enablers include natural or man made disasters such as floods, hurricanes, oil spills, explosions, and others. Cobb and Elder (1983) used an explosion in a West Virginia coal mine and an oil spill off the coast of California as examples of trigger events which heighten the visibility and sensitivity of mine safety and environmental issues. The massacres at Columbine School in Littleton, Colorado heighten the visibility and sensitivity of the gun control issue.

Stressors include sudden increases in mass hardship, rapid institutional changes, breakdowns in daily routines or regulatory institutions, calamitous unemployment rates, rapid urbanization and others. The economic crisis of the great depression impacted the conservative regime of the initial third of the century, making possible the emergence of a Keynesian economic regime. The inflation and unemployment of the late 1970s enabled the deregulation of the airline and trucking industries.

Stressors include cumulative processes such as demographic changes, shifts in modes or relations of production, regional population movements, urbanization, etc. Cumulative processes may develop over a decade or more and create stress on the policy regime and underscore anomalies in the prevailing policy paradigm. One example of a cumulative process stressor is the movement of women into the work force since World War II and into traditionally male dominated positions. This process created stress in the welfare regime, as it changed the image of the role of women from people who stay home and nurture children to people who are expected to work. Of course, the popularizing of stereotypes of lazy welfare recipients dependent on government also weakened support for the Aid for Families with Dependent Children policy regime. The disintegration of the old sharecropping system contributed to the collapse of the southern racial segregation regime and created conditions more favorable for the civil rights movement and the formation of a new civil rights policy regime.

Stressors may also be new discoveries or scandals. In the early 1950s, the publication of studies demonstrating the health effects of smoking created stress on the smoking policy regimes. In the 1990s, this stress was augmented with the discovery of evidence that nicotine is addictive and that the tobacco industry had suppressed this evidence.

Another type of stress, often referred to as a spillover effect, occurs when changes in the state level regime impact both broad policy and policy level regimes. However, these impacts are sometimes uneven. Sometimes they produce substantial change in one policy area and little change in another policy area. For example, the emergence of the New

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Deal state level regime produced profound changes in labor, banking, farm, public employment, and social security policy areas but little change in the civil rights policy area. The short-lived and weak Fair Employment Practice Commission was not created until 1941 and it disappeared shortly after World War II. There were no other changes in civil rights policies within the areas of segregated public accommodations, voting rights, or housing, with the exception of a few U.S. Supreme court decisions.

Paradigm Shifts

Stressors/enablers events do not automatically change policy regimes. Rather, they create conditions which enhance the possibility of change. Stressors stimulate paradigm shifts and paradigm shifts undergrid policy regime changes. However, these paradigm shifts do not occur spontaneously. They occur when events or situations arise that are inconsistent with the dominant policy paradigm or that can be explained more persuasively by an alternative policy paradigm. Alternative paradigms may exist at the same time as the dominant paradigm. Of course, the alternative paradigm receives little attention and credibility. A paradigm shift involves a process that leads to the discrediting of the dominant paradigm and the ascension of an alternative or opposition paradigm.

There are many examples that illustrate how these policy paradigm shifts occur. Consider the smoking policy paradigm (Fritschler and Hoefler 1996). Prior to the twentieth century, there were few studies reporting on the health problems of cigarettes. The dominant paradigm indicated that smoking was innocuous and acceptable among refined people. There was some opposition to smoking on moral grounds, which gained strength with the temperance movement. The first major scientific study demonstrating an association between smoking and health hazards was published in 1939. This study attracted little media or public attention. It enjoyed little support from the scientific community and it suffered scorn and derision from the tobacco industry. It had no credibility in the public mind. Evidence of a policy paradigm shift did not occur until the early 1950s. Between 1950 and 1954, 14 studies were published linking smoking and health hazards, including one study done at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute. In 1957, four health organizations issued a report linking smoking to lung cancer. By the early 1960s the old paradigm had lost credibility and the new paradigm has gained in support and legitimacy. By 1964 the Surgeon General had issued his report on the hazards of smoking. Shortly afterwards Congress passed the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1965 which required cigarette companies to include a statement on the hazards of smoking on the labels of cigarette packages. Three factors contributed to this policy paradigm shift. First, there was a significant increase in the number of published studies operating within alternative paradigms demonstrating the health hazards of smoking. Second, these studies were accepted by reputable opinion leaders. Third, these studies received media coverage and they were publicized by key individuals and organizations.

The shift in the civil rights policy paradigm provides another example. The old southern regime denied African Americans the right to vote, segregated them in public places, barred them from white only restaurants, hotels and parks, and forced them into segregated public schools. The old dominant policy paradigm which legitimized the segregation and disenfranchisement of African Americans contained images of illiterate blacks incapable of making rational decisions; stories of blacks corrupting the political process; and images of dirty, promiscuous, threatening, and immoral blacks that rational and good people would exclude from public places. These images, stories and discourses functioned to legitimize the policy of denying blacks the right to vote and segregating them in public places. They made these racially oppressive policies seem rational, sensible and normal. The newly emerging counter paradigm contained stories of southern registrars giving literacy tests which passed white high school drop outs but failed black college graduates; stories of distinguished, well educated black celebrities and black foreign diplomats who were excluded from hotels and restaurants for no reason except their race; and stories of black soldiers fighting fascism and communism abroad and suffering the humiliation and indignities of racism at home. These stories made the southern racial system appear irrational, unjust and illegitimate. Of course, trigger events, such as viscous attacks on nonviolent civil rights workers well publicized on national television, interacted with the newly emerging alternative paradigm to delegitimization of the old southern segregation regime.

Policy paradigm shifts are signaled by a dramatic increase in media attention toward an issue, by an increase in the number of articles or books published presenting the alternative paradigm and by a change in the way policy leaders present the image of the policy or tell stories about the issue. They do not occur simply as a result of increased media attention. They occur when intellectuals construct alternative paradigms, disseminate them in professional or popular journals, capture media attention, and persuade other intellectuals of their validity. In successful paradigm shifts political leaders articulate and popularize the new paradigm. The shift is complete when the old paradigm becomes discredited and the new one becomes popular.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Legitimation Crises

The third stage in a regime change involves what Habermas (1975) would call a legitimacy crisis. Stressors or trigger events and paradigm shifts often interact to produce a legitimacy crisis. A legitimacy crisis occurs when people lose confidence in the old regime. It occurs when political leaders committed to policy change exploit stressors, challenge the rationality of the existing regime, promote an alternative paradigm and offer a different set of policy solutions. These leaders operate to expand the issue, capture media attention, raise the visibility of the issue, move the arena of conflict to other venues and to a larger audience, away from established policy communities. Leaders outside government create a legitimacy crisis when they establish popular doubt in the validity of the stories, images, and authority upon which the established policy regime is based.

Power Shifts

The fourth stage entails power shifts. There are many different ways in which power shifts occur: defection of a faction of the dominant class, rapid mobilization of a grassroot organization, the dissolution of old coalitions and the formation of new ones, the emergence of new classes and new sources of power, and consolidation among the dominant class. Power shifts also occur with changes in the role and leadership of the state, changes in the position of the president, congress or the supreme court. Many of these types of power shifts occur simultaneously. Many are precipitated or enabled by the impact of stressors and paradigm shifts. No doubt the emergence of consumer protection interests and the rapid mobilization of Ralph Nader's organization contributed to the power shift which led to the creation of the consumer product safety regime. This same mobilization contributed to the dissolution of the Civil Aeronautics Board regime. Of course, the direct role of the president and congress constituted a profound shift in power in and of itself.

Power shifts also occur as opposition groups challenging the existing regime, gain in leadership skills, knowledge and organizational resources. Leadership skills entail the ability to raise money, establish goals, articulate ideas, gain access to the media, influence public opinion, mobilize large numbers of supporters, build coalitions, create political momentum, and develop effective strategies which identify appropriate targets, expand the issue, and gain access to other and additional venues (Alinsky 1971; Fainstein and Fainstein 1974; Lipsky 1970). Leadership also involves the ability to exploit trigger events, the capab-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ility of accomplishing organizational goals, and the talent for convincing members of the possibility of change. It means, as the social movement literature indicates, persuading people that existing arrangements are no longer legitimate, rational, or inevitable and that alternative arrangements are possible and feasible.

Organization and Policy Change

The final stage in the change process involves changes in the organization of the policy implementation process and in policy goals. Substantial policy change generally involves the expansion of the decision making arena within government and the opening up of new venues of policy making. Change generally culminates in the reorganization of the policy implementation structure. This reorganization is accompanied by changes in policy goals, shifts in the policy paradigm, and changes in power arrangements.

Drawing from Hayes' (1992) model of non-incremental change, we identify four types of regime changes: 1) dissolution/recreation, 2) consolidation, 3) internal reorganization, and 4) new creation. Each of these organizational and policy goal changes was undergirded by both a power and paradigm shift.

The dissolution/recreation exemplifies the type of change that occurred with the elimination of the AEC and the creation of the NRC and the ERDA. The old AEC gave priority to promoting nuclear energy. The new NRC was given primary responsibility for safety. The dismantling of the AEC and the formation of the NRC reflected the growing power of the anti-nuclear movement and the ascension of a new, more negative image of nuclear energy. For example the old paradigm that promoted nuclear energy as cheap and safe was replaced by a new paradigm that emphasized the dangers of melt-downs and radiation leaks and the problems of disposing of nuclear waste materials. Again, a power and paradigm shift undergirded the change in policy regime.

The consolidation regime change occurs with the combination of two or more agencies or programs into one. A good example of a consolidation regime change is the creation of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) program. The program was formed out of about 16 job training, public employment, and youth employment programs of the 1960s and early 1970s. This consolidation was accompanied by changes in policy goals, policy paradigm, and power. The old regime goal of targeting the economically disadvantaged was supplanted by the new regime goal of giving local areas more discretion over the program. With the creation of CETA, power had shifted away from anti-poverty organizations toward local governments. The old paradigm

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which defined the issue as one of promoting the national goal of targeting assistance on the poor and empowering poor communities was replaced by the new policy paradigm which decried the programs of the sixties for displacing local priorities with national goals and undermining local authority by empowering radical anti-poverty leaders. Of course, the more recent Job Training Partnership Act policy regime illustrates internal reorganization regime change, as the new implementation structure now includes a central role for state government as states now have JTPA offices, as the JTPA regime gives top priority to job training and placement, and as power has shifted further from anti-poverty groups to business interests.

The passage of the Work Opportunity and Personal Responsibility Act of 1996 provides another example of internal reorganization regime change. This act turned a categorical grant program into a block grant which shifted power over this program from the national government to the states and exempted the national government from its obligation of automatically increasing funds to meet increasing state needs. The goal of the old regime of providing money, food stamps and other forms of assistance to needy families was subordinated to the goal of the new regime of getting recipients off the welfare rolls and into the job market.

The organizational and policy goal changes brought about by the Work Opportunity and Personal Responsibility Act of 1996 were undergirded by substantial shifts in power. The old anti-poverty coalition had disintegrated. The new conservative coalition had emerged to dominate the anti-poverty policy arena. The National Welfare Rights Organization had disappeared. The Welfare Warriors, active in the early 1990s, were missing in the mid 1990s. Labor had left the coalition. The Children Defense Fund, the National Organization for Women, the Center for Law and Social Policy, and a few other minor organizations were no match for the Conservative coalition, which consisted of organizations such as the Christian Coalition, the Traditional Family Values Coalition, the CATO Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Hoover Institute, the National Association of Manufactures, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Republican dominated National Governors Association and other organizations. The passage of the Work Opportunity and Personal Responsibility Act of 1996 was clearly undergirded by a profound shift in power toward the new dominant conservative coalition.

Regime changes occur when regimes become stressed, alternative policy paradigms arise, legitimacy crises occur, and shifts in power become evident. Often the process of change involves the interaction of stressors and paradigm shifts, and legitimacy crises. Political leaders

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

play a role in assaulting the existing regime, advocating the new policy paradigm, promoting policy solutions, and shepherding policy proposals through government. The policy change process is completed with the emergence of new policies, new policy goals and altered implementation arrangements.

Clean Air Policy as an Example

Let us reexamine changes in clean air policy from the perspective of the regime model. This perspective underscores the role of stressors, power shifts, paradigm changes, legitimacy crises, and organizational change. The old, pre-1979 clean air regime was dominated by industry. These industries included the Manufacturing Chemists Association, American Paper Institute, American Petroleum Institute, National Coal Association, American Mining Congress, Edison Electric Institute, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers (Esposito 1970).

The old dominant pre-1970 policy paradigm also operated to prevent the emergence of national clean air regulations. Within the context of this paradigm, it was assumed that the earth had inexhaustible resources; that this planet had an interminable frontier with unlimited space and endless capacity to repair, purify and replenish itself; and that science provided the capability to solve all human problems and the ability to control nature and pollution. Pollution was seen as an individual matter, a necessary by-product of industrial production, a small price to pay for progress, and a state and local issue, not one requiring federal intervention. National clean air policies were seen as unnecessary, excessive, and irrational.

Both the power arrangements and the policy paradigm operated to prevent the enactment of national clean air regulations. Paradigm shift, power change, stressors, legitimacy crisis all acted to produce the rise of a new policy paradigm.

Policy Paradigm Shift

Evidence of a paradigm shift emerged in 1962, with the publication of Rachel Carson's book, *Silent Spring*. This book summarized in lay language the research on the toxic and cumulative effects of organic pesticides, particularly DDT. In response to Carson's book, President Kennedy put together a special panel of experts to examine its conclusions. This panel supported Carson's conclusions and criticized the chemical industry (Carson 1956). A few years later Kenneth Boulding (1996), in his classic article, 'The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth,'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assailed most of the assumptions of the old prevailing paradigm: that the earth had inexhaustible resources, unlimited space for waste disposal, and regenerative abilities. In 1970, Ralph Nader's group published *Vanishing Air* (Esposito 1970). This study targeted automobile producers and electrical power companies as the culprits of many sources of air pollution. These studies not only attacked the old paradigm, they presented compelling evidence of a substantial environmental crisis, redefined the air pollution problem, offered alternative policy solutions, and contributed to the formation of a new environmental policy paradigm.

A number of stressors and trigger events interacted with the emergence of the new policy paradigm to act as a catalyst for change. Stressors include the strain or spillover effect of the civil rights and anti-war movement and what Vogel called the weakening political position of the business sector. The profound growth of a middle class throughout the 1950s and 1960s provided a sector that could afford to challenge air polluting industries. Also, the sons and daughters of members of this class provided recruits for the environmental movement. Trigger events include oil spills, health reports on the impacts of smog, particularly as a cause of death and illness among elderly residents; and other similar incidents were the triggering events which raised the visibility of the environmental issue and helped capture the attention of public opinion.

Power Shift and Legitimacy Crisis

A significant power shift occurred with the rapid growth and mobilization of environmentalist organizations. This growth began in the late 1960s. Membership in older organizations increased precipitously. The number of members in the Sierra Club increased tenfold from 1952 to 1969 (Switzer 1994). Membership in the Wilderness Society increased from 12,000 in 1960 to 54,000 in 1970. New more aggressive environmental organizations were established. The Environmental Defense Fund was founded in 1967, the Council on Economic Priorities in 1969. The Center for Science in the Public Interest, Citizens for a Better Environment, Environmental Action, Friends of the Earth, the League of Conservative Voters, and the National Resource Defense were all created a year later (Switzer 1994).

The rapid growth of these organizations were part of an environmental social movement. This movement involved teach-ins, Earth Day celebrations, and demonstrations. It raised the visibility of environmental issues and promoted the new environmental paradigm. It changed public thinking over environmental issues. According to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gallup polls, environmental issues were not mentioned as problems between 1967 and 1969 (Switzer 1994). In the spring of 1970, American polls indicated that the environment was ranked as the second most critical problem and was considered an important issue by well over 50 percent of respondents (Switzer). Most importantly, this movement raised the saliency of the new policy paradigm and shifted power in favor of environmentalists. (Vogel 1989). This paradigm and power shift defined a legitimacy crisis of the old clean air regime. This crisis and shift in paradigm, power and public opinion explained changes in the role of the president and key congressional leaders. These leaders, who once opposed more aggressive environmental policies, suddenly became environmentalists. President Nixon and Senator Muskie, initially reluctant to support more expansive environmental policies, fought to upstage each other with the most aggressive legislation.

The enactment of the Clean Air Act of 1970 and the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) signaled the creation of the new clean air regime. This creation was undergirded by the emergence of a new policy paradigm and new organizational arrangements. This agency was formed by consolidating responsibilities and personnel from about 13 different agencies such as the Department of Interior, Health, Education and Welfare, and Agriculture. It acquired new authority, new responsibilities, and new personnel. It established the specific policy goals of reducing automobile emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides by 90 percent. This policy, along with the new policy paradigm and new organizational arrangements, formed the clean air policy regime.

In the early 1980s, the Reagan administration assaulted this regime on several fronts. This administration recruited people from polluting industries hostile to EPA regulations, cut the EPA budget, subjected new regulations to cost benefit analysis, and targeted specific regulations for elimination (Tolchin and Tolchin 1983; Landy, Roberts and Thomas 1994). Despite this assaults, environmentalists reemerged and formed the National Clean Air Coalition to lobby for stronger clean air legislation. Members of this coalition included the Sierra Club, the Environmental Defense Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, the Audubon Society, the American Lung Association, the National Resources Defense Council, church groups and labor unions, particularly the United Steelworkers Union (Bryner 1993, 86). As a result of their efforts many of the anti-environmental administrators were removed, many budget cuts restored, and many environmental polices were even stronger. The EPA issued more automobile emissions regulations, eventually removing lead from gasoline. Congress passed the Clean Air Act of 1990 which addressed the problem of acid rain more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

directly than previous legislation; imposed stricter emission standards for new motor vehicles; targeted electric generating power plants, requiring them to reduce the emission of sulfur dioxide by 10 million tons per year and nitrogen oxide by 2 million tons per year; and phased out the production of ozone depleting chemicals (Bryner 1993). Two factors explain the stability of clean air policy: the powerful environmental coalition and the dominant environmental paradigm. This coalition mobilized against the Reagan administration. The presence of the dominant paradigm explains continual public opinion in support of clean air policy and opposition to Reagan's assaults.

The Regime Model and Public Policy Literature

The policy regime model offers an explanation for long term policy stability and short term change. The power, paradigm and organizational dimensions of the policy regime contribute to both stability and change. Stable power arrangements, dominant policy paradigms, organizational arrangements, and public officials and policy makers dependent on the regime all operate to maintain policy stability. Substantial policy change occurs when regimes are impacted by stressors. These stressors have the potential for demonstrating anomalies in the dominant policy paradigm, enabling shifts in power, and creating legitimacy crises. Regime changes occur with the shifting of power alignments, the discrediting of dominant paradigms, the ascension of alternative paradigms, the formation of new organizational arrangements, and the setting of new policy goals. The regime model draws from the policy literature and synthesizes several models of policy change. Although it rejects some models, it offers to resolve some of the controversies in the policy literature.

Policy-process and agenda-building

The regime model draws from the policy process, agenda-building, and group theory literature which focuses on the dynamics of political processes and policy-actors. It incorporates the role of interest groups, trigger events, agenda-building and institutional arrangements. However, the regime model differs from these theories insofar as the regime model acknowledges the upper class bias of the pluralist model of policy change and the impacts of systemic stressors.

NeoMarxists

The regime model adopts the notions of changes in modes and relations of production and contradictions of capitalism as important systemic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stressors ignored by the traditional institutional and political process literature. Moreover, the regime model incorporates the neoMarxists notion of dominant ideology and ideological conflict in its notion of policy paradigms. The policy paradigm is analogous to the Marxist notion of ideology, except that the concept of a policy paradigm is more narrowly focused than the Marxist notion of ideology, which sometimes encompasses the culture of the entire society. The regime model accepts the Marxist notion of class conflict and explains shifts of power in terms of the tensions between labor and capital. This model also recognizes systematic bias in favor of the dominant class, the positional advantage of the business sector, and the constraints of economic arrangements and the contradictions of capitalist production. Of course, Marxist models tend to be lean when it comes to internal government organization, patterns of policy making and implementation structure, concepts derived from traditional, institutional and political process literature.

Baumgartner and Jones

Whereas we borrow much from Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones, there are some important differences. They, especially Jones, explain policy change in terms of shifts in the focus of attention and changes in policy images. We define these shifts in attention and changes in policy images as policy paradigm shifts. These paradigm shifts are accompanied by changes in the way policy problems are defined and the types of policy solutions presented. Policy paradigm shifts are an integral part of policy regime changes.

Bryan Jones suggests that changes in public opinion affect shifts in the focus of the attention of policy makers, even though their priorities and ideas remain the same. The policy regime model suggests that public officials shift their position in response to paradigm shifts, as the alternative paradigm presents a different policy image and focuses attention on different sets of factors and offers different sets of policy solutions. Moreover, policy makers inside government often change their position in anticipation of the next election and the real possibility that an opponent will make an issue of how they voted (Mayhew 1974).

Advocacy Coalition Framework

There are similarities between the regime model and the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). External coalition perturbations are policy regime stressors. The ACF notion is that shared normative and causal beliefs are policy regime paradigms, except that the concept of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a paradigm serves broader functions in maintaining and changing policies. The ACF and the policy regime model require a time span for study of more than a decade. Whereas, ACF attributes some policy changes to policy learning, the regime model suggests that what appears to be learning is often a paradigm shift. Frank Fischer (1995) demonstrates the role of paradigms in policy evaluation research.

State Centered Approach

The policy regime model rejects the state centred approach as too narrow, because it ignores the role of stressors, completely disregards relations of power, discounts social movements and excludes the function of ideas or paradigms. The ACF, social movement, and pluralist approaches reject the state centered view.

Weakness of Regime Model

The strength of the regime model is in its simplicity and its eclectic approach. Policy regime models suffer from the same weaknesses as international regime models. Their boundaries and definitions are fuzzy. It is not clear where state regimes, policy regimes, and sub-policy regimes begin or end. The picture of a policy regime is still murky. Despite our effort at developing a concise definition, there is little agreement in the literature on a definition. The model simplifies explanations of policy stability and change. It reduces these explanations to a few factors: stressors and the dimensions of the regime – power, organization, and paradigm. The utility of the model is in its ability to synthesize a broad literature and resolve some issues.

REFERENCES

Alinsky, Saul, *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971).

Baumgartner, Frank R. and Bryan D. Jones, *Agendas and Instability in American Politics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993).

Bloom, Jack, *Class, Race and the Civil Rights Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).

Boggs, Carl, *The Two Revolutions: Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism* (Boston: South End Press, 1984).

Boulding, Kenneth, 'The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth' in Henry Jarret edited *Environmental Quality in a Growing Economy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966).

Bryner, Gary C., *Blue Skies, Green Politics: The Clean Air Act of 1990* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1993).

Bullock Charles S. III and Charles M. Lamb, *Implementation of Civil Rights Policy* (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1984).

Carson, Rachel, *Silent Spring* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1956).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cobb, Roger W. and Charles Elder, *Participation in American politics: the Dynamics of Agenda Building* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983).
Congressional Information Service Annual Index 1997; United States House of Representatives Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee 1994.
Crenson, Matthew, *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971).
Danziger, Marie, 'Policy Analysis Postmodernised: Some Political and Pedagogical Ramifications' *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 1995 (435–450).
Domhoff, William, *State Autonomy or Class Domination* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1996).
Domhoff, William, *Who Rules America: Power and Politics in the Year 2000* (Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Co. 1998).
Doughterty, James and Robert Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey* (New York: Longman, 1997).
Downs, Anthony, *Inside Bureaucracy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967).
Esping-Anderson, Gosta, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
Esposito, John C., *Vanishing Air: Ralph Nader's Study Group Report on Air Pollution* (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1970).
Fainstein, Norman I. and Susan S. Fainstein, *Urban Political Movements: The Search for Power by Minority Groups in American Cities* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974).
Fischer, Frank, *Evaluating Public Policy* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1995).
Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1991).
Fritschler, A. Lee and James M. Hoefler, *Smoking and Politics: Policy Making and the Federal Bureaucracy* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1996).
Glasberg, Davita S. and Dan Skidmore, *Corporate Welfare Policy and the Welfare State: Bank Deregulation and the Savings and Loan Bailout* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997).
Gramsci, Antonio, edited and translated by Guintin Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: International Publishers, 1980).
Gusfield, Joseph, *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking, Driving and Symbolic Order* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
Habermas, Jurgen, *Legitimation Crisis* (Boston: Beacon, 1975).
Harris, Richard A. and Sidney M. Milkis, *The Politics of Regulatory Change: A Tale of Two Agencies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
Hayes, Michael, *Incrementalism and Public Policy* (New York: Longman, 1992).
Heclo, Hugh, 'Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment' in Richard J. Stillman II edited, *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992).
Jessop, Bob, *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*. (New York: New York University Press, 1982.)
Jones, Bryan, *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
Jones, Charles O., 'Speculative Augmentation in Federal Air Pollution Policy-Making' in James E. Anderson edited, *Cases in Public Policy-Making* (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1976).
Kingdon, John W., *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1984).
Kratochwil, Friedrich and John G. Ruggie, 'International Organization: The State of the Art' in Paul F. Diehl edited *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World*. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1997.)
Landy, Marc K., Marc J. Roberts and Stephen R. Thomas, *The Environmental Protection Agency: Asking the Wrong Questions From Nixon to Clinton* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
Lindblom, Charles E., *Politics and Markets: The World's Political-Economic Systems* (New York: Basic Books, 1978).
Lipsky, Michael, *Protest in City Politics: Rent Strikes, Housing and the Power of the Poor* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970).
Lowi, Theodore, *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979).
Mayhew, David, Congress: The Electoral Connection. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
Mazmanian, Daniel A. and Paul A. Sabatier, *Implementation and Public Policy* (Greenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1983).
Miliband, Ralph, *The State in Capitalist Society: An Analysis of the Western System of Power* (New York: Basic Books, 1969).
Murray, Charles, *Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1950–1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press

O'Connor, James, *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1973).
Offe, Claus, *The Contradictions of the Welfare State* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1984).
Pierson, Christopher. *Beyond the Welfare State: The New Political Economy of Welfare*. (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.)
Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward, *The Breaking of the American Social Compact* (New York: The New Press, 1997, 243).
Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971).
Poulantzas, Nicos, *State, Power, Socialism* (London: NewLeft Books, 1978).
Ripley, Randall B. and Grace A. Franklin, *Congress, the Bureaucracy, and Public Policy* (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1980).
Rochefort, David and Roger Cobb, *The Politics of Problem Definition* (Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas Press, 1994).
Sabatier, Paul, 'An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein' in Daniel C. McCool edited, *Public Policy Theories, Models, and Concepts* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995, 340).
Sabatier, Paul, 'The Advocacy Coalition Approach' in Paul Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith edited, *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach.* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1993.)
Schattschneider, E.E., *The Semisovereign People* (Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1963.)
Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram, 'Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy,' *American Political Science Review* vol. 87, No. 2, June 1993.
Schram, Sandford, *Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and the Social Science of Poverty* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1995).
Sidel, Ruth, *Keeping Women and Children Last: America's War on the Poor* (New York: Penguin Books, 1996, 53).
Skocpol, Theda, 'Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research' in Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol edited, *Bringing the State Back In*. (New York: Cambridge University Press 1985.)
Skocpol, Theda, 'Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal' *Politics and Society* vol. 10, 1980, 155–201.
Skocpol, Theda, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).
Smith, Zachary, *The Environmental Policy Paradox*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2000).
Stone, Clarence N., *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946–1988* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1989).
Stone, Deborah A., *Policy Paradox and Political Reason* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown College Division, 1988).
Switzer, Jacqueline V., *Environmental Politics: Domestic and Global Dimensions* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994).
Tolchin, Susan J. and Martin Tolchin, *Dismantling America: The Rush to Deregulate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).
Truman, David, *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971).
Vig, Norman J., 'The President and the Environment: Revolution or Retreat?' in Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, *Environmental Policy in the 1980s: Reagan's New Agenda* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1984).
Vogel, David, *Fluctuating Fortunes: The Political Power of Business in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1989).
Wilson, James Q., *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.* (New York: Basic Books, 1989.)

CARTER A. WILSON
Political Science
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
Fax: 419-530-4199
e-mail: neuhau@utnet.utoledo.net

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00000842 Published online by Cambridge University Press