As Francis Fukuyama (2004) notes, weak or failed states are the source of many of the world's most serious problems, and so state-building and the reconstruction of failed states is one of the major challenges of our time. This recent imperative towards public sector reform follows on the heels of the movement in the 1980s and 1990s among the OECD countries to introduce "new public management" (NPM – generally leaner public organizations coupled with a greater reliance on market mechanisms for service delivery), efforts to rebuild central and Eastern communism's collapse, and the growing realization in the technical assistance community that institutions mattered, and that economic growth depended as much on competent public administration as it did on market liberalization.

Why and how did modernizing government through public sector reform become a global movement? Four hypotheses will guide the research. The first is that the movement can be explained by the emergence of a global network of institutions and organizations, governmental, inter-governmental and non-governmental, collectively dedicated to public sector reform. The network facilitates the flow of ideas, debates, models, and practices around the world. Second, while there are strong pressures towards developing standards or best practices, the network is marked by divergent and disparate views as well, depending on the interests of organizations and the nature of network collaboration and competition. Third, the flow of ideas is facilitated by a range of different instruments, from naming and shaming (e.g., Transparency International), to discussion fora and reports (e.g., OECD), to tied aid in technical assistance (e.g., World Bank). Fourth, actual public sector reform projects involve a dense interaction among members of the network in specific sites.

The research will make several contributions. It will help us better understand the dynamics of public sector reform efforts, the instruments used by different organizations, and the reasons why they do or do not work. To date, the focus has been on single country studies, or comparative analyses; the impact and effect of global networks dedicated to public sector modernization has been occasionally noted, but never explored in depth. The work should have strong practical implications for the development and technical assistance policy communities. Another contribution will be to the literature on policy transfer, learning and diffusion. As noted in the detailed description that follows, that general literature has only very recently begun to examine international governmental organizations and global policy networks. This would be among the first examinations of the global network around modernizing public management. The project will also closely examine the instruments used by different organizations to effect policy and governance change. Of particular interest is the emerging emphasis on governance indicators and standards of "good governance."

As well, the research will draw an emerging literature on complexity and network theory, and use it as a heuristic to study the nature of the network as a network – to date, the work on global networks has used the term largely as a descriptor, without drawing out the implications of network dynamics as seen in complexity theory. Finally, it will explore two case studies in depth (Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Georgia) to provide a microanalysis of how the network operates on the ground in terms of dynamics of cooperation and competition. This will introduce an important element of "multi-scale" analysis – capturing global network dynamics as well as their expression at the local level.

The project will emphasize research training at an advanced level for a number of doctoral students over the three year period: questionnaire design, supervised interviews, database development, and literature searches using advanced electronic tools. The strategy for the communication of results will involve a project web page, conference papers, refereed articles, and ultimately, the submission of a manuscript to a peer-reviewed publisher.

Objectives

This research program aims to explain how public sector reform and "modernization" became so widespread in the past decade. In contrast to theories of policy transfer, learning or diffusion (see below), that focus on intra-state factors, the core hypothesis here is that this movement can be explained by the emergence of a global network of institutions and organizations, governmental, inter-governmental and non-governmental, collectively dedicated to public sector reform. Another key objective is to explain how the network influences public sector reform, its specific techniques and instruments. Key, contestable hypotheses are that various instruments are used by different organizations (e.g., shaming v. tied aid), that organizations have their own preferences and approaches, and that while there are central tendencies in the movement, it is also marked by debates and diversity that need to be mediated in various ways.

One of the key themes in the public policy and public management literatures in the last two decades has been the spread of NPM, and more generally "modernized government", throughout the world. Past research has focused on what the content of NPM actually is, whether there are varying models, how successfully NPM has been transferred from one political system to another, how thorough that transfer has been and how well it has become embedded in state policy and administrative systems. With the exception of a specialized literature on public sector reform in central and Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Soviet Union, which necessarily had to take account of international actors in the reform process, the work on the policy transfer of governance ideas overwhelmingly focused on the dynamics of transfer and take-up within single states, or conceptualized the transfer in terms of bilateral exchanges (e.g., "exporting the New Zealand model"). In the last five years, as part of a more serious consideration of globalization, there has been increasing interest in the role of international actors, principally international governmental organizations (IGOs) such as the World Bank, the OECD, and the EU in encouraging or pressuring states to adopt a reform agenda. To date the research has been largely anecdotal and atheoretical. This research will remedy that by conducting a thorough analysis of the global network of key public sector reform agents, what ideas and agendas they champion, how those ideas and agendas clash and articulate, and how they are implemented. While several theoretical frameworks will be marshalled for the research (see below), the project will draw on the new and exciting field of complexity and network theory to explore the dynamics of the network as a network (for example, that the importance of network nodes can be distinguished in terms of their links; that the strength of the network actually depends on cultivating weak ties).

In addition to explaining the modernizing government movement and its dynamics, the research will produce policy relevant insights into the process of overseas technical assistance and governmental reform projects. Two case studies will be used to test theoretical propositions, explore how global networks operate in local circumstances, and will yield practical insights into technical assistance programs.

Context

"Modernizing government" has gone from the occasional, isolated spasm of reform to a perpetual, insistent, and coordinated global process involving both developed and especially developing and "transitional" countries. The OECD's most recent review of "modernizing government" clearly sees it as a journey without end, with new lessons to be applied and renewed energies devoted to the task (OECD, 2005). Administrative and policy reform is not new, with the modernization of Japan after the Meiji restoration as perhaps the most dramatic example in recent times (Westney, 1987), and students of public policy and administration have always paid attention to reform cycles extending back to the

Progressive movement (Hofstader, 1963) and civil service reforms in the early 20th century (Roberts, 1996). What is new in the last quarter century, however, is how the reform process has become multinational, and in recent years, global. Several somewhat isolated strands of literature have tried to come to grips with these developments.

The first is the literature on democratic transition that accompanied the shift of US foreign policy from anti-communism to democracy promotion with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 (Carothers, 1996, 2002; Perlin, 2003). Until the mid-1990s, that literature was preoccupied with the internal drivers of transition (Cox, 1993; Elster et al., 1998; Schmitter, 1996), but increasingly took account of international organizations and pressures (Cooley, 2003; Dawisha, 1997; Deacon and Hulse, 1997; Deacon, 1997; Deacon et al, 2003; Linden, 2002; Meaney, 1995; Nello, 2001; Smith, 2001; Wedel, 1998; Whitehead, 1996). This paralleled a shift in emphasis in technical assistance to the region from economic liberalization (Pickel and Wiesenthal, 1997) to state structures (World Bank, 1997). This democratization literature concentrated on formal democratic institutions (elections, political parties, parliament, civil society), though some attention was paid to administration reform (Agh, 1997, 2001, 2003; Hesse, 1993; Nunberg, 1999). As former communist states seek and achieve accession to the EU, the transition and democratization literature has evolved into a literature on Europeanization (Brusis, 2002; Goetz, 2001; Grabbe, 2001; Meny, Muller and Quermonne, 1996).

A second body of literature has focused explicitly on administrative reform and the NPM movement (Aucoin, 1995; Barzelay, 1992, 2001; Bevir, Rhodes, and Weller, 2003; Christensen and Laegreid, 2002; Hood, 1996; Kernaghan, 2000; Lane, 2000; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Peters, 2001). The extent of modern administrative reform and reorganization has been called "unprecedented" (Peters and Pierre, 2001, p.1), and described as a "global management revolution" (Kettl, 2005). The literature has been preoccupied with describing changes in single countries such as New Zealand (Boston, 1996; Boston et al., 1999) or the Anglo-democracies (Savoie, 1994), and more rarely in comparative terms (Aucoin, 1995; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000). The consensus is that despite some convergence, there remains substantial diversity (Olsen and Peters, 1996; Peters and Pierre, 2001; Pollitt, 2001; Premfors, 1998; Wise, 2002). Most of this literature is functionalist and rooted in a modernization paradigm (Lynn Jr., 2001), though there are references to the role of international organizations such as the OECD and the World Bank (Hood, 1998; Farazmand, 2004). In short, this literature has described the global management revolution, but has failed to explain it.

This oversight can in part be remedied by turning to the literature on policy learning and policy transfer. Early efforts focused on diffusion among American states (Walker, 1969; Collier and Messick, 1975; Eyestone, 1977), but cross-national borrowing drew scholarly attention in the 1990s (Bennett, 1991; Wolman, 1992). While there are different patterns of diffusion (Bennett, 1997), the role of IGOs has emerged as a key factor (Dolowitiz and Marsh, 1996, 2000; Drezner, 2001). In a rare crossover among literatures, Jackoby (2001) relies on policy transfer theory to make sense of imitative policy practices among central European elites as they copy western models, and also highlights the importance of international organizations.

This leads to a fourth, international relations literature on the growing importance of IGOs and transnational policy networks. This literature is relatively new as well, with Risse-Kappen (1995, p. 31) noting only a decade ago that work on the interaction between international norms and institutions and domestic politics was only beginning. It reflected a new interest in the international spread of ideas through epistemic communities (Haas, 1992), discourse coalitions (Hajer, 1997; Risse-Kappen, 1994) and transnational advocacy networks (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). IGOs are now seen as vehicles for the spread of international norms (Finnemore, 1993), with their own agendas and power bases distinct from the states that comprise them (Barnett and Finnemore, 1999). Work on global policy networks takes

these insights one step further in arguing that contemporary public policy is increasingly influenced by loose coalitions of government agencies, IGOs, corporations, NGOs, professional associations, and others (Ougaard and Higgott, 2002; Reinicke, 1999; Stone, 2004).

While each of these literatures contributes to our understanding of the global public management movement, each has its limitations. The transition literature has been eclipsed by the Europeanization process; the NPM literature is largely descriptive and atheoretical; the policy transfer literature is promising, but has paid little attention to the public management movement as a whole. The global policy networks literature is the most promising in that it combines the strengths of the others in a wider framework. However, I have found almost no research in this field on the wider policy and management reform movement, despite its growing importance in connection with state-building, democratization and development (Easterley, 2001; Fukuyama, 2004; Prezworski et al., 2000; Pritchett and Woolcock, 2002). Hansen et al. (2002) do explicitly address what they call "transnational discourse communities" around NPM (the complex of UN agencies, the OECD and affiliated institutions, and professional organizations of academics and practitioners), but they focus on local government reform. Sahlin-Andersson (1996, 2000, 2001; Dejlic and Sahlin-Adersson, 2006) has focused on governance policy transfer through the OECD, using the concept of "editing" to capture how models and templates are adopted and implemented. Slaughter (2000, 2004a, 2004b) has examined transnational governmental networks, but she ignores nongovernmental actors. There is work, of course, on individual IGOs, most notably the World Bank (e.g., Beeson, 2001; Chhibber, Peters and Yale, 2006; Chang, 2001; Fine and Van Waeyenberge, 2005; George and Sabellie, 1994; Gilbert and Vines, 2000; Paloni and Zanardi, 2006; Pincus and Winters, 2002; Stiglitz, 2003; St. Clair, 2006; Wallich, 1995; Weaver and Leiteritz, 2005). However, even an institution as important as the OECD is just beginning to be examined systematically (Woodward, 2004, forthcoming). In short, it is time for a systematic analysis of global policy networks around public sector reform and "modernization." Work on this is spotty at best. Existing studies of IGOs have tended to focus on the World Bank and the IMF, but in terms of their economic policies rather than their governance agendas. Moreover, no one to my knowledge has attempted to map the key actors, study their interactions and dynamics, and analyze the mechanisms that they collectively use to coordinate governance on a global level (though the World Bank, for example, has periodically reflected on its public sector reform agenda; see Nunberg, 1990; Nunberg and Ellis, 1995; World Bank and IMF, 2001).

This project will extend and deepen several strands of research that I have been conducting over the years. State structures and institutions were a prominent theme in *State, Class and Bureaucracy* (1988), which I revisited in *Interests of State* (1993), and more recently in *The Government Taketh Away* (2003). I realized the growing importance of international influences on domestic policy as early as 1991 in research on continental integration (Pal, 1991), and followed that up with work on the interface of international and domestic politics in Canada (Doern, Pal and Tomlin, 1996). My sense that state institutions were being challenged by new communications technologies, and especially by new networks that spanned geographic boundaries, led me to research the impact of those technologies on political mobilization (Alexander and Pal 1998; Pal 1999). My most recent research has been on the global governance of the internet (Pal and Teplova, 2004; Pal, forthcoming), in which I studied the challenges for states in a new world of global governance. My most recent writing on public policy analysis, in *Beyond Policy Analysis* (2006a), has prominently included discussions of globalization and its impact on public policy dynamics. The current proposal would bring these various strands together in an integrated examination of state formation and governance in an era of globalization.

The research will draw on the bodies of literature discussed above, but the guiding heuristic will be drawn from the new and exciting work underway in complexity and network theory (Barabasi, 2002;

Buchanan, 2002; McNutt, 2006; Taylor, 2001; Thompson, 2004; Urry, 2003, 2004; Watts, 1999, 2003). This work has a natural affinity with the global policy network theory discussed above, but that literature uses the term "network" simply as a descriptive term to capture complex interactions of state and non-state actors in a global public policy space. Complexity and network theory proper actually takes the nature of networks seriously, and presumes that networks have properties and characteristics that govern to some extent the way that they are shaped and behave (the best known example is the "small worlds" phenomenon, now understood in terms of a combination of clustered and random connectors; see Watts, 2003). The contemporary version of complexity theory is grounded in the mathematics of graphs, but there were precursors in the social sciences, for example in the pioneering work of Granovetter (1973, 1983) and Milgram (1967). The most sweeping example of network theory in the social sciences is probably Castells's analysis of the information age (2000a, 2000b, 2004a). Though Castells draws less on formal complexity and network theory than he does on the exemplar of the Internet (2004b), his general approach is consistent with that theory.

Using network theory as a heuristic offers several advantages and insights. First, in contrast to the prevailing view that the network is made up of "actors," it is the network itself that is the "new form of subject." The global public management network consists of IGOs, professional associations, foundations, think tanks, and NGOs and it is the emergent properties of their connections that form a networked substructure that itself becomes a part of the global governance system. As Scholte (2005: 140) has noted, globalization "could not unfold without governance arrangements that promote the process." Policy models about "modern governance" flow through the nodes of the network – OECD conferences and reports, professional gatherings and publications, transnational advocacy around gender equality or transparency, World Bank poverty reduction programs and accompanying conditionalities, foundation support for public sector reform – while there are evidently agents in the network, the network itself is unguided. Second, much of the literature is preoccupied with the degrees of transfer and emulation of external models. A network perspective suggests that this is the wrong question – there will always be diversity in adoption. The critical point is the constant exchange and degree of activity or connection in the networks (even the OECD celebrates the diversity in the modernizing government movement; OECD, 2005). Third, this global network should display the elements of randomness that underpin the small world phenomenon (Freyberg-Inan, 2006), and help explain how a far-flung global network can actually be clustered and inter-connected at the same time. If the global network is "scale free" (where a small number of nodes have a large number of connections) it can help us trace the movement of ideas through the network (e.g., if one influential organization like the World Bank makes a reform proposal, it filters rapidly through the network). Finally, Castells' notion of "codes" that define networks fits nicely with the literature on standardization (Brunsson and Jackobsson, 2000; Mattli, 2001; Mattli and Buthe, 2003). While to my knowledge only Sahlin-Andersson has seriously explored public management reform as a process of standardization, the idea holds enormous promise. ISO 9000 ("Quality Management Principles"), for example, while targeted at the private sector, is promoted as a "generic" standard that applies to public management as well. There are dozens of "good governance" indicators that are increasingly used by IGOs and business risk analysts to gauge the quality of public management in given countries (Arndt and Oman, 2006). This is nothing less than a process of attempted standardization through global public sector management reform networks.

Methodology

The research program would consist of four distinct but connected strands of empirical research. The first is the actual mapping of the global public management reform network – IGOs such as the World Bank, the OECD, the EU (e.g., SIGMA and PHARE programs), the UNDP, Asia Development

Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, etc.; governance oriented foundations such as the Soros network and Eurasia; bilateral technical assistance around governance and management modernization (e.g., CIDA, USAID, SIDA); governance oriented advocacy organizations such as Transparency International and Freedom House; think tanks, prominent universities and university networks (e.g., AUCC); international professional association such as the IIAS, and consultancies. To make it manageable, only organizations focused on the six system reform dimensions as outlined by the OECD (2005) would be included (open government, performance, accountability, restructuring, market mechanisms, and public employment). A guiding and testable hypothesis behind the exercise would be that like typical networks, this one would display clusters as well as "attractors" (nodes with a disproportionate number of links, likely the World Bank or Soros). Another hypothesis is that rather than convergence, the network displays increasing complexity and diversity, and it is the flows of information and interconnection among nodes in the network that gives it its strength.

A second strand would be to closely examine the distinct agendas, foci, and techniques of dissemination and interaction among the nodes. This is almost absent from the literature, but as a mechanism underpinning the "global management revolution" is of central importance. The World Bank coordinates with the IMF and the OECD, which works with Transparency International, which interacts with the Open Society Institute. Understanding the "loose couplings" of the different nodes in the network is central to understanding the network's increasing density and resilience, as well as some of its instabilities. This would be explored through network analysis (e.g., joint conferences, donor coordination committees), but also though interviews with knowledgeable insiders and officials. Semi-structured interviews would ask about organizational interaction, coordination, competition, distinct views and approaches, priorities, techniques of intervention, dynamics between the network and targeted recipients of aid/advice. I have done some of these types of interviews in Tbilisi and Moscow, and the results show both divergent approaches among the different organizations (I interviewed World Bank and UNDP personnel), but also some competition (each organization has its own reform agenda) as well as attempts at coordination (the World Bank donor coordination group is extremely sophisticated).

A third strand would focus on the process of governance standardization: the development of principles and norms, emergent models of "best practice," and the nature and increasing use of governance indicators (the World Bank Institute estimates that there are over 140 such indicator instruments; for example, Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index, the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutions Assessment, and most prominently the KKZ index; see Landman and Hausermann, 2003). Governance indicators are becoming important in a variety of ways. They are tools of "soft power" that increasingly can be used to name and shame governments in the face of global public opinion, and development assistance and aid, as well as private sector investment, are increasingly tied to measures of governance performance. Depending on circumstances and vulnerabilities, this exposes some states to strong pressures by international agencies and donor countries to adopt (or at least appear to adopt) the institutions and practices of "modern" government.

A final strand of the research would consist of two country case studies: Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), and Georgia. Case studies "on the ground" are crucial to understanding how the global network operates in practice, how its different nodes or members connect in specific sites, and compete and cooperate. What instruments do they use, what agendas do they pursue, and how does the global flow of policy models and reform initiatives get projected into specific sites, and how are those sites then drawn into the network? These countries were selected for theory driven and research reasons, supplemented by pragmatic considerations. Both countries have geo-political strategic significance for the West, which makes them disproportionately important nodes for the global governance network, with all of the significant players present and active. They are both dependent on aid and technical assistance, and so

are "open connectors" for the network. BiH is a post-conflict zone, while Georgia is on the fault lines of a crucial oil region as well as former Soviet aspirations. They are not "representative" cases in a statistical sense, but meet the standard of significant illustrations as part of the case study method (Pal, 2005). The pragmatic reasons are that I have been involved in both countries for several years in CIDA-funded governance projects, know many of the key actors personally, can confidently draw on resources (e.g., interviewers), and will continue working in them over the next two years, thus saving significantly on travel costs. I believe that this unique access will be tremendously helpful in conducting interviews and mapping activities, and indeed I have done some of this in the past year and begun to present my findings (Pal, 2006b; Pal, 2006c). I am confident that I can nonetheless maintain the objectivity and distance required by a researcher.

Most of the data required to answer these questions will be in published form – scholarly articles, organizations' reports and publications, web sites, and newspapers. This will be supplemented by interviews in Ottawa, Washington, Paris, Sarajevo and Tbilisi. Travel costs can be minimized due to the fact that I will be travelling to the region on other projects at least twice in the next two years. Accordingly most of the SSHRC funding will be used to support graduate students in conducting the detailed network mapping and analysis, as well as one interviewer in each of the countries in the second and third years of the project. Generally speaking there are no language barriers since almost all members of governance-oriented organizations in the three countries speak English or French, but local interviewers will be helpful in case there are impediments. They can also administer a standardized questionnaire with a wider range of interviewees than I might, given time constraints.

Communication of Results

The results of this research will be of interest to both scholars and practitioners. The scholarly contribution will be in the application of complexity and network theory to a new but promising domain, as well a rigorous analysis of the global public sector reform network. Interested policy communities will include: the governance IGOs themselves; the management reform policy communities in each of the case study countries; and those interested in the challenges of technical assistance (Lindquist, 2001). I will develop a website for the project, which given the large amount of data to be gathered, will be an ideal vehicle to communicate findings. I will hire two doctoral students per year for the project, and will encourage them to use the research findings in their dissertation research, as well as co-publish. I will publish peer-reviewed articles in several different disciplinary journals, since the topic touches on public policy, international relations, globalization, and public management. Presentations of research results will be made to scholarly conferences as well as to practitioners here in Canada, the case study countries, and potentially through the Soros network of foundations (I am a Senior Teaching Fellow with the Open Society Institute and International Policy Fellowship program in Budapest/Central European University). The final results of the project will be published in a peer-reviewed book on global public sector reform and modernization.

REFERENCES

Àgh, Atilla (1997). The Actors of Systemic Change: The Political Context of Public Sector Reform in Central Europe. Discussion Paper No. 19, European Centre for Comparative Government and Public Policy (Berlin).

Àgh, Attila (2001). Public Sector Reforms, Institutional Design and Strategy for Good Governance in East Central Europe. *Studies in East European Thought* 53 (3): 233-255.

Àgh, Attila (2003). Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe. In Jon Pierre and B. Guy Peters, eds., *Handbook of Public Administration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Alexander, Cynthia J. and Leslie A. Pal (Eds.) (1998). *Digital Democracy: Policy and Politics in the Wired World.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Arndt, Christiane and Charles Oman (2006). *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators*. Paris: OECD.

Aucoin, Peter (1995). *The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective.* Montréal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Barabasi, Albert-Laszlo (2002). *Linked: The New Science of Networks*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Barnett, Michael N. and Martha Finnemore (1999). The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization* 53 (4): 699-732.

Barzelay, Michael (1992). *Breaking through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing Government*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Barzelay, Michael (2001). *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Beeson, Mark (2001). Globalization, Governance, and the Political-Economy of Public Policy Reform in East Asia. *Governance* 14 (4): 481-502.

Bennett, Colin J. (1991). What is Policy Convergence and What Causes It? *British Journal of Political Science* 21: 215-233.

Bennett, Colin J. (1997). Understanding Ripple Effects: The Cross-National Adoption of Policy Instruments for Bureaucratic Accountability." *Governance* 10: 213-233.

Bevir, Mark, R.A.W. Rhodes, and Patrick Weller (2003). Traditions of Governance: Interpreting the Changing Role of the State. *Public Administration* 81:1-17.

Boston, J. et al. (1996). *Public Management: The New Zealand Model*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Boston, Jonathan, Paul Dalziel, and Susan St. John (1999). *Redesigning the Welfare State in New Zealand: Problems, Policies, Prospects.* New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Brunsson, Nils and Bengt Jacobsson, eds., *A World of Standards.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brusis, M. (2002). Between EU requirements, Competitive Politics, and National Traditions: Re-creating Regions in the Accession Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. *Governance* 15 (4): 531-559.

Buchanan, Mark (2002). *Nexus: Small Worlds and the Groundbreaking Science of Networks.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Carothers, Thomas (1996). *Assessing Democracy Assistance: The Case of Romania.* Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Endowment.

Carothers, Thomas (2002). The End of the Transition Paradigm. *Journal of Democracy* 13 (1): 5-21.

Castells, Manuel (2000a). *The Information Age, Volume 1: The Rise of the Network Society.* 2nd ed. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, Manuel (2000b). *The Information Age, Volume 3: End of Millennium.* 2nd ed. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, Manuel (2004a). *The Information Age, Volume 2: The Power of Identity.* 2nd ed. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, Manuel (2004b). Informationalism, Networks, and the Network Society: A Theoretical Blueprint. In Manuel Castells, ed., *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 3-45.

Chang, Ha-Joon (Ed.) (2001). *Jospeh Stiglitz and the World Bank: The Rebel Within.* London: Anthem Press.

Chhibber, Ajay, R. Kyle Peters and Barbara J. Yale (Eds.) (2006). *Reform and Growth: Evaluating the World Bank Experience.* Somerset, N.J.: Transaction.

Christensen, T. and P. Laegreid. (Eds.) (2002). *New Public Management: The Transformation of Ideas and Practice.* Hampshire: Ashgate.

Collier, D. and R. Messick (1975). Prerequisites versus Diffusion: Testing Alternative Explanations of Social Security Adoption. *American Political Science Review* 69:1299-1315.

Cooley, Alexander (2003). Western Conditions and Democratic Choices: The Influence of External Actors on the Post-Communist Process. In Freedom House, *Nations in Transit, 2003.* Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

Cox, Robert (1993). Creating Welfare States in Czechoslovakia and Hungary: Why Policymakers Borrow Ideas from the West. *Government and Policy* 11: 349-364.

Dawisha, Karen and Michael Turner (1997). The Interaction between Internal and External Agency in Post-Communist Transitions. In Karen Dawisha, ed., *The International Dimension of Post-Communist Transitions in Russia and the New States of Eurasia.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 398-424.

Deacon, Bob (with Michelle Hulse and Paul Stubbs) (1997). *Global Social Policy: International Organizations and the Future of Welfare.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Deacon, Bob and Michelle Hulse (1997). The Making of Postcommunist Social Policy: The Role of International Agencies. *Journal of Social Policy* 26 (1): 43-62.

Deacon, Bob et al. (Eds.) (2003). *Global Social Governance: Themes and Prospects.* Helsinki: Globalism and Social Policy Programme.

Dejlic, Marie-Laure and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.) (2006). *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doern, G. Bruce, Leslie A. Pal, and Brian Tomlin (Eds.) (1996). *Border Crossings: The Internationalization of Canadian Public Policy.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Dolowitiz, D. P. and D. Marsh (2000). Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making. *Governance* 13: 5-23.

Dolowitz, D. and D. Marsh (1996). Who Learns What from Whom? A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature. *Political Studies* 44: 343–357.

Drezner, Daniel W. (2001). Globalization and Policy Convergence. *International Studies Review* 3 (1): 53-78.

Easterly, William R. (2001). *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Elster, Jon, Claus Offe, and Ulrich K. Preuss (1998). *Institutional Design in Post-communist Societies: Rebuilding the Ship at Sea.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eyestone, R (1977). Confusion, Diffusion, and Innovation. *American Political Science Review* 71: 441-447.

Farazmand, Ali (2004). Sound Governance in the Age of Globalization. In Ali Faramand, ed., *Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovations.* Westport, Conn: Praeger, 1-23.

Fine, Ben and Elisa Van Waeyenberge (2005). Correcting Stiglitz: From Information to Power in the World of Development. In Leo Panitch and Colin Leys, eds., *Socialist Register 2006: Telling the Truth.* London: Merlin Press, 146-168.

Finnemore, Martha (1993). International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy. *International Organization* 47 (4): 565-597.

Freyberg-Inan, Annette (2006). Just How Small is this World Really? An Application of Small World Theory to the Study of Globalization. Global Networks 6 (3): 221-224.

Fukuyama, Frances (2004). *State-Building: Governance and the World Order in the 21st Century.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

George, S. and Sabellie, F. (1994). *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire.* London: Penguin.

Gilbert, C. and D. Vines (Eds.) (2000). *The World Bank: Structures and Policies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goetz, Klaus H. (2001). Making Sense of Post-communist Central Administration: Modernization, Europeanization or Latinization? *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (6): 1032-1051.

Grabbe, Heather (2001). How does Europeanization affect CEE Governance? Conditionality, Diffusion and Diversity. *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (6): 1013-1031.

Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-80.

Granovetter, M. (1983). The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited. *Sociological Theory* 1: 203-33.

Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization* 46:1–35.

Hajer, Maarten A. (1997). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, Hans Krause, Dorte Salskov-Iversen and Sven Bislev (2002). Discursive Globalization: Transnational Discourse Communities and New Public Management. In Morten Ougaard and Richard Higgott, eds., *Towards a Global Polity.* London: Routledge, 107-124.

Hesse, Joachim Jens (Ed) (1993). *Administrative Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe: Towards Public Sector Reform in Post-Communist Societies.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hofstader, Richard (1963). *The Progressive Movement, 1900-1915.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Hood, Christopher (1998). *The Art of the State: Culture, Rhetoric, and Public Management.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jacoby, Wade (2001). Tutors and Pupils: International Organizations, Central European Elites, and Western Models. *Governance* 14: 169-200.

Keck, M. E., and K. Sikkink (1998). *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kernaghan, K. (2000). The Post-Bureaucratic Organization and Public Service Values. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 66: 91-104.

Kettl, Donald F. (2005). *The Global Public Management Revolution.* 2nd ed. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Landmand, T. and J. Hausermann (2003). Map-Making and Analysis of the Main International Initiatives on Developing Indicators on Democracy and Good Governance. Report for the Statistical Office of the Commission of the European Communities (EUROSTAT), Human Rights Centre, University of Essex.

Lane, Jan-Erik (2000). *New Public Management.* London; New York: Routledge.

Laurence Whitehead (Ed.) (1996). *The International Dimension of Democratization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linden, Robert (Ed.) *Norms and Nannies: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States.* Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lindquist, Evert A. (2001). Discerning Policy Influence: Framework for a Strategic Evaluation of IDRC-Supported Research. Ottawa: International Development and Research Centre.

Lynn Jr., Laurence E. (2001). Globalization and Administrative Reform: What is happening in Theory?" *Public Management Review* 3: 191-208.

Mattli, Walter. (2001). The Politics and Economics of International Institutional Standards Setting: An Introduction. *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(3): 328-344.

Mattli, Walter and Tim Buthe (2003), Setting International Standards: Technological Rationality of Primacy of Power? *World Politics* 56: 1-42.

Meaney, Constance Squires (1995). Foreign Experts, Capitalists, and Competing Agendas: Privatization in Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary. *Comparative Political Studies* 28 (1): 275-305.

Meny, Yves, Pierre Muller, Jean-Louis Quermonne (1996). *Adjusting to Europe: The impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Politics.* London: Routledge.

Milgram, S. (1967). The Small World Problem. *Psychology Today* 2: 60-67.

McNutt, Kathleen (2006). Research Note: Do Virtual Policy Networks Matter? Tracing Network Structure Online. Canadian Journal of Political Science 39 (2): 391-405.

Nello, Susan Senior (2001). The Impact of External Economic Factors: The Role of the IMF. In Jan Zielonka and Alex Pravda, eds., *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe, Vol. 2: International and Transnational Factors.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76-111.

Nunberg, Barbara (1990). *Public Sector Management Issues in Structural Adjustment Lending.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Nunberg, Barbara and John Nellis (1995). *Civil Service Reform and the World Bank.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Nunberg, Barbara (1999). *The State After Communism: Administrative Transitions in Central and Eastern Europe.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1999).

OECD (2005). *Modernizing Government: The Way Forward*. Paris: OECD.

Olsen, J.P. and G. Peters (Eds.) (1996). *Lessons from Experience. Experiential Learning in Administrative Reform in Eight Countries*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Plume.

Ougaard, Morten (2004). *Political Globalization: State, Power and Social Forces.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Pal, Leslie A. (1988). *State, Class and Bureaucracy: Canadian Unemployment Insurance and Public Policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pal, Leslie A. (1991). The State in Mind: The Future of the Traditional Nation-State. In Leslie A. Pal and Rainer-Olaf Schultze, eds., *The Nation-State Versus Continental Integration: Canada in North America -- Germany in Europe.* Bochum: Brockmeyer, 361-377.

Pal, Leslie A. (1993). *Interests of State: The Politics of Language, Multiculturalism and Feminism in Canada.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pal, Leslie A. (1999). Wired Governance: The Political Implications of the Information Revolution. In Robert Boyce, ed., *The Communications Revolution at Work: The Social, Economic, and Political Impacts of Technological Change.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1-38.

Pal, Leslie A. and R. Kent Weaver (Eds.) (2003). *The Government Taketh Away: The Politics of Pain in the United States and Canada.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Pal, Leslie A. and Tatyana Teplova (2004). Domain Games: Global Government of the Internet. In E. Lynn Oliver and Larry Sanders, eds., *E-Government Reconsidered: Renewal of Governance for the Knowledge Age.* Regina, Sask: Canadian Plains Research Centre and Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy, 43-58.

Pal, Leslie A. (2005). Case Study Method and Policy Analysis. In Iris Geva-May, ed., Thinking Like a Policy Analyst: Policy Analysis as a Clinical Profession. New York: Palgrave, 227-257.

Pal, Leslie A. (2006a). *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Management in Turbulent Times.* 3rd ed. Toronto: Thomson Nelson.

Pal, Leslie A. (2006b). Exporting Policy Models: Policy Transfer and International Dynamics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, York University, May 3–June 4.

Pal, Leslie A. (2006c). Exporting Policy Models: The Role of International Governmental Organizations. Paper presented to the 20th World Congress of the International Political Science Association, July 9-13, Fukuoka, Japan.

Pal, Leslie A. (forthcoming). Governing the Electronic Commons: Globalization, Legitimacy, Autonomy and the Internet. In Stephen Bernstein, ed., *Legitimacy and Democracy.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Paloni, Alberto and Maurizio Zanardi (Eds.) (2006). *The IMF, World Bank and Policy Reform.* New York: Routledge.

Perlin, George (2003). International Assistance to Democratic Development: A Review. IRPP Working Paper Series, no. 2003-04. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Peters, B. Guy (2001). *The Future of Governing*, 2nd. ed. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (Eds.) (2001). *Politicians, Bureaucrats and Administrative Reform* London: Routledge.

Pickel, Andreas and Helmut Wiesenthal (Eds.) (1997). *The Grand Experiment: Debating Shock Therapy, Transition Theory, and the East German Experience.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Pincus, J. and J. Winters (Eds.) (2002). *Reinventing the World Bank.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pollitt, Christopher (2001). Convergence: The Useful Myth. *Public Administration* 79: 933-47.

Pollitt, Christopher and Geert Bouckaert (2000). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* New York: Oxford University Press.

Premfors, Rune (1998). Reshaping the Democratic State: Swedish Experiences in a Comparative Perspective. *Public Administration* 76:141-59.

Prezworski, Adam et al. (2000). *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Pritchett, Lant and Michael Woolcock (2002). *Solutions When the Solution is the Problem: Arraying the Disarray in Development*. Washington: Center for Global Development, Paper 10.

Reinicke, Wolfgang H. (1999/2000). The Other World Wide Web: Global Public Policy Networks. *Foreign Policy* 117: 44-57.

Risse-Kappen, T. (1994). Ideas do not Float Freely: Transnational coalitions, domestic structures, and the end of the Cold War. *International Organization* 48:185-214.

Risse-Kappen, T. (Ed.) (1995). *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-state Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts. Alasdair (1996). *So-Called Experts: How American Consultants Remade the Canadian Civil Service, 1918-1921*. Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Sahlin-Andersson, Kerstin (1996). Imitating by Editing Success: The Construction of Organizational Fields. In Barbara Cznarniawska and Guje Sevon, eds., <u>Translating Organizational Change.</u> Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 69-92.

Sahlin-Andersson, Kerstin (2000). Arenas as Standardizers. In Nils Brunsson and Bengt Jacobsson, eds., *A World of Standards.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 100-113.

Sahlin-Andersson, Kerstin (2001). National, International and Transnational Constructions of New Public Management. In Tom Christensen and Per Lægreid, eds., *New Public Management: The Transformation of Ideas and Practice*. Ashgate, Aldershot, 27-43.

Savoie, Donald J. (1994). *Thatcher, Reagan, Mulroney: In Search of a New Bureaucracy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schmitter, Phillipe C. (1996). The Influence of the International Context upon the Choice of National Institutions and Policies in Neo-Democracies. In Laurence Whitehead, ed., *The International Dimension of Democratization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 26-54.

Scholte, Jan Aart (2005). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2000). Government Networks: The Heart of the Liberal Democratic Order. In G.H. Fox and B.R. Roth, eds., *Democratic Governance and International Law.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 199-235.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie. (2004a). *A New World Order.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2004b). Disaggregated Sovereignty: Towards the Public Accountability of Global Government Networks. *Government and Opposition* 39 (2): 159-90.

Smith, Karen E. (2001). Western Actors and the Promotion of Democracy. In Jan Zielonka and Alex Pravda, eds., *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe, Vol. 2: International and Transnational Factors.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 31-57.

St. Clair, A. L. (2006). The World Bank as a Transnational Expertised Institution. *Global Governance* 12 (1): 77-95.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2003). *Globalization and Its Discontents.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Stone, Diane (2004). Transfer agents and Global Networks in the 'Transnationalization' of Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (3): 545-566.

Taylor, Mark C. (2001). *The Moment of Complexity: Emerging Network Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, Grahame F. (2004). Is All the World a Complex Network? *Economy and Society* 33 (3): 411-424.

Urry, John (2003). *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Urry, John (2004). Small Worlds and the New 'Social Physics'. *Global Networks* 4 (2): 109-130.

Walker, J. (1969). The Diffusion of Innovation among the American States. *American Political Science Review* 69: 880-899.

Wallich, Christine J. (1995). What's Right and Wrong with World Bank Involvement in Eastern Europe. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 20 (1): 57-94.

Watts, Duncan (1999). *Small Worlds: The Dynamics of Networks between Order and Randomness.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Watts, Duncan (2003). *Six Degrees: The Science of a New Age.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Weaver, Catherine and Ralf J. Leiteritz (2005). Our Poverty is a World Full of Dreams: Reforming the World Bank. *Global Governance* 11: 369-388.

Wedel, Janine R. (1998). *Collision and Collusion: The Strange Case of Western Aid to Eastern Europe*, *1989-1998.* New York : St. Martin's Press.

Westney, D. Eleanor (1987). *Imitation and Innovation: The Transfer of Western Organizational Patterns to Meiji Japan.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wise, Lois Recascino (2002). Public Management Reform: Competing Drivers of Change. *Public Administration Review* 62 (5): 555-567.

Wolman, Harold (1992). Understanding Cross-National Policy Transfers: The Case of Britain and the U.S. *Governance* 5: 27-45.

Woodward, Richard (forthcoming). The OECD: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century. In Tom Lee and Stephen McBride, eds., *Neo-Liberalism, State Power and Global Governance*. New York: Kluwer.

Woodward, Richard (2004). The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. *New Political Economy* 9(1): 113-127.

World Bank (1997). *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Changing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Bank and IMF (2001). *Civil Service Reform: Strengthening World Bank and IMF Collaboration*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.