

**SPECIAL ISSUE ARTICLE**

The importance of policy entrepreneurs in developing countries: A systematic review and future research agenda

Caner Bakir¹ | K. Aydin Gunduz²¹Koc University, Turkey²TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Turkey**Correspondence**

C. Bakir, Koc University, Department of International Relations, 34450, Istanbul, Turkey.

Email: cbakir@ku.edu.tr

Summary

How and with what effect policy entrepreneurship occurs is a persistent and intriguing question for scholars of public policy and administration and political science. So far, the main interest has been on policy entrepreneurship in developed countries rather than developing countries, which largely remains a black box. Adopting a systematic approach to reviewing the literature, this article aims to fill this void. It investigates when, why, and how policy and institutional reforms in developing countries take place, with special reference to the role of policy entrepreneurs. It reviews selected articles published in the Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge Social Science Citation Index database from 1984 to 2018. It aims to show the current state of empirical and theoretical knowledge about policy entrepreneurship in developing countries and persistent knowledge gaps. The present review contributes to the body of knowledge on this topic in three main ways. First, we provide a comprehensive review of policy entrepreneurship in developing countries. Second, we consolidate existing research in the political science, public policy and administration, and political economy disciplines. Third, we establish connections between fragmented literatures, identify gaps between different research streams, and suggest promising paths for future research on policy entrepreneurship in developing countries.

KEYWORDS

agency, institution, institutional theory, policy entrepreneur, structure

1 | INTRODUCTION

John W. Kingdon's pioneering work on individual policy entrepreneurs and policy entrepreneurship, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, was published in 1984 and influenced a generation of scholars focused on agenda setting and public policy making in developed (i.e., high income) countries; there has been a growing interest in this topic regarding middle- and low-income countries since 2012 (Faling et al., 2019; Capano & Galanti, 2018). This is mainly due to a quest to understand the role of individual (and/or organizational) agency in governmental agenda setting processes in particular and in policy and institutional changes in general. Although policy entrepreneurs are increasingly recognized as principal actors in domestic policy making in developing countries since the extension of the MSF's logic

to a developing country first time in 2009 (see Bakir, 2009a); our understanding of who they are, what policy entrepreneurs' resources are, and how they relate to policy entrepreneurship, as well as how various temporal and nontemporal contexts inform what they do and where, when, how, and why they do it, are still limited in public policy research (Bakir, 2013, Bakir & Gunduz, 2017; Bakir & Jarvis, 2018). Thus, it is of critical importance to take stock of the existing knowledge on policy entrepreneurs as agents and policy entrepreneurship as a process (Ackrill, Kay, & Zahariadis, 2013). In this respect, this article systematically reviews 27 selected studies in this literature. Specifically, the contributions of this article are threefold. First, we provide a comprehensive review of policy entrepreneurship in developing countries. Second, we consolidate existing research in the political science, public policy and administration, and international relations disciplines.

Third, we establish connections between fragmented literatures, identify gaps between different research streams, and suggest promising paths for future research on policy entrepreneurship in developing countries. To this end, we conducted a systematic literature review to analyze how the scholarship has been built over the last four decades. The remainder of the article is as follows. First, we will describe our research methodology, including a review and classification of the results. We then report the results of our study by synthesizing and discussing our findings. Finally, we discuss the limitations of the current literature and their implications for further research.

2 | METHODOLOGY

The design of this review is built upon our previous work, a more extensive systematic literature review that evaluates the scholarship on institutional change processes in macroeconomic bureaucracies across the globe (Bakir & Gunduz, 2017). Following up on its general assumptions and principles, we adopted a similar approach of systematic review to illustrate and discuss the use of the “policy entrepreneurship” concept in the context of developing countries. After considering the strengths and weaknesses of both narrative and systematic reviews, we again chose to adopt a systematic review approach to detect the contributions of interest through “a replicable, scientific and transparent process” (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003, p. 209). This allows us to minimize bias, at the cost of potentially leaving out remarkable works that might have explored issues of policy entrepreneurship to answer some very interesting questions within developing countries. For instance, books and book chapters have been excluded due to variations in peer review standards and processes (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Bachrach, & Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Bachrach, & Podsakoff, 2005). In addition, we limited our endeavor to journal articles because we acknowledge that the detection of books and book chapters for a systematic literature review would be a very difficult task; these specific works would be better collected and evaluated as a part of a narrative review project, as the latter does not require adherence to a systematic and objective search protocol applied in an inclusive database.

In this study, we review double-blind-reviewed journal articles that we collected after a two-step selection process. Our data source was the Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge Social Science Citation Index, SCI Expanded catalogue, which is known to be one of the most comprehensive databases of peer-reviewed journal articles. We began looking for articles of interest using filters that included the timespan, research disciplines, and our keywords. In order to set our timespan filter, we decided to cover all relevant articles following Kingdon's introduction of the concept of “policy entrepreneur” in *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* (1995, 1995). Our period of interest thus begins in 1984 and extends until November 2018; this allows us to include the most recent contributions as well. For the research discipline filter, we selected four subject categories: political science, public administration, international relations, and planning and development that lists public policy journals. Then, we introduced “policy entrepreneur*” as a search string, to capture all articles that used this concept

TABLE 1 Inclusion criteria and Web-based search results

General information		
Service	Thomson & Reuters—Web of knowledge	
Date	November 7, 2018	
Timespan	Starts: January 1, 1984	Ends: November 7, 2018
Catalogue	Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), SCI Expanded	
Filtering processes		
Filter 1	Topic: “policy entrepreneur*” Disciplinary categories: Political science or public administration or planning and development or international relations Document type: Article	Results: 218 articles
Filter 2	Elimination of articles that do not analyze cases and/or observations from countries on the IMF Emerging Market and Developing Economies list (as of April 2018) Accessed: Review articles and analyses of international organizations are excluded.	Results: 27 articles

in the title, abstract, or among the keywords. As shown in Table 1, this set of filters yielded an initial pool of 218 articles.

In the second step, we introduced our region-specific criteria to narrow the initial pool and focus on articles about the change processes that took place in developing countries. To this end, we used the International Monetary Fund Emerging Market and Developing Economies list (IMF, 2018) and eliminated articles not utilizing these countries as a case or observation. Additionally, we excluded one article about international organizations and two review articles that evaluated existing empirical analyses and theoretical contributions. At the end of this elimination process, we acquired our final pool consisting of 27 articles (see Appendix A).

3 | REPORTING THE FINDINGS

3.1 | Regional distribution

There has been increasing interest in policy entrepreneurship research in developing countries over the years; 59% of the articles (16 of 27) in the pool were published between January 2013 and November 2018. Most studies have a national focus (59%), followed by a subnational (37%) and supranational (4%) focus. The majority of the 27 articles in our pool focus on three regions (see Table 2): Central and Eastern Europe (9 or 33%), East Asia (8 or 30%), and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA; 6 or 22%). China is definitely the most frequently studied country (8), single-handedly placing East Asia in the top three of our regional classifications. Turkey stands out as the second most frequently studied country, making MENA one of the most popular regions in our pool. Although the regional distribution is affected by the existence of certain “outstanding” countries to a great

TABLE 2 Regional distribution of cases analyzed in the articles

Regions	Countries
Central and Eastern Europe (9)	Romania (2), Russia and the former USSR (2), Croatia, Hungary, Latvia, Serbia, and Ukraine
East Asia (8)	China (8)
Middle East and North Africa (6)	Turkey (4), Jordan, and Tunisia
Other (6)	Indonesia (2), Brazil, India, Mexico, and Vietnam

Abbreviation: USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

extent, we observe that there is no single case that puts Central and Eastern Europe at the top of the list. That is probably due to the widespread and extensive political and social transformations that countries from Russia to Hungary have undergone following the end of the Cold War; some of these have been analyzed with the help of the “policy entrepreneurship” concept. The Central and Eastern European cases bring us to further consideration of other processes—that is, European Union (EU) integration and political regime changes—as relevant contexts, in addition to geographical distribution.

3.2 | Context of transformations

The postcommunist transformation was one of the major structural factors that opened the door to a variety of organizational and policy change processes—not only in countries where communist rule ended abruptly but also in China where the communist state and economy have started to evolve towards a more promarket outlook since the Deng Xiaoping administration, even before the collapse of the Soviet Union. Consequently, the general trend of transitioning from a communist system—whether it entailed a radical postcommunist reconfiguration as in the case of former Soviet states or a series of incremental reforms as in China—might have motivated public policy scholars to study these cases, which offer various instances and paths of policy entrepreneurship.

One strand of Chinese scholarship on policy entrepreneurship refers to “fragmented authoritarianism” as “the most robust framework available to understand China’s political system” (Besha, 2010, p. 215).¹ In this view, it is

authoritarian in the discipline it exerts over subordinates, and relatively closed to public policy input from citizens; it is fragmented in that territorial and functional lines of authority below the center are often disjointed and policy making incremental (Besha, 2010, p. 215).

The other strand (see, e.g., Wan, Chen, & Sperling, 2018) refers to “fragmented authoritarianism 2.0,” in which previously excluded non-state actors penetrate policy making processes and increasingly influence policy outcomes due to a relative decline in barriers to political participation. This perspective reinforces Mertha’s (2009) argument that policy change in China is more likely when “previously-excluded members of the policy-making process in China [e.g., policy entrepreneurs]—officials

only peripherally connected to the policy in question, the media, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and individual activists—[successfully enter] the political process precisely by adopting strategies necessary to work within the structural and procedural constraints of the fragmented authoritarianism framework” (Mertha, 2009, p. 999).

It is important to note that postcommunist transformation processes turned out to be more complex and therefore even more interesting in other parts of the world. In Central and Eastern European countries, the transition from communism was intertwined with another transformation process—namely, “Europeanization.” EU accession was—or still is in some cases—a major motivation for policy and institutional changes. Policy entrepreneurs in candidates and new member states have been involved in a number of reform initiatives in order to make their national institutions compatible with the EU and harmonize their policies in areas that require convergence across member states. When all of the cases in the pool are considered, the significance of Europeanization is not limited to the transformation of Central and Eastern European countries. Articles on Turkey refer to the dynamics of Europeanization and evaluate its implications for transformation and policy decision processes there too (e.g., Burgin, 2016; Ugur & Yankaya, 2008). However, as demonstrated in the following section, Europeanization is not merely a unilateral convergence and emulation process. The enlargement process also creates policy innovation at the EU level, depending on the needs of incoming member states (Iusmen, 2013).

3.3 | Units of analysis and policy areas

Two additional dimensions that we want to highlight are the units of analysis and policy areas. We observed that the concept of “policy entrepreneurship” is not only used to understand and analyze public policy making. Of the 27 articles, two discuss policy entrepreneurs operating in corporations; Raines and Prakash (2005) and Pulver (2007) note the role of policy entrepreneurs in firm-level policy changes. Both articles are about corporate environmental policy making processes. While Raines and Prakash (2005) conduct a survey to detect the role of policy entrepreneurs within firms from both advanced and emerging economies, Pulver (2007) analyzes Petroleos Mexicanos (PEMEX) as a “least-likely case” to explain how the firm “imported” environmental standards in an unexpected way. This type of focus, however, is rare in our general pool.²

The remaining 25 studies demonstrate diversity in many respects, even though they all look into changes in public policy or institutions. In addition to national-level transformations, supranational- and regional-level policy changes have been studied (e.g., Wetterberg & Brinkerhoff, 2019; Schweizer, Dupuis, & de Buren, 2016). Not only do the levels of analysis vary but so do the policy areas and topics. The policy areas and topics covered by articles in our pool are very diverse indeed. They, for example, cover issues from Europeanization, foreign policy, migration, the environment and water to housing,

¹For fragmented authoritarianism in China, see also Lieberthal and Oksenberg (1988).

²Our filtering process with regard to research disciplines may have had an impact on the number of articles regarding firm-level changes. This is likely a major issue in business administration and economic sciences but not the disciplines we focused on in this review.

budgeting, and central banking. Environmental issues and policies are the most commonly examined, at 6 out of 27 or 26% of the articles.

3.4 | Method

The majority of the 27 articles adopt qualitative research methods. Single-case designs constitute an overwhelming majority (70%), as 19 out of 27 articles are built on the detailed analysis of one case. However, in some articles, authors used within-case comparisons across subnational units (see Wampler, 2009; Wetterberg & Brinkerhoff, 2019) or across different processes in the same case (Schnell, 2015; Zhu, 2008). Cross-case comparisons were very rare (see Appel & Orenstein, 2013; Dean, 2017; Schweizer et al., 2016; Vukasovic & Huisman, 2018; Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012). Among these, two articles present a methodologically driven case selection strategy. While Schweizer et al. (2016) analyze the role of the third sector in delivering innovative policy solutions across Indonesia and Switzerland in a “most different systems design,” Vukasovic and Huisman (2018) select their cases as two groups of “most similar” cases: Croatia and Serbia on the one hand and Belgium and the Netherlands on the other.

The study by Raines and Prakash (2005), which relies on the statistical analysis of survey data, stands as an exception to the preponderance of qualitative analysis. Additionally, there are a few articles that use descriptive statistics extensively in a comparative fashion, such as Wampler (2009), Appel and Orenstein (2013), and Wetterberg and Brinkerhoff (2019). Concerning data sources, 89% of the articles (24 of 27) reference original interviews conducted by the investigators. The popularity of interviews over surveys is not that surprising, given that the former offer the most appropriate data collection solution for accessing the elite-level negotiations and discussions—which determine the fate of policy reforms and institutional changes.

3.5 | Who are policy entrepreneurs?

Most of the studies show that there are a variety of individual policy entrepreneurs, including scientists, activists, bureaucrats, advisors, advocates, and/or politicians, as well as organizational policy entrepreneurs such as firms, NGOs, peak business associations, and political parties. In line with Kingdon (1995, p. 122), most research on policy entrepreneurs in developing countries considers policy entrepreneurs to be political actors located in the public or private nonprofit sectors that promote policy ideas that they favor as policy advisors and/or policy advocates. The majority of studies focus on individual (67%) and organizational (26%) policy entrepreneurs. There are articles that emphasize both individual and organizational entrepreneurs (Checkel, 1993; Ugur & Yankaya, 2008). For Kingdon (1995, p. 122), the “defining characteristic” of policy entrepreneurs “is their willingness to invest their resources—time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money—in the hope of a future return.” That return comes in the form of advancing their self-interest or preferred ideas. The literature largely adopts this definition. However, Zhu (2012), Hammond (2013), and Sun (2015) adopt Mintrom and Norman’s (2009, pp.

652–653) four criteria—social acuity, problem definition, team building, and leading by example—to identify and explain the success of policy entrepreneurs.

For Kingdon (1995, pp. 16–18, 172–179), the problem, policy, and politics streams are distinct and flow independently from one another; policy entrepreneurs employing ideas and exploiting windows of opportunity couple them to set the governmental agenda. Most of the literature using the multiple-streams framework (MSF) emphasize distinct actors operating in these streams to set the governmental agenda. For example, they refer to “policy makers,” in the problem stream, “bureaucratic entrepreneurs” in the policy stream, and “party politics [e.g., the Communist Party of China], pressure from interest groups ... (e.g., state-owned enterprises or a government agency), and the national mood [e.g., public]” in the politics stream (Wan et al., 2018, p. 144, 146). Others term policy entrepreneurs operating in the problem stream “problem framers” and the policy stream “alternative specifiers” (Zhu, 2012, p. 193). In contrast, on the basis of a case study on central banking reform in 2001 in Turkey, Bakir (2009a) shows that policy entrepreneurship is not limited to the agenda setting process, including all stages of public policy making, policy entrepreneurs may operate in intersections of numerous ideas, and all of the problem, policy, and politics streams that are not separate and independent of one another.

Drawing on organizational and individual actors as policy entrepreneurs, Checkel (1993) illustrates how the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO) and its then-head Aleksandr Yakovlev played a remarkable role in the discursive change in Soviet foreign policy in the 1980s. Under the Gorbachev administration, Soviet foreign policy abandoned its harshly anticapitalist rhetoric, wherein capitalism was inherently and inevitably a militaristic, expansionist, and war-prone model, which had made cooperation with capitalist states almost impossible. The IMEMO supported the Gorbachev administration during its efforts to reshape the Soviet foreign policy approach. While the IMEMO grew stronger within the Soviet intelligentsia, Gorbachev acquired the cognitive and discursive support that he needed for transforming the uncompromisingly anticapitalist tone that had marked traditional Soviet foreign policy. Checkel’s (1993) analysis demonstrates that politicians and academics can increase their agency, even in authoritarian regimes, and trigger changes in the status quo through forging such alliances.

There is also a comparative analysis of two organizational actors in policy entrepreneurship. For example, building on a case study on Turkey, Ugur, and Yankaya (2008, p. 581) discuss how “the Justice and Development Party (AKP) and the Turkish Industrialists’ and Businessmen’s Association responded to a window of opportunity by advocating a series of reforms that represented a bold challenge to the traditionally reform-averse and Eurosceptic political culture in Turkey.” For Ugur and Yankaya (2008, p. 581) “entrepreneurship skills should consist of resourcefulness not only with respect to agenda setting and issue brokering but also with respect to assessment of the risks and benefits associated with policy change. In our case, policy entrepreneurs detect the fall in the political cost of reform under EU conditionality.”

Policy entrepreneurs’ titles, identities, and the level at which they operate—that is, local, national, or international—vary depending on

the context and the policy area analyzed in each article. In certain remarkable cases, policy entrepreneurs from outside policy making circles were able to seize the initiative and exercise agency. In this respect, NGOs have been recognized as policy entrepreneurs (Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012). Schweizer et al. (2016) further show that specific NGOs—frustrated by the weakness of public bureaucracies and lack of response to the severe threat of deforestation and satisfactory solutions for the preservation of water catchment capacity—sought to act as policy entrepreneurs to complement ineffective preexisting policies. Despite significant structural and institutional differences across the cases, their analysis of Indonesia and Switzerland demonstrate NGO-sponsored policy innovation processes were possible.

3.6 | What are policy entrepreneurs' resources and how do they relate to policy entrepreneurship?

Unfortunately, our analysis yields very little on the discussions around causal pathways for policy entrepreneurship. Indeed, how and why the actions of "actors trigger a variety of causal mechanisms that generate desired policy outcomes are not sufficiently recognised or appreciated by previous scholarship" (for an integrated view on the linkages between actions, instruments, causal mechanisms, contexts and policy outcomes, see Bakir, 2019). The piece of literature in this meta-analysis is not very sensitive to the questions pertaining to the factors that affect the entrepreneur's success and failure and to the necessary or enabling conditions. Majority of the articles (16 out of 27) aim at descriptive inference—therefore, an inquiry into the causal processes and mechanisms is rare. Even among the articles that demonstrate some intent towards causal inference making, the agency of the policy entrepreneur is weakly considered with regard to institutional and/or structural factors that make their job easier or more difficult. Moreover, the diversity of the subject matters and levels of analysis make a systematic analysis of causal pathways almost impossible. When dealing with a pool of more analytically and subject-matter-wise homogenous articles, using inferential statistics or qualitative comparative analysis would be a very promising strategy for detecting generalizable patterns of causation and instilling the case study findings to diagnose multiple pathways leading to success or failure across various reform processes. Due to the aforementioned characteristics of our pool—that is, diversity of processes in many ways and limited interest on causal inference—we were unable to consider such alternative tools and strategies for analyzing causal explanations. Scholars deal with dissimilar reform cases occurring at different levels and in incomparable contexts; hence, they do not converge on similar variables of interest—that, in return, makes inferential statistical methods and qualitative comparative analysis incongruent research solutions for their meta-analysis. In other words, findings provided by these studies do not inform us on a class of comparable cases, amenable to a more detailed and systematic inquiry into the causal effects and mechanisms. Having noted this limitation in our analysis, we adopted a more interpretive and flexible approach in our assessment of findings on opportunity structures and enabling factors. To this end, we focused on resources that policy entrepreneurs can make use of and political settings and environments where they operate in.

Like policy entrepreneurs in developed countries, our review shows that policy entrepreneurs operating in different issue areas and countries have various resources that affect their strategies to influence governmental agendas and policy change. These resources can be grouped into five categories: (a) knowledge and/or expertise, (b) position in formal organizations, (c) informal networks or interpersonal connections, (d) skills in mobilizing ideas and utilizing discourses, and (e) multiple identities. Academic, technical, and/or scientific knowledge authority and professional experience enable policy entrepreneurs to identify problems and specify solutions. Their formal position, informal networks, and multiple professional identities—such as scientist, activist, bureaucrat, advisor, advocator, mediator, academic, and/or politician—enable them to operate in a variety of organizational and ideational realms, as well as the problem, policy, and politics streams. Availability of these resources enable policy entrepreneurs to build, coalitions, resolve conflicts, and steer domestic policy making process towards desired outcomes. Bakir (2009a) highlights agency-level enabling conditions. These are related to the multiple identities of the policy entrepreneur, which

enable him [policy entrepreneur] to operate in different ideational realms as decision-maker (e.g., politician and bureaucrat), academician (e.g., theoretician and intellectual), framer (e.g., spin doctor publicizing favourable interpretation[s] of some of the neoliberal ideas), and mediator [between domestic and transnational policy communities]. ... policy innovation and institutional change is more likely to take place when policy entrepreneurs, mediating various ideas and utilizing discourse within and between domestic and transnational policy communities, operate successfully in a punctuated equilibrium. ... Specifically, he carried, connected, and decontextualized different kinds of ideas such as programs and paradigms as well as communicative and coordinative discourses to affect policy and institutional changes (Bakir, 2009a, pp. 587, 588).

In addition to the agency-level enabling conditions, the structural context of economic liberalization, policy entrepreneurs' formal and/or informal connections to the transnational policy community are recognized as one of the key enabling factors at the agency level. This is compatible with the direction of the overall transformation that developing countries—post-Soviet states in particular—are undergoing at a systemic level, namely, Westernization. Involvement with Western organizations is decisive in more than just the Europeanization reforms that we covered in a separate section above. For instance, pension privatization reforms in the countries of the former Eastern bloc were steered by World Bank-linked domestic actors and appointees (Appel & Orenstein, 2013).

Instead of a unified, well-endowed, multilateral actor, a network of formal and informal like-minded politicians and organizations facilitated the diffusion of the flat tax. There were numerous actors, NGOs, think tanks, and political parties, who made the flat tax central to their political agenda and who collaborated and

supported each other, ultimately leading to a region wide movement of policy innovation. These informal cross-national networks of politicians, ministry of finance officials, and policy specialists on the right were dense and far-reaching (Appel & Orenstein, 2013, p. 138).

In this respect, cross-national and international formal and informal networks are among the principal agency-level resources for policy entrepreneurs. In a similar fashion, Bakir (2009a, p. 572) notes that “ideas are more likely to cause policy and institutional changes when policy entrepreneurs mediate various ideas and discourse within and between domestic and transnational policy communities in a punctuated institutional equilibrium.”

Among developing countries, a variety of articles explores the case of China utilizing the policy entrepreneur concept and/or MSF. In this respect, Chinese scholarship emphasizes policy entrepreneurs operating in the state apparatus or NGOs. For example, in his qualitative analysis of China's lunar space program, Besha (2010) argues that the scientific knowledge and expertise of scientists who held formal positions at the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) and interpersonal connections that enabled individual policy entrepreneurs to form supporting coalitions within the Chinese state apparatus generated the political support of elite decision makers. He identifies three main strategies of coalition formation adopted by scientists at the CAS as policy entrepreneurs. These are the formation of “policy advocacy groups of elite policy entrepreneurs (e.g., CAS scientists), *Guanxi* (interpersonal networks), and the use of Leading Small Groups (*lingdao xiaozu*) to coordinate various organizations” (Besha, 2010, p. 215). Scientific knowledge and office positions in the key state organization (i.e., CAS) enabled a small number of elite scientists to perform the role of policy advocacy. Their policy ideas were then translated into a policy program when they had access to “top policy makers, who placed it on the agenda” as a result of their personal connections (Besha, 2010, p. 215). Chinese space policy proposals lacking the support of the central government, military and Chinese Communist Party would be unlikely to reach an elite decision maker (i.e., the Chinese president). Thus “inside access” and “interpersonal connections” are principal resources of policy entrepreneurs in China to access elite government policy and decision makers. In doing so, policy entrepreneurs are able to influence the governmental agenda. Besha notes that feasibility studies for funding approval and interagency coordination and collaboration among “both civilian and military ministries,” through “a leading small group ... of substantial authority,” are necessary for policy implementation (Besha, 2010, p. 218). This policy process is “slow, methodical, highly rational and incrementalist” and “membership in the LSG [Leading Small Group] is not dependent upon personality, but upon [formal] position and [affiliation with] organization” (Besha, 2010, p. 221). Besha also notes that as government officials, CAS scientists were “acting as both advisors and advocates for a specific space policy” (Besha, 2010, p. 217).

Several articles in our pool underline the importance of policy entrepreneurs by demonstrating how they acted during reform processes. In contrast to those articles that analyze successful cases, Meyer-Sahling (2001) offers an original point of view that highlights the importance

of policy entrepreneurs in creating path-breaking policy and institutional changes by focusing on their absence. In his study on civil service reforms in postcommunist Hungary, Meyer-Sahling (2001) argues that reforms have been limited and required multiple updates because no policy entrepreneur steered the process or introduced an extensive draft of reforms that all parties in the bureaucracy and parliament would converge upon. The author thus demonstrates the role of policy entrepreneurs through a not-so-successful case of reform—one marked by a near vacuum of policy entrepreneurship. In a similar vein, Wan et al. (2018) show that in the absence of relevant formal rules and a policy entrepreneur to enforce them, mesolevel and microlevel coordination between ministries and local agencies were ineffective at tackling problems. They apply MSF to their analysis of the ballast-water management scheme in China. They argue that policy change did not take place due to the absence of bureaucratic entrepreneurs under a fragmented authoritarian framework “which dictates that no change should go against the established order and interests unless ‘top-down’ intervention takes place” (Wan et al., 2018, p. 146). In this view, the success of policy entrepreneurship is linked with (bureaucratic) policy entrepreneurs' role in drawing nationwide coverage in the mainstream media. In this respect, public awareness and engagement are the key strategies for policy entrepreneurs to influence the state's policy agenda.

Zhu (2008) likewise adapts the policy entrepreneur concept to suit the Chinese case and highlights the pragmatic aspects of a policy entrepreneur's strategy to present “a technically infeasible but politically acceptable” policy. This novel finding on the strategy adopted by a policy entrepreneur in China offers a unique insight into the Chinese policy making process. In contrast to Kingdon's and his followers' widely held view that policy entrepreneurs should demonstrate the technical feasibility of their proposals (Kingdon, 1995, p. 131), Zhu shows that Chinese policy entrepreneurs may successfully engender change by “submitting a [legally, administratively, financially or technologically] infeasible proposal to the government to promote a feasible policy change” (Zhu, 2008, p. 318). According to Zhu (2008), policy entrepreneurs sought to change an existing policy by creating public pressure for a constitutional review—a politically acceptable but technically infeasible process in the Chinese system. Although such a review was infeasible, the confluence of public pressure and political acceptability allowed the State Council to choose the technically feasible option of amending previously passed regulations without a loss of credibility.

Drawing on a comparative case analysis of water resources management in India on the Ganges and in China on the Mekong, Zawahri and Hensengerth (2012) focus on how NGOs and policy entrepreneurs collaborate to “change the domestic water management discourse from a state-hydraulic paradigm to a more sustainable water management paradigm” (Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012, p. 269). Zawahri and Hensengerth (2012) note that the main agency-level enabling condition for domestic NGOs (DNGOs) related to the environment and policy entrepreneurs is the possession of “highly specialized technical knowledge of the forces contributing to the ecological problems within the basin” (Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012, p. 274). Despite different political regimes in India and China, they found the DNGOs used similar tactics to influence their respective governments' decisions. Command of the

production of technical knowledge, its effective dissemination to affected communities through the media and public mobilization were used by policy entrepreneurs in both countries to pressure the government for policy change. Specifically, the strategy used to channel this fundamental resource of specialized technical knowledge and alter the states' actions included "awareness raising campaigns, leafleting, demonstrations, lobbying of government officials, monitoring government compliance with existing legislation, and litigation" (p. 271).

Zhu (2012) draws both on Kingdon (1995) and Mintrom and Norman (2009) in the exploration of the activities and strategies of a government official (the vice governor in charge of housing reform) as a policy entrepreneur in delivering housing monetarization reform in the Guizhou Province in China. Zhu (2012) argues that the appointment of a vice governor (i.e., formal position) and the Central Government's housing monetarization reform agenda in 1998 opened a window of opportunity for the introduction of a "holistic approach" to housing reform. The policy entrepreneur used a discursive strategy emphasizing "distributive justice in housing allocation and overcoming financial constraints," incorporating his innovative idea into the provincial housing reform program announced (Zhu, 2012, p. 196). Zhu (2012) identifies two main strategies adopted by the policy entrepreneur: leading by example and coalition building. This work by Zhu (2012) offers a novel insight to the policy entrepreneurship literature in China. It shows that (a) policy entrepreneurship in China is not limited to non-state actors, scientists, experts, or NGOs; (b) in regard to key skills, a successful governmental actor as a policy entrepreneur could display social acuity, define problems, build teams, and lead by example in multiple streams; and (c) a policy entrepreneur can affect policy innovation by engaging local people. Apparently, a successful policy entrepreneur in the Chinese context may adopt a strategy of making some of the policy debates "exoteric"—open, public, and political.³

3.7 | How do structural and institutional macrocontexts inform policy entrepreneurship?

In addition to microcontexts (i.e., agency-level enabling conditions), macrocontexts enable policy entrepreneurs and inform policy entrepreneurship. Like agency-level enabling conditions, nontemporal contexts enable (or constrain) policy entrepreneurship. Policy entrepreneurship is a matter of agency; one of the most interesting questions regarding developing countries is how the context of these countries enables or constrains entrepreneurship, and whether there is "room for agency." This question is rooted in the fact that most developing countries have an authoritarian or hybrid political regime, whereas the policy entrepreneurship literature has emerged and flourished through the analysis of processes in Western democracies, such as in North America, Western Europe and Australia. Therefore, the authoritarian or transitional character of political systems in developing countries should be taken into account or discussed as a worth-noting aspect—analysis of which would reveal the similarities and differences of the institutional and

policy change processes across the developed-developing countries divide with regard to dissimilar political structures.

How do policy entrepreneurs operate in China's "fragmented authoritarian" political regime? Adopting an "inside access model" (see Wang, 2004), Besha (2010) offers an insightful account of policy entrepreneurship in an authoritarian political regime where "most decisions are made within government with little or no input from citizen groups" (p. 215).

Policy solutions are proposed by advisors and members of the scientific elite within government. These advisors do not necessarily seek public approval, and interaction is primarily between policy advisors and policy makers. (Besha, 2010, p. 215)

In contrast, Hammond (2013, p. 122) argues

... the Chinese system is, in spite of its authoritarian nature, not the monolithic top-down state machine that Beijing presents and Western observers perceive. There is space within the political system and hierarchy of the bureaucracy for individuals, or groups of like-minded individuals, to have an impact on the policy process (see also Zhu, 2008).

Similar to Besha (2010), Zawahri and Hensengerth (2012) note the constraints arising from national political regimes that inform the actions of DNGOs.

Regime type presents a structural constraint that can shape the possible channels of influence and impact what environmental DNGOs can accomplish. Democratic India provides more space for its environmental DNGOs to operate than authoritarian China. This public space includes the possibility of legal action against the government or industrialists for failing to comply with existing environmental legislation, and the ability to use elections. China's authoritarian system means that environmental DNGOs, without protection from higher-ranking government officials, must operate more cautiously and less forcefully (Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012, p. 294).

Another distinctive feature of the macrocontext in developing countries relates to the economic realm. Developing countries and firms from these countries are latecomers to the global economy. Therefore, their priorities and the standards that they adopt might differ from advanced countries and actors coming from these economies. Public sector actors in emerging countries pursuing rapid development might have different policy preferences than those in economically advanced countries. For instance, trade liberalization might be an unthinkable option for certain actors in emerging economies, where the national market would be considered not mature enough and domestic industry not competitive enough to integrate with the global economy. In a similar fashion, home-grown industries in these countries might find labor regulations and environmental standards that their competitors in developed economies must comply with to be

³For the distinction between the concepts "exoteric" politics and "esoteric" politics, see Moran (1984).

very costly. Therefore, in emerging markets, policy entrepreneurs acting for policy change in the same direction as advanced economies are very likely to face stronger resistance to those norms and standards. The PEMEX's unexpectedly early adoption of high-level environmental standards therefore stands out as a most likely case that challenges this latecomer's resistance argument. Pulver (2007) notes that PEMEX, a state-owned firm in the petrochemicals sector, could have preferred not to match its standards to those of its rivals from advanced economies in order to avoid the potential costs of implementation. However, that was not the case; PEMEX adopted these standards as early as possible. Pulver's (2007) research reveals that the PEMEX managerial board played a decisive role in this change process. Beginning with Andre Lajous—company's general director between 1994 and 1999—PEMEX was keen to adopt the environmental standards as soon as its competitors from advanced economies, such as BP and Shell, did. The rationale behind that preference was about the firm's image in the making. PEMEX sought to prove that it was more than a latecomer in the sector but instead, an equally competitive player with similar nonmaterial concerns, capable of matching what the other players were doing. Therefore, adopting the costly environmental standards right after its competitors did was a matter of prestige. Emphasizing the convergence of norms, PEMEX directors tried to underline that the firm was no different than the major players in the sector with regard to its standing and reputation in the international market. This article is an illuminating one, as it shows how policy entrepreneurs—even in the market realm—are capable of adopting policies despite their visible material cost by referring to certain non-material benefits such as the brand or firm image. Therefore, the ideas and discourse employed by entrepreneurs are vital for generating legitimacy for policy change and influencing actor behavior.

The Europeanization process as a structural factor also informs policy entrepreneurship. Schnell (2015), in her study on the transparency and anticorruption reforms in Romania, evaluates the significance of Europeanization as follows:

*Despite misgivings, EU accession countries have achieved a tremendous amount of economic, social, and political transformation in a relatively short time. If we wish to understand what aspects of this experience are transferable, we need to deconstruct it and understand the causal mechanisms at work. EU accession entailed a perhaps unprecedented adoption of "pre-designed" institutional forms, via the *acquis communautaire*, but was accompanied by substantial technical and financial assistance, economic integration, increased migration, and stronger European socialization of both citizens and elites (Schnell, 2015, p. 286).*

The 2004 EU enlargement—which added impetus to the Western integration of some postcommunist states—included several instances of change to be analyzed with regard to observing the role of policy entrepreneurs acting across multiple levels of governance in developing countries. It is worth noting that such Europeanization experiences are not limited to the adoption of EU-level standards by new member

states. Although the harmonization processes are interesting enough for the analysis of norm diffusion patterns, EU integration is not solely a unilateral, top-down change process that moves from the supranational to domestic level. EU enlargement has the potential to trigger policy innovation at the supranational level as well. Lusmen's, 2013 article on the making of a previously nonexistent EU-level children's rights protection policy is a remarkable example. The accession of Romania, where the state of the children's rights in the country was a pressing condition, served as a catalyst for developing a children's rights policy framework at the EU level. Franco Frattini, the then-European Commissioner responsible for justice, liberty, and security, intervened and pushed for the standardization of children's rights across the member countries by referring to the situation in Romania. As a result, a domestic-level crisis in children rights protection in this new member state accelerated the making of a new policy at the supranational level.

Vukasovic and Huisman (2018), in their analysis of higher education reforms in Europe, point out that the end of the Milosevic regime enabled former opposition figures who had maintained warm relations with the West—albeit through informal ties—and made them prominent agents of change. They became ministers and university presidents and were appointed as chief bureaucrats at the end of the autocratic era; they seized the opportunity to utilize agency in several change processes—including higher education reform—in the postauthoritarian setting. Indeed, potential policy entrepreneurs may demonstrate agency despite the persistence of an authoritarian system at large (e.g., Beshar, 2010; Checkel, 1993; Zhu, 2012), and transitions from authoritarianism provide opportunities for the rise of new policy entrepreneurs as well (Vukasovic & Huisman, 2018).

4 | SO WHAT? DISCUSSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There are several common weaknesses of policy entrepreneurship research in developing countries. Some of these are epidemic in policy entrepreneurship research in general (Bakir, 2013; Bakir & Gunduz, 2017; Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, Bakir & Jarvis, 2018). The first weakness relates to conceptual stretching and the insufficient theoretical, conceptual, and empirical engagement in policy entrepreneurship research. Such weaknesses can be categorized into two groups. In the first group, there are articles that do not explain what is meant by policy entrepreneurship or how it is measured in relation to agenda setting and/or policy change. Articles in the second group do not even define the "policy entrepreneur" concept and analyze the entrepreneurship process without engaging with Kingdon's MSF. For example, Zhu and Zhang (2013, 2016) claim that they offer a comparative study of policy entrepreneurs with special reference to the roles of four individual experts (technology communicators, theory demonstrators, idea entrepreneurs, and knowledge brokers) in the Wenling participatory budgeting reform in China. They refer to Kingdon (1995) and the policy entrepreneur concept in their discussion of policy experts. However, they do not operationalize the policy entrepreneur concept or apply MSF in their analysis (Zhu & Zhang, 2016, p. 854). Similarly, drawing

on the example of higher education policy changes in four European countries—Belgium/Flanders, Croatia, the Netherlands, and Serbia—Vukasovic and Huisman (2018, p. 272) argue that the opportunism of policy entrepreneurs in policy processes unfolding at the European and national levels is an issue and “the necessary condition for such opportunism is temporal ordering between European initiatives and domestic policy developments that allows domestic policy entrepreneurs to use European preferences to legitimize their proposals.” Although Kingdon was referred to and the policy entrepreneur concept used in the article, the empirical case does not operationalize how EU-guided policy reform initiatives were translated into specific domestic preferences and outcomes through policy entrepreneurship.

The second weakness relates to the limited amount of theoretically informed, rigorous empirical research on the interactions, and relationships between various forms of ideas and agency. There are two main types of ideas. Cognitive ideas are outcome-oriented “descriptions and theoretical analyses that specify cause-and-effect relationships,” whereas normative ideas are non-outcome-oriented ideas that “consist of values, attitudes, and identities” (Campbell, 2004, p. 93). Ideas matter because they inform the decisions and actions of agents; interests are “one form of idea” (Béland & Cox, 2011, p. 10) because “interests of political actors are socially constructed rather than determined by well-defined material facts” (Rodrik, 2014, p. 192; Blyth, 2002). Policy entrepreneurs promote ideas that they favor at the expense of the competing ideas of others in the policy entrepreneurship process. However, there has been limited attention to different types of ideas and discourse and different forms of policy entrepreneurs in the policy entrepreneurship process (Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, p. 470). If “at the core of politics is the way ideas are packaged, disseminated, adopted, and embraced” (Béland & Cox, 2011, p. 11), then there is a need to show the relationships between agency, ideas, and discourse. Unless we establish such relationships, it will be impossible to determine how ideas and agency affect policy entrepreneurship and reveal the political dimension of interactions as they are carried out through discourses conveying contending ideas in the political realm. In the absence of institutional theory in general, and ideational and discursive analyses in particular, we do not know how policy entrepreneurs use a number of ideas and discursive tools to influence the public and political agendas or policy outcomes. If the transmission of specialized knowledge by policy entrepreneurs to form and mobilize a proreform coalition and consequently influence politicians is at the center of influencing nongovernmental and governmental actors’ decisions and actions (Zawahri & Hensengerth, 2012), then it is legitimate to expect an exploration of how different types of ideas travel through the strategic actions of policy entrepreneurs to become policy. Policy entrepreneurs link ideas with policy outcomes through their actions. To understand how various ideas gain legitimacy and inform stakeholders’ decisions and actions, analysis of discourses is of the utmost importance. This is because entrepreneurs use discourses “the interactive processes by which ideas are conveyed” (Schmidt, 2008, p. 305) to affect government policy (for an exception, see Bakir, 2009a). Here, the distinction between the coordinative and communicative discourse is useful. Former “consists of the individuals and groups at

the center of policy construction who are involved in the creation, elaboration, and justification of policy and programmatic ideas,” whereas the latter “consists of the individuals and groups involved in the presentation, deliberation, and legitimation of political ideas to the general public” (Schmidt, 2008, p.310). A limited research shows the utility of discursive analysis in policy entrepreneurship literature. In the foreground of policy entrepreneurship process, coordinative discourse plays a pivotal role in design, articulation, and legitimation of outcome-oriented cognitive ideas such as policy and programmatic ideas (Bakir, 2009a, p.590). 4 role in policy entrepreneurship processes to legitimize normative ideas to public (Bakir, 2009a, p.589).

Neglect of discursive institutionalism is an acute problem in policy entrepreneurship scholarship in both developed and developing countries. Along the same line, the ideational power of policy entrepreneurs, “as the capacity of actors (whether individual or collective) to influence other actors’ normative and cognitive beliefs through the use of ideational elements” (Carstensen & Schmidt, 2016, p. 320), is not discussed in the context of policy entrepreneurs and policy entrepreneurship.

As Bakir and Jarvis (2018, pp. 6–13) note “ideational institutionalisms—third-wave institutionalism” may help policy scholars in their conceptualization of ideas, agency, and power (see Béland & Cox, 2011, 2016; Béland, 2016; Blyth, 2016; Blyth, Helgadottir, & Kring, 2016; Carstensen & Schmidt, 2016, Seabrooke & Wigan, 2015; Helgadóttir, 2016). Concerning types of ideas, there is a need to distinguish policy outcome-oriented cognitive and non-outcome-oriented normative ideas that operate in the foreground and in the background of policy debates (see Campbell, 2004, p. 93). For example, policy programs—as outcome-oriented cognitive ideas in the foreground of policy debate—exert influence in the *policy stream* (e.g., how to solve a specific problem), whilst communicative discourses—as non-outcome-oriented normative ideas in the foreground of debates—legitimize these programs to the public in the *politics stream* (e.g., why a program is appropriate). In the policy stream, paradigms—as the assumptions of elite decision makers—constrain or enable cognitive aspects of policy programs and public sentiments—as normative background assumptions—do the same for normative aspects of programs. By distinguishing different types of ideas in multiple streams and policy making, analytical and conceptual clarity on their respective effects on agenda setting and policy outcomes can be achieved.

Although ideas and discourses are essential components of change processes and need to be delved into in the analyses of change, they do not cause policy outcomes themselves. The agency decides and takes an action to mobilize varying ideas and discourses to affect policy agendas and outcomes (Bakir, 2009a, 2013, ch. 4). The existing scholarship on policy entrepreneurship does not offer how different types of actors and agency are associated with different types of ideas in policy entrepreneurship process. Further, it is widely assumed that diverse individual or collective actors operate in “the *interstices* of these ideational realms” (see Campbell, 2004, p. 107, emphasis added). However, there are much-neglected combined activities of a policy entrepreneur engaging in institutional work in the public sector. This is most likely with multiple professional identities, operating in *intersections* rather than *interstices* of different types of ideas that “influence entrepreneurship

activity in distinctive but interrelated and complementary ways in a dynamic *institutionalization process*" (Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, p. 472, *emphases added*; see also Bakir, 2009a, p. 579). In addition to multiple agents operating in their respective ideational realms, it is also possible that an individual agency with multiple professional identities carries different types of ideas in multiple streams and various stages of public policy making. Further, one of the fundamental weaknesses of the policy entrepreneurship research is the linkage between policy entrepreneurship research and institutional entrepreneurship, that is, the role of individual entrepreneurs in the institutionalization of policy ideas.

The third weakness relates to the under-researched "logic of context"—the role of appropriate contexts in informing agents in the different stages of the policy making processes. The public policy literature and policy entrepreneurship research neglect how complementarities arising from interactions among structural, institutional and agency-level contexts inform decisions and actions of agents (Bakir, 2013, 2017). Policy entrepreneurs are influential when they operate in conducive temporal and nontemporal contexts. Indeed, recently it has been argued that the decisions and actions of policy entrepreneurs are shaped by structural-, institutional-, and agency-level contexts that generate complementarities reinforcing the agency of individual policy entrepreneurs (see Bakir 2013, chs. 4-5, Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, 2018). However, we have limited empirical research on how these multiple contextual factors inform the agential actions of organizational and/or human agents in policy entrepreneurship processes and the strategies they adopt. This implies the need to consider the "logic of context" in which various agency and actors are embedded.

In our systematic review and synthesis of policy entrepreneurship in developing countries, we find that individual policy entrepreneurs require agency-level enabling conditions as resources. The resources of agency at the microlevel include (a) knowledge and/or expertise, (b) position in formal organization, (c) their networks or interpersonal connections, (d) skills in mobilizing ideas and utilizing discourses, and (e) multiple identities. The scholarship on policy entrepreneurship needs to explore the relationship between such resources of policy entrepreneurs and their strategic actions and success. However, some of the previous research is exclusively limited to whether a policy entrepreneur "displays social acuity," "defines problems," "builds teams and coalitions," and "leads by example." Where does the capacity of a policy entrepreneur to display various qualities come from? The capacity of an individual policy entrepreneur to demonstrate such qualities is, in part, a product of their agency-level resources. Unsurprisingly, there have been calls for policy scientists to further engage with organizational (or sociological) institutionalism (see especially Battilana & D'Aunno, 2009; Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009) to unpack the relationship between "agency-level enabling conditions" and "institutional and policy entrepreneurship" (Bakir, 2013, pp. 12–14; Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, pp. 471–472; Bakir & Jarvis, 2018, p. 27; Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, pp. 493–494). What are the agency-level enabling conditions that facilitate (or impede) policy entrepreneurship? How do policy entrepreneurs overcome the "paradox of embedded agency" (see Bakir, 2013, pp. 13–14; Bakir & Jarvis, 2017, pp. 470–471)? How does "institutional work" of policy entrepreneurs affect institutionalisation and/or institutional change (Bakir, 2013, ch.4)?

In addition to our limited knowledge of the influence of microcontexts on agency behavior, current scholarship rarely acknowledges, much less explores, how structural and institutional contexts inform agency behavior. As Bakir (2013, pp.44–46) argues, in common parlance, the terms "structure" and "institution" are often combined and/or conflated (see, e.g., Campbell, 2004, pp. 23, 174, 183). Further, the most of the articles we surveyed conflates organisational actors such as bureaucratic or intergovernmental organisations with institutions. This practice notwithstanding, it is important to distinguish analytically and conceptually between structures, institutions and actors (i.e., individual, organisational or collective) for academic and practical purposes in order to analyze their relationship, interactions, and influence (for a critical discussion, see Bakir, 2013, ch.2). To do so, it is crucial to go beyond "context matters" and to explore how context matters. Macrocontexts include structures—"broader [material and cultural] contexts within which institutions and agents are embedded"—and institutions—"formal (i.e., legal) and informal (i.e., ideational) rules that guide the behavior of actors through [the] logic of instrumentality (maximizing benefits relative to costs) and/or logic of appropriateness (acting appropriately vis-à-vis cultural environments)" (Bakir, 2013, p. 13). Certain structural and institutional complementarities arise from interactions between the influences that different structures and institutions have on agent's behavior (see Bakir, 2013, p. 12; for institutional complementarity, see Amable, Ernst, & Palombarini, 2005: 313; Crouch, 2010). For example, there was an institutional change in financial regulation and supervision in Australia in 1997. Several complementarities emerging from appropriate macrocontexts reinforced the policy entrepreneurship process led by the Treasurer and backed by the Treasury Department as the steering bureaucracy (Bakir, 2013, pp. 116–134). This included institutional complementarities such as a new financial regulatory idea (i.e., Twin Peaks), as well as structural complementarities such as the election of a new government in Australia as well as Australian policy and political pragmatism (see also Bakir, 2003, 2009b). In a similar vein, the 2001 Turkish financial crisis—the structural material context—was an external shock that had a "radical political impact (i.e., the effects on government and political parties in the parliament [through a legitimacy crisis]) and policy impact (i.e., a window of opportunity was opened for policy entrepreneurship for policy and institutional changes)" (Bakir, 2009a, p. 587). The institutional context included the increased legitimacy of the normative and cognitive ideas for central bank independence.

In addition to microcontext and macrocontext (nontemporal), there is a lack of adequate concern for the temporality of the policy entrepreneurship process. From a comparative historical analysis point of view, the temporality of reforms has two dimensions: the temporal location and temporal structure of the institutional or policy change (Thelen & Mahoney, 2015). The former relates to the precise timing of these changes—that is, when they become more possible and take place following the appearance of certain structural and individual factors. The latter assesses the temporality within the process—the pace of the process itself and the mechanistic configuration of the intervening factors after the opening of the reform window. As Thelen and Mahoney (2015, p. 24) point out, so far analysis of temporal structure has opened new avenues of research about the modes of

transformation and the nature and types of incremental changes—for example, layering, drift, and conversion. Unfortunately, none of these avenues have been explored by existing scholarship on policy entrepreneurship in emerging countries yet.

In line with Kingdon's (1995, p. 214) emphasis on the indispensable connection between the timing and actions of an appropriate policy entrepreneur, the temporal location of the change has been the temporal dimension that the authors have paid more attention to. For instance, Checkel (1993, p. 275) refers to a combination of multiple factors operating at the domestic and international levels, which together provided a critical juncture for the foreign policy change during the Gorbachev administration. Later, Schweizer et al. (2016), in their analysis on policy initiatives taken by environmental NGOs, refer to the discovery of environmental hazard areas in the 1990s as an exogenous shock, which paved the way to the opening of a window of opportunity for them. In contrast, unfortunately, temporal structure remains even more understudied and neglected. In consideration of overlapping contextual layers with different attributes, explanations of policy entrepreneurship also require periodization specifying the beginning and end of the temporal context informing the policy entrepreneurship (for useful discussions on temporal dimension, see Büthe, 2002; Falletti & Lynch, 2009; Pierson, 2004). Therefore, the quest to explore temporality should not simply end when the policy window opens; the "size of the window" matters for the scope and continuation of reforms. For example, the March 2001 appointment of a former World Bank vice president in as a new economic minister in Turkey after an external shock of financial crisis was a critical juncture marking the beginning of policy and institutional entrepreneurship processes that related to microeconomic policy reforms in Turkey. The November 2002 general elections marked the end of this temporal context. Mele and Ongaro (2014, p. 129), in their analysis of Italian public sector reforms, point out that the length of the temporal context shapes the strategies and expectation of entrepreneurs to a great extent:

[U]nder circumstances of consistent political instability, that is to say when policy entrepreneurs are aware of the likelihood of a short cycling, technical feasibility tends to be assessed and sought mostly in terms of temporal feasibility (i.e., the ability of policy entrepreneurs to couple the streams within a short timeframe).

As such, the temporal context after the opening of the policy window is a worth-analyzing dimension, as that is actually one of the key factors informing entrepreneurs of the fate of reforms. On the basis of their evaluation of the time frame, reformers assess the feasibility of reform and appropriateness of strategies.

In the articles we analyzed, despite a lack of concern for the aforementioned linkage between temporal context and strategies, we noticed some effort to shed light on the strategies of policy entrepreneurs in connection to the nontemporal context, that is, how policy entrepreneurs are informed by the contexts in which they operate in their selection of strategies. For instance, Besha (2010, p. 215) discusses the strategies available to policy entrepreneurs operating under Chinese "fragmented authoritarianism" by referring to different

organizations and networks in the Chinese context. Mukhtarov et al. (2013, p. 116) offer a general typology of strategies for transnational NGOs, which seek to convey global narratives of ecological policy change across different contexts. This is in line with the general trend that we have observed in the broader literature, beyond studies of emerging countries. Strategies of policy entrepreneurs have been examined by many scholars who have sought to understand potential strategies in various policy change processes in developed countries—for example, Heikkila et al. (2014), Pralle (2006), and Shpaizman, Swed, and Pedahzur (2016). In general, strategies can be grouped under three headings: (a) venue shopping—which refers to moving a policy change agenda item to a policy level that increases the chances of implementation; (b) (re)framing or (re)defining the policy in such a way that the idea becomes more palatable among stakeholders; and (c) coalition building, which equates to the formation of proreform partnerships to convince all parties in the decision making processes. Unfortunately, in the articles we found, "strategy"—despite its appeal as a keyword—is used with very limited or almost no connection to conceptual discussions regarding the analytical significance of strategies. The demarcation and linkage between a strategy, an agent, and a discourse are not clearly stated or illustrated in general. Therefore, more extensive and in-depth research on the link between context-specific resources and strategies necessitates a closer interaction with theoretical discussions in the policy entrepreneurship scholarship. By recognizing exogenous shocks, critical junctures, multiple identities, various ideational realms, and discursive strategies, it is possible to appreciate and recognize policy entrepreneurs' strategic actions in policy entrepreneurship.

In sum, future research should understand complementarities arising from the interactions among these interdependent temporal and nontemporal contexts that enable policy entrepreneurship (Bakir, 2013, ch. 4). What are the agency-level enabling conditions that facilitate (or impede) policy entrepreneurship? How do structural (e.g., change in government, political regime, the EU integration process, globalization process, or a political/economic crisis), and institutional contexts (formal and informal rules) interact with agency-level enabling conditions to complement policy entrepreneurship? What is the periodization of the beginning and end of policy entrepreneurship? Future research may explore the significance of temporal contexts and multiple nontemporal contexts. This includes interactions within and across various structural-, institutional-, and agency-level factors. This calls for future research on multiple (i.e., structural, institutional, and agency) levels of analyses that move beyond local, national, regional, or international levels. Moreover, discussions around comparative historical analysis can enrich and strengthen the policy entrepreneurship literature. Linking agents with the temporal context in a politically informed fashion would not only broaden the researchers' concerns for the essence of critical junctures but would also better position and make sense of the interactions between policy entrepreneurs and other agents in the corresponding political landscape. Such an approach is amenable to revealing the added-value of historically minded agency analysis, which would take agents and their interactions out of the "black box," where they are likely to remain if a simplistic structuralist perspective is adopted (Capoccia, 2015, p. 162).

The fourth weakness is about the method and methodology-related sections of most of the articles. It is a serious concern that these studies lack transparent, rigorous, and inductive qualitative research design and implementation. As Bakir (2017, p. 223) noted elsewhere, "in the absence of transparent and rigorous research design, we cannot see how the research progressed from raw data to analyze which precede the theorizing process." Indeed, most papers do not even have a separate method section nor justify the type of case selected, sampling method, data collection (e.g., triangulation), or process of analysis. In the absence of research transparency and its scholarly presentation for external and internal validity, distinctions between data offered by interviewees and data induced by the researcher and/or the incorporation of emerging themes into aggregate theoretical constructs are missing. Thus, theory building, the emergence of new theoretical or conceptual frameworks and models, or fresh perspectives are limited in the policy entrepreneurship scholarship. The Gioia method (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013; Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994) is one serious candidate for a remedy for most of these qualitative research design weaknesses. This interpretive research method distinguishes between "first-order data" (offered by interviewees) and "second-order data" (induced by the researcher), leading to the generation of "aggregate dimensions" informed by theoretical insights. Data analysis involves step-by-step development of this data structure, acting as a barrier for cherry picking evidence. It searches for relationships between and among these "first-order," "second-order," and "aggregate" categories to reach transparent, plausible, and convincing conclusions. The aim is to achieve transparent and rigorous inductive theory building through transparent and rigorous research design. Thus, this method enables a researcher to consider data theoretically, not just methodologically (for its application in policy sciences, see Bakir, 2013; 2017). Furthermore, comparative research design is lacking in most studies. Thus, it is difficult to generate portable causal explanations to other contexts and expand the MSF (Bakir, 2019).

The fifth overall weakness in the scholarship is that several authors refer to "policy innovation" or the "innovative strategies" of policy entrepreneurs (see, for example, Hammond, 2013, p. 133; Sun, 2015, p. 136; Ugur & Yankaya, 2008, p. 590; Zhu, 2012, p. 191; Zhu & Zhang, 2016, p. 862). We do not know how the "policy innovation," "innovative strategy," or "strategy" concepts are defined or measured, what makes policy entrepreneurs design and implement an "innovative" strategy or how they succeed in achieving their desired outcomes through employing it. Policy entrepreneurship literature in general needs to have a shared understanding of the concepts of policy innovation and strategy, their definition, measurement, and operationalization, with special reference to an agency operating in appropriate contexts. How do different types of entrepreneurs and ideas relate to strategic actions? Are policy inventions and innovations the same thing? Do policy entrepreneurs advise and/or advocate for a brand new policy idea or policy tool? Or do they engage in making changes to existing policies and/or instruments by introducing new ideas (i.e., policy layering)? How do temporal and non-temporal contexts enable (constrain) policy entrepreneurs to engage in policy innovations and strategies and why? How do policy

entrepreneurs' actions trigger causal mechanisms that generate desired policy outcomes? What are the resources and capacities that relate to the strategies they employ? Are policy innovations possible without policy entrepreneurs? What role do policy entrepreneurs play in the implementation of innovative policies and with what effect?

This paper is not without methodology-related limitations either. First, we included peer-reviewed research articles from the most comprehensive database but excluded single-authored books and chapters in edited books. Second, we recognize our subjectivity in the classification of papers. Third, it covers articles published in English only. However, we believe that none of the omitted research would have contained information that would critically alter our conclusions due to the rigorous procedure of the review.

FUNDING

There is no funding for this research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors thanks Darryl Jarvis for his valuable feedback on an earlier version of this article and gratefully acknowledges generous invitation of the organizers and comments of the participants of "The 5th International Conference on Social Policy and Governance Innovation: Towards Collaborative and Balanced Public Policy" on October 27–28, 2018 at the South China University of Technology in Guangzhou.

ORCID

Caner Bakir  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8166-4623>

REFERENCES

- Ackrill, R., Kay, A., & Zahariadis, N. (2013). Ambiguity, multiple streams, and EU policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(6), 871–887.
- Amable, B., Ernst, E., & Palombarini, S. (2005) How do financial markets affect industrial relations: An institutional complementarity approach, *Socio-Economic Review*, 3(2), 311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1093/SER/mwi013>
- Appel, H., & Orenstein, M. A. (2013). Ideas versus resources: Explaining the flat tax and pension privatization revolutions in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(2), 123–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012453036>
- Arieli, T., & Cohen, N. (2013). Policy entrepreneurs and post-conflict cross-border cooperation: A conceptual framework and the Israeli-Jordanian case. *Policy Sciences*, 46(3), 237–256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-012-9171-9>
- Bakir, C. (2003). Who needs a review of the financial system in Australia? the case of the Wallis inquiry. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 38(3), 511–534. doi:<https://doi.org/>
- Bakir, C. (2009a). Policy entrepreneurship and institutional change: Multi-level governance of central banking reform. *Governance*, 22(4), 571–598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01454.x>
- Bakir, C. (2009b). The governance of financial regulatory reform: The Australian experience. *Public Administration*, 87, 910–922. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01778.x>
- Bakir, C. (2013). *Bank behaviour and resilience: The effects of structures, institutions and agents*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bakir, C. (2017). How can interactions among interdependent structures, institutions, and agents inform financial stability? What we have still to learn from global financial crisis. *Policy Sciences*, 50(2), 217–239.
- Bakir, C. (2017). Policy learning and policy change: Learning from research citations. *Policy Sciences*, 50, 585–597.
- Bakir, C. (2019). Actions, contexts, mechanisms and outcomes in macroprudential policy design and implementation. *Public Policy and Administration* (forthcoming).
- Bakir, C., & Jarvis, D. (2017). Contextualising the context in policy entrepreneurship and institutional change. *Policy and Society*, 36(4), 465–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1393589>
- Bakir, C., & Gunduz, K. A. (2017). When, why and how institutional change takes place: a systematic review and a future research agenda on the importance of policy entrepreneurship in macroeconomic bureaucracies. *Policy and Society*, 36(4), 479–503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1369676>
- Bakir, C., & Jarvis, D. S. L. (2018). *Institutional entrepreneurship and policy change: Theoretical and empirical explorations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70350-3>
- Battilana, J., & D'Aunno, T. (2009). Institutional work and the paradox of embedded agency. In T. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 31–58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511596605.002>
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3, 65–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903053598>
- Béland, D. (2016). Kingdon reconsidered: Ideas, interests and institutions in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18(3), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2015.1029770>
- Béland, D., & Cox, H. R. (Eds.) (2011). *Ideas and politics in social science research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Béland, D., & Cox, H. R. (2016). Ideas as coalition magnets: Coalition building, policy entrepreneurs, and power relations. *European Journal of Public Policy*, 23, 428–445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1115533>
- Besha, P. (2010). Policy making in China's space program: A history and analysis of the Chang'e lunar orbiter Project. *Space Policy*, 26, 214–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2010.08.005>
- Blyth, M. (2002). *Great transformations: Economic ideas and institutional change in the twentieth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blyth, M. (2016). The new ideas scholarship in the mirror of historical institutionalism: A case of old wines in new bottles? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3), 464–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1118292>
- Blyth, M., Helgadottir, O., & Kring, W. (2016). 'Ideas and historical institutionalism', in *The Oxford handbook of historical institutionalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boodoo, Z., & Olsen, K. H. (2018). Assessing transformational change potential: The case of the Tunisian cement Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA). *Climate Policy*, 26(1), 35–45.
- Burgin, A. (2016). Why the EU still matters in Turkish domestic politics: Insights from recent reforms in migration policy. *South European Society and Politics*, 21(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13608746.2016.1152653>
- Büthe, T. (2002). Taking temporality seriously: Modeling history and the use of narratives as evidence. *American Political Science Review*, 96(3), 481–493. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055402000278>
- Campbell, J. L. (2004). *Institutional change and globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Capano, G. and Galanti, M. T. (2018). Policy dynamics and types of agency: From individual to collective patterns of action. *European Policy Analysis*, 4(1), 23–46.
- Capoccia, G. (2015). Critical junctures and institutional change. In J. Mahoney, & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Advances in comparative-historical analysis* (pp. 147–179). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316273104.007>
- Carstensen, M., & Schmidt, V. A. (2016). Power through, over and in ideas: Conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23, 318–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1115534>
- Checkel, J. (1993). Ideas, institutions, and the Gorbachev Foreign Policy Revolution. *World Politics*, 45(2), 271–300. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2950660>
- Crouch, C. (2010). 'Complementarity'. In G. Morgan, J. L. Campbell, C. Crouch, O. K. Pedersen & R. Whitley (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative institutional analysis*, pp. (117–137). New York, NY, Oxford University Press.
- Dean, L. A. (2017). The diffusion of human trafficking policies in the post-Soviet region: A comparative analysis of policy adoption in Ukraine, Latvia, and Russia. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 19(5), 403–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2016.1271174>
- Falleti, T. G., & Lynch, J. F. (2009). Context and causal mechanisms in political analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(9), 1143–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009331724>
- Faling, M., Biesbroek, R., Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S., & Termeer, K. (2019). Policy entrepreneurship across boundaries: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Public Policy*, 39(2), 393–422.
- Gioia, D., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151>
- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 370–403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393936>
- Gioia, D. A., Thomas, J. B., Clark, S. M., & Chittipeddi, K. (1994). Symbolism and strategic change in academia: The dynamics of sensemaking and influence. *Organization Science*, 5(3), 363–383. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.3.363>
- Hammond, D. R. (2013). Policy entrepreneurship in China's response to urban poverty. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(1), 119–146. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12005>
- Heikkila, T., Pierce, J. J., Gallaher, S., Kagan, J., Crow, D. A., & Weible, C. M. (2014). Understanding a period of policy change. *Review of Policy Research*, 31(1), 65–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12058>
- Helgadottir, O. (2016). The Bocconi boys go to Brussels: Italian economic ideas, professional networks and European austerity. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3), 392–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1106573>
- IMF. (2018). *World economic outlook database, April 2018*. Country groups information. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2018/01/weodata/weoselagr.aspx>
- Ipek, P. (2013). Ideas and change in foreign policy instruments: Soft power and the case of the Turkish international cooperation and development agency. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 173–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12031>

- Iusmen, I. (2013). Policy entrepreneurship and Eastern enlargement: The case of EU children's rights policy. *Comparative European Politics*, 11(4), 511–529. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cep.2012.27>
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Lieberthal, K., & Oksenberg, M. (1988). *Policy-making in China: Leaders, structures and processes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mertha, A. (2009). «Fragmented authoritarianism 2.0»: Political pluralization in the Chinese policy process. *The China Quarterly*, 200, 995–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305741009990592>
- Mele, V., & Ongaro, E. (2014). Public sector reform in a context of political instability: Italy 1992–2007. *International Public Management Journal*, 17(1), 111–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.849168>
- Meyer-Sahling, J. H. (2001). Getting on track: Civil service reform in post-communist Hungary. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8(6), 960–979. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760110098305>
- Mintrom, M., & Norman, P. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 37, 649–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2009.00329.x>
- Moran, M. (1984). *The politics of banking*. London: MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-04512-9>
- Mukhtarov, F., Brock, A., Janssen, S., & Guignier, A. (2013). Actors and strategies in translating global conservation narratives to Vietnam: An agency perspective. *Policy and Society*, 32(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2013.05.006>
- Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in time. History, institutions, and social analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400841080>
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Bachrach, D., & Podsakoff, N. (2005). The influence of management journals in the 1980s and 1990s. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(5), 473–488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.454>
- Pralle, S. (2006). The “mouse that roared”: Agenda setting in Canadian pesticides politics. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(1), 171–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00165.x>
- Pulver, S. (2007). Importing environmentalism: Explaining Petroleos Mexicanos' cooperative climate policy. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 42(3), 233–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12116-007-9010-8>
- Raines, S. S., & Prakash, A. (2005). Leadership matters: Policy entrepreneurship in corporate environmental policy making. *Administration and Society*, 37(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399704272594>
- Rodrik, D. (2014). When ideas trump interests: Preferences, worldviews, and policy innovations. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(1), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.1.189>
- Schmidt, V. A. (2008). Discursive institutionalism: The power of ideas and discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 303–326. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.060606.135342>
- Schnell, S. (2015). Mimicry, persuasion, or learning? The case of two transparency and anti-corruption policies in Romania. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(4), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1721>
- Schweizer, R., Dupuis, J., & de Buren, G. (2016). Environmental innovation strategies: When and why NGOs go beyond public regulations. *Environmental Politics*, 25(5), 899–920. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2016.1175543>
- Seabrooke, L., & Wigan, D. (2015). Powering ideas through expertise: Professionals in global tax battles. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23, 357–374.
- Shpaizman, I., Swed, O., & Pedahzur, A. (2016). Policy change inch by inch: Policy entrepreneurs at the Holy Basin of Jerusalem. *Public Administration*, 94(4), 1042–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12273>
- Sun, Y. (2015). Facilitating generation of local knowledge using a collaborative initiator: A NIMBY case in Guangzhou, China. *Habitat International*, 46, 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.11.005>
- Thelen, K., & Mahoney, J. (2015). Comparative-historical analysis in contemporary political science. In J. Mahoney, & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Advances in comparative-historical analysis* (pp. 3–38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316273104.002>
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- Ugur, M., & Yankaya, D. (2008). Policy entrepreneurship, policy opportunism, and EU conditionality: The AKP and TUSIAD experience in Turkey. *Governance*, 21(4), 581–601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00414.x>
- Vukasovic, M., & Huisman, J. (2018). Europeanization, policy transfer or domestic opportunity? Comparison of European impact in higher education policy. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: research and Practice*, 20(3), 269–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2017.1320132>
- Wampler, B. (2009). Following in the footsteps of policy entrepreneurs: Policy advocates and pro forma adopters. *Journal of Development Studies*, 45(4), 572–592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380802582346>
- Wan, Z., Chen, J., & Sperling, D. (2018). Institutional barriers to the development of a comprehensive ballast-water management scheme in China: Perspective from a multi-stream policy model. *Marine Policy*, 91, 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.02.016>
- Wang, S. (2004). Changing models of China's policy agenda setting. *Modern China*, 34(1), 56–87.
- Wetterberg, A., & Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2019). The political economy of public reform adoption: Patterns in twenty Indonesian districts. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(4), 476–512.
- Zawahri, N. A., & Hensengerth, O. (2012). Domestic environmental activists and the governance of the Ganges and Mekong Rivers in India and China. *International Environmental Agreements*, 12, 269–298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-012-9179-9>
- Zhu, X., & Zhang, P. P. (2016). Intrinsic motivation and expert behavior: Roles of individual experts in Wenling participatory budgeting reform in China. *Administration and Society*, 48(7), 851–882. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713519092>
- Zhu, X. F. (2008). Strategy of Chinese policy entrepreneurs in the third sector: Challenges of “technical infeasibility”. *Policy Sciences*, 41(4), 315–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-008-9070-2>
- Zhu, Y. P. (2012). Policy entrepreneur, civic engagement and local policy innovation in China: Housing monetarisation reform in Guizhou Province. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 71(2), 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2012.00768.x>

How to cite this article: Bakir C, Gunduz KA. The importance of policy entrepreneurs in developing countries: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Public Admin Dev*. 2020;40:11–34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1864>

APPENDIX A

TABLE A1 Summary table: Methodology, content, and findings

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
1	Checkel, J.	1993	World Politics Ideas, institutions, and the Gorbachev Foreign Policy Revolution	USSR	Foreign policy	Single-case design— (interviews and content analysis)	State policy change process	MEMO (think tank) and then-head Aleksandr Yakovlev	Analytical—Prospects for policy entrepreneurship for agents in non- Western, authoritarian settings	Causal—refers to the existence of a problem and its recognition by political leadership as necessary conditions
2	Meyer-Sahling, J. H.	2001	Journal of European Public Policy Getting on track: Civil service reform in post-communist Hungary	Hungary	Civil service reform	Single-case design— historical analysis (interviews)	Institutional change in the civil service sector	LACK THEREOF ...	Analytical—absence of a “policy entrepreneur” is argued to be one of the reasons why Hungary did not have a durable and solid transformation in the civil service	Causal—considers the absence of a tolerant policy entrepreneur as a decisive factor in the failure.
3	Raines, S. S. & A. Prakash	2005	Administration & Society Leadership matters: Policy entrepreneurship in corporate environmental policy making	Large-N data	Corporate environmental policy making	Large-N design (survey data)	Firm policy	Various (CEOs and environmental managers)	Analytical— contribution to the understanding of intrafirm dynamics in the corporate environmental policy making processes	Causal—however does not test for the policy entrepreneurs' interaction with other factors
4	Pulver, S.	2007	Studies in Comparative International Development Importing environmentalism: Explaining Petroleos Mexicanos' cooperative climate policy	Mexico	Corporate environmental policy making— Kyoto Protocol	Single-case design— historical analysis (interviews and archives)	Firm policy	PEMEX managers— pioneer Adrian Lajous	Analytical—study of PEMEX as a least likely case for importing environmental norms—oil sector, state owned, from a developing country (analytical novelty— focus on “importing” rather than “exporting” in a norm diffusion process)	Causal—underlines three enabling factors: (a) supportive national policy environment, (b) close links with the epistemic community, (c) compatibility of the agenda with the organizational level priorities

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
5 Ugur, M. & D. Yankaya	2008	Governance	Policy entrepreneurship, policy opportunism, and EU conditionality: The AKP and TUSIAD experience in Turkey	Turkey	EU conditionality for membership	Single-case design—historical analysis (interviews and archives)	State policy	Organizations: TUSIAD and AKP	Analytical—types of agency—distinction between policy entrepreneurs, who act in a longtime horizon, and policy opportunists, who act in a rather short time horizon. Policy innovation—in those early days, AKP's policy entrepreneurship consisted of a bold policy innovation: distancing itself from the anti-EU attitudes of the historically western-oriented state elite and stepping in as the new owner of the modernization-cum-Europeanization project	Descriptive—however takes note of the EU conditionality as an enabling factor—decreasing the cost of reform for policy entrepreneurs
6 Zhu, X. F.	2008	Policy Sciences	Strategy of Chinese policy entrepreneurs in the third sector: Challenges of "Technical Infeasibility"	China	Detention and repatriation policy for urban vagrants and beggars	Single-case design—within-case comparison (across policies)	Detention and repatriation policy	Chinese policy entrepreneurs in the third sector	In contrast to democratic regimes, technical feasibility is not required for successful PE and technical infeasibility may be an advantage. Whether in business or in politics, entrepreneurs perform similar functions as they seek to discover unfulfilled needs and suggest innovative means to address them	Descriptive—focuses on the strategy of the policy entrepreneurs—taking a scandal (namely, Sun Zhigang incident) as a triggering event that opens the window of opportunity for the reform.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
7 Wampler, B.	2009	Journal of Development Studies	Following in the footsteps of policy entrepreneurs: Policy advocates and pro forma adopters	Brazil	Democratic governance—participatory budgeting	Statistical comparison across municipalities within a single case (survey and interviews)	Municipalities (to observe the cross-sectional difference in adoption and application)	Mayors	Types of agency: policy entrepreneurs, policy advocates, and pro forma adopters. Criteria for classification: motivations and the expected benefits of the agents. Argument: agents who simply apply a policy (i.e., pro forma adopters) are less motivated, and when they implement the policy, its impact tends to be significantly less compared to early examples	Descriptive—introduces a typological theory of agency in participatory budgeting reform processes.
8 Bakir, C.	2009	Governance	Policy entrepreneurship and institutional change: Multilevel governance of central banking reform	Turkey	Public policy	Single-case design—historical analysis (interviews)	Central banking reform	Minister	Significance of multiple professional identity of policy entrepreneurs in mobilizing various ideas and discourses to deliver policy/institutional change	Causal—emphasizes the role of policy entrepreneurs by underlining the failure of international leverages and linkages in delivering the reform. Focuses on the entrepreneur's multiple identities which enable him to operate across various ideational realms.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
9 Besha, P.	2010	Space Policy	Policy making in China's space program: A history and analysis of the Chang'e lunar orbiter project	China	Space policy	Single-case design (interview and archives)	State-funded research project: Lunar orbiter project	Multiple agents operating at various levels—the Chinese Academy of Sciences occupy a key role	Descriptive research which uncovers the policy making processes in the Chinese Space Program	Descriptive—no reference to enabling factors or necessary conditions.
10 Zhu, Y. P.	2012	Australian Journal of Public Administration	Policy entrepreneur, civic engagement and local policy innovation in China: Housing monetarisation reform in Guizhou Province	China	Housing monetarization reform	Single-case design—supported with a few interviews	Housing monetarization reform experience in Guizhou	Vice governor	Explores the role of proximate decision makers as policy entrepreneurs and their strategies of engaging local citizens to promote institutional factors increasing or decreasing the likelihood of implementation.	Descriptive—a rather agent-centric analysis with almost no inquiry into the structural and institutional factors increasing or decreasing the likelihood of implementation.
11 Zawahri, N. A. & O. Hensengerth	2012	International Environmental Agreements	Domestic environmental activists and the governance of the Ganges and Mekong Rivers in India and China	China and India	Environmental policies	Cross-case comparison (interviews)	Environmental policies: water quality policy of India; biodiversity policy of China	NGOs	A coalition of actors that generates discursive change influences state policy	Descriptive—an agent-centric analysis with a limited consideration on enabling factors such as interministerial conflicts and political elites' limited technical expertise

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
12 Hammond, D. R.	2013	Policy Studies Journal	Policy entrepreneurship in China's response to urban poverty	China	Urban resident minimum livelihood guarantee	Single-case design (interviews and archive)	State policy on urban resident minimum livelihood guarantee	Minister	Another paper examines "the role of policy entrepreneurs beyond agenda setting and within the bureaucracy"	Descriptive—agent-centric analysis marked by a lack of interest in understanding structural or institutional factors which affect the agency
13 Appel, H. & M. A. Orenstein	2013	Comparative Political Studies	Ideas versus resources: Explaining the flat tax and pension privatization revolutions in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union	Post-communist countries	Economic liberalization	Cross-case comparison without large-N systematic data collection tools or models (interviews)	Post-communist free market reforms: Pension privatization and flat tax	Pension privatization: World Bank-linked domestic actors or appointees; flat tax reform: interconnected domestic elites as policy entrepreneurs; armed with right-wing think tanks	Policy entrepreneurs—armed by powerful ideas—may be substitutes for resources to be endowed/allocated by IOs in policy promotion/change processes—MSF not used; policy entrepreneurs as "members of epistemic community"	Causal—seeks to reveal whether financial resources and conditionality are necessary conditions for the international diffusion of policies. Infers that the latter are important but not necessary, as ideas circulating among the actors in the epistemic community may also trigger change without positive or negative sanctions.
14 Mukhtarov, F. et al.	2013	Policy and Society	Actors and strategies in translating global conservation narratives to Vietnam: An agency perspective	Vietnam	Ecological conservation projects in Vietnam	Single-case design (interviews)	Ecological conservation projects in Vietnam	Multiple agents operating at various levels—no prominent one	Three groups of strategies for diffusion are presented and illustrated: Scale-based, meaning-based (ideas), context-based (interactions); p. 116	Descriptive—agent-centric analysis. However, points out that transnational actors' success depends on their cooperation with the local actors.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
15 lusmen, I.	2013	Comparative European Politics	Policy entrepreneurship and Eastern enlargement: The case of EU children's rights policy	Romania	Europeanization—children's rights protection scheme	Single-case design (archive and interviews)	EU (supranational)	EU Commission—Fratini EU Commissioner on fundamental rights and freedoms	Role of policy entrepreneurs in agenda setting at EU-level policy making. Policy innovation at the supranational level to respond to the problem stream which is transformed after the accession of a new member state	Rather descriptive—underlines that EU Commissioner Fratini had the upper hand in steering the process thanks to his knowledge and the experience on the case which opened the window of opportunity.
16 Arieli, T. & N. Cohen	2013	Policy Sciences	Policy entrepreneurs and post-conflict cross-border cooperation: a conceptual framework and the Israeli–Jordanian case	Israel and Jordan	Cross-border relations in post-conflict settings	Single case: border areas of two neighbor states (interviews in field work)	Cross-border relations in post-conflict settings	Entrepreneurs, politicians, civil society	Analytical—first time in a post-conflict border setting—however does not offer much analytical leverage to explain or to be tested.	Descriptive—points out that PEs connections in the political sphere for authorization are crucial, given the complexities of post-conflict setting.
17 Sun, Y.	2015	Habitat International	Facilitating generation of local knowledge using a collaborative initiator: A NIMBY case in Guangzhou, China	China	Public policy/public administration/collaborative governance	Single-case design (archive and a few interviews)	A "not-in-my-backyard" (NIMBY) phenomenon in China	Government officials as collaborative initiators	Policy entrepreneurs and leaders as collaborative initiators have a different mindset that "helps facilitate collaborative dynamics integrating otherwise distributed capacities and knowledge within policy networks"	Descriptive—fragmented and noninteractive public opinion collection processes leave reformist actors unguided, therefore they do not lead to the joint action needed for reform.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
18 Ipek, P.	2015	Foreign Policy Analysis	Ideas and change in foreign policy instruments: Soft power and the case of the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency	Turkey	Foreign policy	Single-case design (interviews and archive)	Organizational (Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency)	Foreign policy elites	Explores and shows how both ideas and material interests matter in policy change processes	Causal—refers to two necessary conditions for successful FP reform: (a) a group of FP elites with shared normative beliefs, (b) a majority govt to take care of the appointments and the implementation.
19 Schnell, S.	2015	Public Administration and Development	Mimicry, persuasion, or learning? The case of two transparency and anti-corruption policies in Romania	Romania	Transparency, public information and anticorruption policies	Within case comparison (across policy making processes)	Two policy change processes: Freedom of Information Act and Public Asset Disclosure	Multiple agents operating at various levels—no prominent one	Problem-driven iterative appropriation in the international diffusion of transparency and anticorruption actors, even policies—however, it should be noted that policy entrepreneurship is very weakly applied in this paper.	Descriptive—focuses on how international influence empowers prochange actors, even they have a limited/partial support at home.
20 Wetterberg, A. & D. W. Brinkerhoff	2016	International Public Management Journal	The political economy of public reform adoption: Patterns in twenty Indonesian districts	Indonesia	Public policy—new public management reforms	Within case comparison (across districts—field work and interviews)	Reform processes within the framework of the Kinerja program, in 20 districts across four provinces	Various—but mostly bureaucrats operating at the local level	Authors discuss the role of policy entrepreneurs and the patterns of reform adoption on the basis of four factors, which they derive from a political economy perspective.	Causal—focuses on explaining which reform is more likely to be implemented, among alternatives—rather than necessary or enabling factors for implementation in general.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
21 Schweizer, R. et al.	2016	Environmental Politics	Environmental innovation strategies: When and why NGOs go beyond public regulations	Indonesia and Switzerland	Environmental innovations and NGOs	Cross-case comparison (selected with a logic close to a most different systems design— interviews)	Two regional environmental issues in two different countries	Environmental NGOs	An innovative policy is suggested by social actors against the threat of deforestation—to maintain the water catchment capacity: Payments for Environmental Services. Weakness of public institution to offer satisfactory remedies led to frustration and in response environmental NGOs complemented preexisting ineffective policies.	Causal—explains how NGOs adopt environmental innovation strategies, does not focus on the success of policy implementation processes.
22 Burgh, A.	2016	South European Society and Politics	Why the EU still matters in Turkish domestic politics: Insights from recent reforms in migration policy	Turkey	Policy reform in migration	Single-case design (interviews)	Migration policy reform	European Commission	The EU matters as it sets incentives for compliance and uses preaccession assistance as a policy instrument (i.e., new institutional constraints or stipulating social learning processes— PE is used loosely and not defined	Causal—explains why and how the Europeanization effect persists in a least-likely case by referring to the “carrots” provided by the Union despite the deadlock in the accession talks.
23 Zhu, X. & P. P. Zhang	2016	Administration & Society	Intrinsic motivation and expert behavior: Roles of individual experts in Wenling participatory budgeting reform in China	China	Public policy— participatory budgeting	Single-case design (interviews)	Participatory budgeting reform in Zhejiang (at regional level)	Individual experts	Authors identify four roles of individual experts/Innovation: “Since 2000, the local governments [...] have made efforts to promote innovation and exploration for public budgeting reform, introducing the appropriate citizen participation	Rather descriptive —formulates a typology of “intrinsic motivations” but does not analyze the factors shaping policy entrepreneurs’ opportunity structures.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
24 Dean, L. A.	2017	Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis	The diffusion of human trafficking policies in the post-Soviet region: A comparative analysis of policy adoption in Ukraine, Latvia, and Russia	Latvia, Russia and Ukraine	Diffusion of human trafficking policies	Cross-case comparison (interviews)	National legal frameworks and their evolution	Various	Policy innovation is not a question of simple emulation—domestic factors are more important than international pressure for change argues the author	Causal—diagnoses external and internal factors which determine the fate of reform. However, considers them as "other variables" in addition to the PEs—instead of discussing how the latter operate in a structure shaped by the former.
25 Boodoo, Z. & K. H. Olsen	2018	Climate Policy	Assessing transformational change potential: The case of the Tunisian cement Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA)	Tunisia	Environmental policies—Nationally appropriate mitigation actions	Single-case design (several interviews in field work)	NAMA in Tunisian cement sector	German Development Cooperation Agency as donor (and the role of domestic institutions in implementations is discussed)	Assumption - in developing countries, policy change and innovation is a matter of international influence to a great extent. That actually contradicts Dean (2017)	Descriptive—no reference to enabling factors or necessary conditions.

(Continues)

TABLE A1 (Continued)

Author	Year	Journal	Title	Cases	Field/area	Method	Unit of analysis	Agent	Analytical novelty/ policy innovation	Inferential intent
26 Vukasovic, M. & J. Huisman	2018	Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis	Europeanization, policy transfer or domestic opportunity? Comparison of European impact in higher education policy	Belgium, Croatia, Serbia and the Netherlands	Europeanization— higher education system & policy convergence	Cross-case comparison of four European countries grouped as MSSD dyads. (interviews)	National policy changes in four countries	Opposition in the Milosevic era had informal ties with the West and then seized the opportunity in the postauthoritarian setting (they became ministers, university presidents, and bureaucrats ... etc.)	Analytical innovation— a detailed operationalization of "international influence" in the European context	Descriptive— seeks to elucidate the causal mechanism of Europeanization. Considers the factors that affect the policy entrepreneurs' capability to make use of the European influence such as existence of a domestic contestation, temporal sequence of the debate and Europeanization, and significance of the European values in the society.
27 Wan, Z. et al.	2018	Marine Policy	Institutional barriers to the development of a comprehensive ballast-water management scheme in China: Perspective from a multi-stream policy model	China	Ballast water management scheme	Single-case design (supported with interview data)	Ballast-water management scheme in China	Various bureaucratic actors	Application of MSF to a case	Descriptive—no reference to enabling factors or necessary conditions.

Abbreviations: AKP, Justice and Development Party; CEO, chief executive officer; EU, European Union; IMEMO, Institute of World Economy and International Relations; MSF, multiple-streams framework; NGO, nongovernmental organization; PEMEX, Petroleos Mexicanos; TUSIAD, Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association; USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, IO; international Organizations, FP; Foreign Policy, NAMA; Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action, MSSD, Most Similar Systems Design.