

countries in between, comply with their Summit commitments across a wide range of issue areas. Why then, is there a sustained, and in fact, increasing level of compliance with Summit commitments? How does one account for and explain these patterns of Summit compliance?

Based on their empirical findings, Von Furstenberg and Daniels draw conclusions based on three conjectures regarding Summit compliance.

The first conjecture is that joint economic commitments tend to be honoured to a lesser degree than an individual commitment, as collective commitments generate "free-rider" problems. Their findings, however, indicate no statistical difference between these two types of commitments. Hence, compliance with multilateral commitments is no less than with commitments assigned to specific countries.

The second conjecture is that commitments that promise delivery of a policy measure or instrument that is under the direct control of policy makers would be honoured to a higher degree than commitments promising an outcome for a policy target.⁹ The scores, however, reveal the opposite. Commitments on direct policy measures receive a lower than average score than those on economic targets. It appears that policymakers have at least as much difficulty adopting policy measures as they do forecasting the impact of policy measures on, and achieving target variables.¹⁰

Finally, some imagine that policy makers of smaller nations would scrupulously honour their commitments so as to provide political leverage over the policy makers of the larger and more powerful nations. Further, the degree to which one nation can exert

⁹ See, Putnam, Robert D. and C. Randall Henning, "The Bonn Summit of 1978: A Case Study in Coordination", in Richard N. Cooper, Barry Eichengreen, Gerald Holtham, Robert D. Putnam and C. Randall Henning, eds., *Can Nations Agree?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1989, pp. 12-140.

¹⁰ Energy is one functional area that stands apart in the von Furstenberg and Daniels studies, indicating that policymakers may be more successful at microeconomic reforms and crisis management rather than macroeconomic policies.