CHAPTER THREE

Dimensions of Public Policy: Values, Processes, Implementation, and Results

Martin Potucek and Laszlo Vass

Public policy has many dimensions. In this chapter we look at a number of them. We begin with normative dimensions of public policy: the importance of values that underlie policy choices. We consider human rights, political and social rights, and the role of ideology in public policy as a social practice. Important to normative dimensions of public policy is one's view of the capacity of human intellect. Looking at those different assumptions, the chapter explores several normative models such as utilitarianism, Rawl's principle of justice, and others. With this foundation, the chapter then turns to the question to the process of policy - how the various stages of policymaking have been conceptualized. Finally, we examine models that focus on the later stages of policymaking - the implementation and realization of policies and the outcome of policies. Were they carried out as intended and did they have an effect on society?

There exists a number of social philosophies, while there are even more practised public policies. Not only does every society have its own historical experience, cultural tradition, belief systems and institutions, but within each society there is also an on-going battle, either hidden or obvious, between various ideas and concepts of the common good and the public interest. Conflicts about "choice of society" (Roebroek) occur regarding issues such as the direction and the nature of society's basic orientation, which can then find its voice in various forms of law, public administration, the understanding of, and adherence to, human rights, and so on.

Public policy as a social practice nevertheless needs some sort of basis for its criteria, which would simplify communication on what is still, and what is no longer, the common good or the public interest. There is a need for something that would give meaning to the varied choices that are put before both the common citizen and the politician, which could even ultimately guide them through crucial situations in which they find themselves on a daily basis.

Contemporary societies are thus characterised by a plurality of opinions on what is or is not proper and desired, and we have many reasons to believe that it is this very plurality which brings the necessary scope of possible choices and adaptability in difficult situations.

On the other hand, every society needs a specific common denominator, a kind of collective core criteria, which the broad majority of its members respect and share. Otherwise it is threatened by disintegration and collapse.

Values

Shared values have been a part of human behavior since time immemorial. Those hunters and gathers who lived three hundred thousand years ago observed the basic fundamentals of behavior that regulated their methods of resolving everyday situations: The search for food, movement of individuals, protection against nature's influences and external dangers, as well as sexual and family life. Later, a written codification (albeit not always explicitly stated) of these rules and values also appeared: The Chamurapi law, the scriptures, Talmud and Bible. Europe was influenced by the development of values that originated from the time of the Mesopotamian culture, and which were passed down the through the subsequent periods of antiquity, Christianity, the enlightenment to finally the modern age.

When researching of the relationship of people's values to the market, government and the civic sector we will resist narrowing our view to only a few key values. By this we have in mind the extensively discussed values of **freedom, equality and human rights** that have recently emerged. "Theorists of the "New Right" such as Nozick (1974), the Friedmanns (1980) and Hayek (1976) defended the view that freedom and equality are incompatible:

> "As long as the belief in 'social justice' determines political actions, then this process inevitably brings us ever closer towards a totalitarian system" (Hayek, 1976: 68n)

This viewpoint has been fundamentally rejected by "egalitarian theorists" who maintain that the values of freedom and equality are indeed compatible.[1]

In recent times, the problem of socially conditioned possibilities for the development of the individual has been addressed by theorists such as Sen. In order to be able to understand those (as yet unravelled) human capabilities it is necessary to differentiate between negative an positive freedom (sensu Isaah Berlin). The negative concept of freedom concentrates only on the absence of barriers by which one individual (or institution) constrains another. The positive concept of freedom is interested in what a particular person can or cannot achieve:

> " Should we consider that it is important for a person to be able to live life according to his or her own choices, then the general concept to which we must address ourselves is that of positive freedom" (Sen 1990:49).

---

[1] See, for example, Lukes (1992).

Positive freedom is defined as a broad spectrum of possible choices:

> "It is quite possible that an illiterate person who had been taught to read would nevertheless decide to read nothing.... It is a fact that a great many people do things that others do not do. Nevertheless the fact that sometimes they choose the same thing with an equivalent benefit does not, because of this, make it irrelevant." (Sen 1984)

Theorists using the concept of human resources attempt to understand the complexity and mutual conditioning of human, economic and social development:

> The evolution of human beings into the form of educated, motivated, healthy and well-fed individuals is not merely a final goal, but also a necessary condition of productive work and economic development." (Streeten 1989:74)

Human rights

In comparison with the middle ages, the modern age, inspired by the enlightenment and liberalism, marked a fundamental return to the recognition of the universality of human rights. The concept of human rights that by the 20th century had begun to be used with more frequency has its ancestry in the concept of natural rights. The first theorists of natural rights such as Grotius, Hobbes and Locke, emphasised in particular the right to freedom and property. The concept of natural rights was first incorporated into political documents in 1776, when American Declaration of Independence stated:

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

while the French Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789 spoke of inherent, unalienable and irrevocable rights. We should remind ourselves of the slogan of the French revolution "Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood". From here there is a direct link to a host of declarations of human rights, the most significant of these being the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1948.

This turn-around meant not only a change of view in the status of the individual in society: for the school of thought that placed emphasis on liberal freedoms in particular, it also laid the foundations for the evolution of democratic political systems and public policy. It also freed up unsuspected room for the introduction of the market, as well as an unprecedented blossoming of the economic sphere. On the other hand however, it opened the

way for the emergence of totalitarian movements who, in the name of securing equality, succeeded in temporarily subjugating complete national societies.

Human rights can, of course, also be transported and defined according to those human needs that are perceived and recognised as fundamental. Marshall (1963) offers the following explanation for the evolution of modern states: There exists an elementary form of human equality, linked to the full participation of the individual in the life of a community. This equality is not incompatible with economic inequality. It is therefore necessary to broaden the concept of the rights of the citizen in such a way as to include three components - civil rights, political rights and social rights. **Civil rights** are connected to individual freedom - the protection of the personality, freedom of speech, thought and expression, the right to own property and conclude business agreements, and the right to justice, guaranteed by an independent judiciary. **Political rights** allow the individual to share in the functioning and execution of political power, either in the form of voting one's own deputy to the organs of political power, or where the citizen himself has the right to be elected to these bodies. **Social rights** represent the right to share in the use of a given society's social inheritance, and the right to live in dignity i.e. to live on a level corresponding to the standards prevalent in that society. Marshal claims that while civil rights were formulated in the 18th century and political rights in the 19th century, the 20th century has seen the formulation of social rights.

Ideology

Public policy as a social practice needs to be anchored in some kind of criteria which would simplify communication on what still is and is no longer the public good or the public interest, which would give meaning to varied choices that are put before both the common citizen and the politician, and which would act as a guide when they find themselves faced with decisive or important situations, which occur on a daily basis. We should thus ask ourselves the question - what sort of comprehensive value systems are at our disposition?

There are political ideologies which, together with human values, significantly influence decision making in public policy. These are relatively common and comprehensive interpretations of society's problems and the possible means for resolving them, which are weighed according to differentiated social interests of various groups of citizens. At the same time, however, they also include to a certain extent that which would be referred to as the interests of communities or societies as a whole i.e. public interests.

Ideologies are a necessary component of communication in political discourse. They facilitate an identification of political stand-points and priorities. However, they are at the same time a framework that significantly simplifies the understanding and interpretation of social realities. As such, they are a potential instrument of both misunderstanding, as well as justification for the decisions and acts of the unreasonable and irrational, when faced with a problematic situation. It is in this situation that the advantages of the pluralistic political process, by allowing the possibility of a free exchange of opinions and a range of political preferences, demonstrate themselves, while also allowing for the identification of misleading of deforming elements which had previously not been perceived by its supporters.

Also, it is here where space opens up for making changes and corrections to existing ideologies that have been made necessary by the emergence of new and previously unknown problems. A state may thus find itself faced with a newly defined task such as the battle against international terrorism, while non-profit organisations prick our consciences and arouse our sense of self-preservation regarding the growing negative influence of man on the environment, etc.

Normative models of public policy

Lindblom (1977) characterises the schism of modern social thought by two models/concepts of public policy:

Model 1: The society ordered by reason. This is based on an optimistic assumption of humanity's capacity to act reasonably. (This draws heavily on the enlightened, rationalist tradition and Marxism's belief in the possibility of understanding and utilising the mechanisms of societal motion.) This model is run by a reasoned elite, by analysis, "science", even by the politburo and the state planning commission. Social conflict is suppressed. It answers the question "what is best for society?" The basic regulator upon which it relies is the (state) administration.

Model 2. Human intellect is limited, it is necessary to use other methods to run society. (It is possible to use only partial explanatory models - for example, the causes for the emergence of delinquency among adolescents...). The model is based on the application of human preferences, on the results of their social interactions where they substitute conclusions of analysis. This is why this model so highly values procedures

of social interactions e.g. exchanges. Many interactions are perceived as a means of protecting individuals from their own errors in the building of institutions and in the creation of policy. Political and civil freedom is, among other things, an instrument for safeguarding the interactions that lead to the resolving of problems. Paradoxically, this model gives more weight to intellect and thought. It is based on the conviction that analysis is difficult, often impossible. The conflict of ideas is viewed positively: the battle of doctrines is not destructive, but rather an opportunity to reveal further facts. Problems in society are routinely resolved by this method of interactive processes that are not obvious to any of their participants. An actor enters into an interaction which resolves a problem of allocation of resources, although it is in fact a by-product of the resolving of his/her own individual problem. Initiatives leading to the resolving of problems are also supported in this model. Decision-making is extremely pluralistic and decentralised. The diversity of individuals and groups is seen as positive. The main regulator upon which it relies is the market.

Popper periodically characterises this fundamental difference as being one of closed (model 1) and open (model 2) society. According to him model 1 is unrealisable without revolutionary interference into the societal organism, while model 2 satisfies itself with gradual, partial reforms and social engineering.

It is of course possible to define even more specific models of public policy which have been inspired either by the work of some influential social philosopher, or directly from social practice. (See also Weimer and Vining 1992, Lane 1993, Popper 1994, 1995).

Utilitarianism

Bentham defined the goal towards which human society should direct itself as that of ensuring the maximum happiness for the maximum number of people. The overall, communal public good or happiness is the sum total of the utilities of all members of a given community. Critics of this model point out that the function of social happiness is operationalized only with difficulty. Problems occur when one attempts to measure individual utility - these utilities are rather subjective in character. As observed by Arrow (1971), one gets into numerous methodological complications related to the required aggregation of individual utilities to common utility. (The problem can be got round by measuring consumption, thus giving the utility of each member of society, or by either the amount of consumption of goods

by individual persons or the by the size of wealth and incomes which individuals have at their disposal for the purchase of goods according to their choice.)

Rawls principle of justice

In a critical reaction to utilitarianism Rawls (1995) attempted to define a more specific criterion: According to Rawls, it is necessary to maximise the advantages of the least preferred, based on the assumption that such living conditions are, at the very least, provided to the most handicapped individual as they are to all. Technically this means that systems of redistribution should be implemented right up to moment when the motivational system would be endangered to such an extent that (in regard to an overall decline in production) it would even worsen the standing of the most handicapped individual.

Neoliberalism (libertinism)

Some thinkers (especially Nozick 1974) argue that the best, and in fact almost exclusive, method of achieving happiness in the social organism is to allow complete freedom of operation of market mechanisms. The self-regulatory power of the market can bring society to its desired flourishing; only the market is thus capable of safeguarding economical effectiveness. The state, on the other hand, makes people less free, it prevents them from finding their own way towards happiness and wealth. In other words, it is necessary to reduce the function of the state to the bare necessary minimum. (paraphrased by the expression "the state as an ever-vigilant guardian of the citizens' peaceful slumber.")

Absolute equalitarianism

The Khmer Rouge at the end attempted to realise their own vision of a state in which everyone would be completely equal, and where the market mechanism would not exist. During the realisation of this vision they were more consistent than the representatives of contemporary totalitarian regimes in other countries. Hundreds of thousands of Cambodians paid for this experiment with their lives.

The maintenance of institutional values - Conservatism

Traditionalists are convinced that rather than to go looking for an optimal distribution of resources, it is better to gamble on the workings of proven social, economic and political institutions, and the laws by which the required distribution will unravel itself. Among the

most important of these belong the institutions of the constitution, civil and political rights, the family, the church and the state. Significant importance is attached to social values, norms, conventions and other informal forces (e.g. social control) which influence interactions between members of society.

Reducing inequality

Supporters of this model draw attention to the fact that there are two undesirable aspects to the functioning of market relations. On the one hand, the market does not concern itself with the type of resource used by individuals to assert themselves (be it inherited financial resources, intellectual or physical resources, their state of health or social background), nor is it sensitive to the specific needs of the individual. Thus it occurs that, under otherwise similar circumstances, some people are endowed with large resources while others lack the resources to satisfy their basic needs. The additional argument of this model´s supporters is based on the assumption of a shrinking marginal utility set against growing wealth. Thus, the richer people become, the less marginal utility they receive for the same amount of money. The same unit of wealth would cause the poor to be happier. Should this be the case, then the more equally the given amount of resources is distributed, the higher the value of the function of social happiness will be. It is therefore necessary to supplement the market with a re-distribution of resources through taxation, public budgets and services.

The criterion of human dignity

Popper (1994, 1995) formulates a basic hypothesis of this model thus: It is in a person's make-up that is not possible to ensure happiness for himself, but he can nevertheless safeguard dignified conditions for living. This concept thus contains as its goal for societal evolution the maximum removal of human unhappiness and suffering, rather than the maximisation of happiness for the maximum number of people. Each person has its own inner values which derive more from the fact that he/she is a human being than the fact that he/she contributes to society´s well-being. A component of this dignity is the possibility of choosing ones own life (at least within certain boundaries). As another supporter of this model, Sen(1984, 1990), observes, the concept of dignified survival is a relative one which is tied in with concrete cultural and economic realities of a given country.

Cultivation and utilization of human potential

Advocates of this model base their views on the premise that even if people are not born with the same dispositions and inclinations, it is possible to provide everyone with an even chance of developing and utilizing their dispositions - in other words, it is necessary to provide a guarantee of equality of opportunity. This understanding of freedom does not conflict with the principle of liberalism which states that it is impossible for society to achieve prosperity if it does not benefit the individual. What it does recognise however, is that in a society run along market principles, not every individual has an even chance of personal development - and that it is in society's interest to create for these individuals acceptable conditions. At the same time no-one can be forced to take advantage of these conditions, but each will be given an even chance. (For more details, see Addo 1986, Potůček 1991, 1992, Streeten 1989)

The sustainable development

While all the previous models have been based around the human conditions, this model focuses on life in its complexity. It is thus not solely concentrated on the life of the human race alone, but rather it looks at all living creatures on planet Earth. It has its origins in the teachings of Schweitzer which emphasise respect for life and reflect on new global threats that stand before mankind as a whole.

> "It is aimed towards the search for harmony between man and nature, between society and its environment, in order that we should to bring ourselves as close as possible to the ideals of humanism and respect for life and nature, in all its forms as well as in its various time spans" (Vavroušek 1993)

Even though it is possible only with some of these models to state that they have, in some form or another, been applied practically, at the very least all of them have influenced the perceptions of citizens as well as politicians in the never-ending discussion concerning the desired goals for society's evolution and development.

Even though individual normative models of public policy (as well as the criteria by which they are used) can seem rather general and discussion on them thus somewhat academic, the truth is quite the opposite. These models can have and do have a large practical impact on the selection of instruments for public policy as well as on the formation and realisation of concrete public policies in their specific field.

Normative models are only one kind of model of public policy. Also important is the process of making policies and the environment in which they are made.

The Policy Process and its Environment

Different Definitions of Public Policy

Public policy is one of the most frequently used phrase in discussions about public administration, governance or interest articulation. In spite of the professional importance of this expression, public policy is far from being well defined. It is a very complex and complicated phenomenon, that can be approached from many different directions. Hogwood and Gunn (1984) collected the most common interpretations and characteristics of public policy in the policy literature.

Interpretations of public policy
as label for field of activity
as an expression of general purpose or desired state of affairs
as specific proposals
as decisions of government
as formal authorization
as a program
as output
as outcome
as a theory or model
as process

Characteristics of public policy
policy is to be distinguished from 'decision'
policy is less readily distinguishable from 'administration
policy involves inaction as well as action
policies have outcomes which may or may not have been foreseen
policy is a purposive course of action but purposes may be defined retrospectively
policy arises from a process over time

policy involves intra- and inter-organizational relationships
public policy involves a key, but not exclusive, role for public agencies
policy is subjectively defined

Public policy in practice is a process, including a complex array of actors and interactions inside and around it. The process as a policy framework has very important advantages. First, it suggests that public policy is dynamic. Secondly, such a framework is flexible, showing that the actors and activities are changing over time and space. Thirdly, it is a useful tool for analyzing the interactive nature of policy activities and operations.

The *system*s approach outlined by David Easton has been a generally accepted model for policy analysis for long time (1953). Easton argued that political activity can be analyzed in terms of a system containing a number of processes which must remain in balance if the activity is to survive. The paradigm that Easton employed is the biological system, whose life processes interact with each other and with the environment to produce a changing but stable bodily state. Political systems are like biological systems, argued Easton, and exist in an environment which contains a variety of other systems, including economic, social, and cultural systems. (Easton, 1953.)

The policy-making process involves many sub-processes and necessarily extends over a certain period of time. The objectives and purposes of a policy are usually defined at the start of the policy process, but these may change over time and, in some cases, may be defined only retrospectively. The outputs and outcomes of policies do not necessarily represent the end of the policy process, on the contrary they may give good reason for the prolongation of the policy process.

Policy analysts outline different analytical frameworks for studying the policy process. There are approaches specifying four to nine stages of the policy process, put stress on different parts of the whole process. A relatively more integrated model was proposed by Jenkins (see in Hill, 1997.p.23.) with seven stages:

1. *Initiation*
2. *Information*
3. *Consideration*
4. *Decision*
5. *Implementation*
6. *Evaluation*
7. *Termination*

This model suggests that the policy process is a progressive actualization of policy in a visible and explicit way, which is not the case in most time. An alternative, more "fine-tuned" division is defined by Hogwood and Gunn (1984):

1. *Deciding to decide (issue search or agenda-setting)*
2. *Deciding how to decide (or issue filtration)*
3. *Issue definition*
4. *Forecasting*
5. *Setting objectives and priorities*
6. *Options analysis*
7. *Policy implementation, monitoring, and control*
8. *Evaluation and review*
9. *Policy maintenance, succession, or termination.*

In this approach the emphases is on the decision-making elements of the process, the most political and critical part of the policy making process. A more detailed model offers deeper sight into incremental, rational decision-making. The nine-stage framework shows better the complexity of the process and it goes beyond a simple identification of stages suggesting also the expected actions in the given stages. As far as the process model for public policy is very useful framework for analysis, the following remarks should be taken into account:

- Stage models suggest that public policy is a rational and explicit process, there are serious delimitation of rationalism (Simon, 1947) and explicit formulation in public policy. Policy process rather shows incremental development.
- Policy processes are mostly continuous processes of evolution in which starting point may be in the past.
- Policy initiation may start anywhere in the political system.
- Stages do not mean that a particular policy necessarily formulates on a unified, predictable way.
- Stages (actors and activities) may overlapp and feedback loops may be between them.

For studying the policy process, - not forgetting the remarks in the previous paragraph - a simplified stage framework can be a powerful tool. The most accepted model of the policy process is a four-stage model:

Agenda setting	Formulation	Implementation	Evaluation

Although the model has been developed in West, these stages can be identified in the Central and Eastern European and other post-communist countries as well.

Actors in Policy Process

Policy making generally is a process which involves elected politicians, appointed civil servants and representatives of pressure groups who are able to get in on the action. In the study of policy processes, there has been a long-standing concern to define appropriate roles for the various actors. In the post-communist environment, the most important characteristic of the policy process is its over-politicized nature. Because of this, the politico-administrative relations play a decisive role in forming the position of actors and authorities in the policy process.

"Politico-administrative relationships start with a tricky question: `Who rules?'" (Rabrenovic', 2001) The formal answer is quite simple: both officials and politicians rule. (Page, 1992) Aberbach and Rockman (1998), however, distinguish between formal and informal rule. From an official point of view, the answer is 'politicians'. However, if one views the issue from a more informal perspective, things are not that clear. It is obvious, that politicians naturally expect to make important policy decisions when they come into office. They may soon recognize that without administrators they cannot operate. In this relationship, bureaucrats definitely have influence on the policy process. In spite of the difficulties concerning the "who rules" question, many theorists continue searching for an answer, concentrating on formal rules that guide the behavior of politicians and bureaucrats in the policy process. The study of the policy process requires an understanding of behavior, especially behavior involving interaction within and among organizational memberships. For a policy to be regarded as a `public policy' it must to some degree have been generated or at least processed within the framework of governmental procedures, influences and organizations.

Fighting with the Communist legacy overvalued the importance of establishing the "rule of law". This issue refers to the old question of the separation of politics and administration as well as the Wilson's dichotomy and the Weberian concept of bureaucracy.

> "The concept of politics-administration dichotomy is one of the most contentious notions in the theory of public administration. The origins of this concept, its practical existence and general desirability have been discussed for a long time. From its first appearance until now, the concept of politics-administration dichotomy has had its strong presence in academic literature, being highly praised and forcefully disputed. Notwithstanding the constant challenges, the advocates of the theory of politics-administration dichotomy, however, managed to catch their breath, with the theory becoming one of the few surviving public administration myths." (Rabrenovic', 2001.)

The 'rational model' suggests politicians making the value choices, forming `premises' for the more detailed decision processes to be carried out by officials. Wilson's dichotomy which tried to delineate the respective territories of `politics' and `administration', may be seen as to some extent an attempt to draw a distinction between the `policy decision' and `implementation'. Wilson's dichotomy has been widely attacked, not so much for its prescriptive aspirations, as for its impact upon the way policy processes are described. It is seen as a `hindrance to accurate scholarship'. It is important to observe how often politicians or administrators are involved in the policy process on the `wrong' side of the boundary in Wilson's dichotomy. In fact, permanent officials are almost universally involved in the preparation of policy, while politicians' need to be responsive to the problems faced by their electors leads them often to take an intense interest in the implementation process.

Besides politicians and civil servants, corporatist and civil organizations are also playing significant role in the policy process. In some Central and Eastern European political systems a neo-corporatism has been emerged with changing influence of the unions and employers' groups. (Cox-Vass, 2000.) Professional association are also active contributors in the policy process. Nevertheless, civil organizations are rarely strong in the CEE countries, therefore their influence on the policies is rather incidental. As a consequence, policy communities or issue networks are in very immature stage in this part of the world. A more balanced power-relation and more rapid development of the civil actors needed for approaching that "the ideal picture of the policy process in democracies is one where there is a continuous, dynamic interaction between the government, public administration, populace and institutions of civil society." (Grochowski - Ben-Gera, 2002.p.24.)

Public Policy Making and Implementation

Implementation of a particular policy addresses everything that is somehow connected with the actualization of objectives formed in the phase of drawing up that policy. This includes evaluating the scope of these objectives and selecting the means, methods, and respective instruments best suited for their actualization. The term 'policy implementation' can also of course be used for labeling an individual process that brings policies into being and ensures their application.

Implementation will be discussed here in its first sense, i.e. a process of realizing formulated policies at the time when it has already been more or less decided what should happen, and also how it should be achieved. Of course, it is almost impossible to separate out

stages of policy formulation and implementation. Dictatorships would possibly come the closest to having this ability, but nevertheless not even they can completely ignore what is said to be the feasibility of a policy. The singling out of the process of implementation from the overall process of formulating and realizing policies has therefore suffered repeated criticism, even by those authors who were at first pioneers in establishing this concept.

Four theoretical models of implementation have been proposed:

- The *authoritative model*, emphasizing such instruments as directive instructions, planning, control, hierarchy and accountability.
- The *participative model*, relying more on indirect instruments of control such as setting goals, spontaneity, training, adaptation, negotiation, cooperation and trust as suitable methods of implementation;
- The *coalition of actors model*, resulting from the assumption of a plurality of actors, who participate in the actualization of a particular policy and who communicate between one another, negotiate, reach compromises, but who at the same time share a definite common set of values and who are striving to achieve the same objectives;
- The *endless learning model*, where those who enact policy, in an effort to achieve an optimal solution gradually (often by making use of the method of trial and error or by sheer imitation), optimize the structure of their objectives and the techniques used to achieve them.

People who, in practice, are responsible for the realization of a particular policy sometimes have a tendency to overvalue the importance of an individual decision (be it legislative, administrative or economic) preceding the policy's realization. Experience tells us that there is often a long journey between the making of a decision and its actual realization, in the course of which many, often unforeseen, complications occur. Furthermore, the initial concept of what is desired changes and with this the necessity of certain policies.

When considering the implementation of a given policy, we can also assess which of the normative models of public policy should be the vehicle for its realisation. The weighty, extraordinarily difficult, but nevertheless important choice of which regulatory instrument, or combination of regulators (the market, government, responsibility of civil actors) adequately responds to the requirements of the relevant policy is then made. Nor can one disregard the assessment of a policy's feasibility, i.e. whether it is a suitable moment for the actualization of the particular policy (the existence or non-existence of an opportunity window), what the possible public reaction will be and what effect the chosen approach will have upon various sectional interests and public opinion in general.

Some authors go so far in their statements as to declare that no policy whatsoever has a chance of coming into being. In saying this they expose the basic problems of policy implementation in a society:

- The autonomy of societal development versus the efforts to influence, in some way, that development. Society's development can be influenced, but it is only with difficulty that we can talk of its "controllability". If we accept this position, there then emerges in the formation of policies, and even more so in the case of implementation, the problem of a specific area where autarchic development of society is at least partly possible to influence.
- Growing complexity of the environment in which we live, which makes it even more difficult to foresee all necessary preconditions of a successful policy implementation.
- The considerable momentum (path dependency) of value orientations and the behavior of both people and institutions (in the case of organizations, the interests of their members fixed on their survival).
- No policy is realized in isolation. With it tens, possible hundreds of other policies are also realized. This situation is sometimes seen as a parallelogram of policies and the strengths of the actors involved. Along with this comes the typical interfering, conflicts, consonance with inevitable unexpected consequences.
- The difficulty in anticipating future developments and the limited possibilities of preparing for them in advance.
- The problem of policy simulation: There is sometimes an intentional falsehood in a policy which pretends that particular polices have come into effect and gives them symbolic support even though the true interests of the executors of policy lie elsewhere.
- The problem caused by a policy's undesired consequences. The unforeseen negative influence of a policy on an area or interest can either frustrate or even discredit its implementation.

Lipsky (1980) was the first to note the importance of the conditions where policy implementation is actually being realized, i.e. at the direct point of contact between the citizen and the service provider. The high level of freedom for decision making retained by the providers who are in direct contact with ordinary people, this means that it is often their interests, attitudes and responsibilities that prove decisive in the success or failure of a policy's realization, even though the policy had actually been conceived and drawn up "from above".

Another point of interest is whether the implementation occurs within the framework of policies already in operation (this has it roots in the functioning of institutions and the behavior of individuals - "muddle through" in the sense suggested by Lindblom) or if it introduces some important innovations, fundamental reforms or basic changes to the course of society's life and thus to those conditions that satisfy the interests of both the citizen as well as particular institutions.

The so-called implementation deficit is often referred to in literature. The basis of this disparity is the belief that once a formulated and accepted policy somehow achieves its objectives automatically, policy is easily realized. The implementation deficit can be expressed as the disparity between the disposable capacities for the actual realization of a policy set against the capacities which would have had to have been invested in order to achieve the desired goal.

Ordinary people are by and large not initiators of policies. Their position can be divided between the two extremes of total indifference on the one hand and direct participation in implementation on the other. Where the citizen sits on this demarcated scale is therefore of some importance for the success of many policies. Implementation is also about how a particular policy is accepted on its own terms, as well by whom and when.

Apart from the intentional actions of their individual members, the behavior of collective actors also depends on their ability to organize themselves, as well as on their contribution to a particular policy in term of disposable resources and responsibility. Collective actors also play an important role in influencing individual behavior by formulating stimuli for actions and also stabilizing expectations.

When considering the role of differentiated actors in the implementation process, one should at the very least take into account:

- Their "understanding of the world", their ideologies, the frames of reference used by them for interpreting social realities.
- Their behavior, values, motivations and interest structures.
- Their resources - intellectual, financial and organizational.

A point to note is how many actors participate in the implementation of a particular policy. As their numbers increase, so exponentially does the likelihood of conflicts of interests occurring, and with this the need for drawn out negotiations, the formation of functioning coalitions etc. This is where the theory and methodology of conflict resolution, a new, living and developing discipline, can be applied.

If policy is being realized within the framework or through the medium of a single institution, the situation is more straightforward than if it had to be realized throughout a whole sector. The most complex situation arises if a policy intervenes across a total functional sphere of society (e.g. unemployment), or a whole society (e.g. a program of drug abuse prevention).

Policy implementation can be prepared methodologically through the formulation of scenarios for the implementation process. These scenarios are made up of a description of the motivations, the frames of reference, and resources of those groups targeted by the implementation, as well as the internal conditions necessary for policy realization. The timing of the implementation, and the problem thrown up by it, can be separated out into two dimensions:

- Short-term versus long-term implementation of a policy (this is connected to whether implementation ties into the operative, tactical or strategic level of the policy)
- The connectivity or non-connectivity of the policy process. Where a policy falls into the latter category, the timing of individual actions becomes important both from the viewpoint of a suitable starting point as well as from its consequential effect. The decision on the timing a policy's realization is conditioned by how well informed those implementing the policy are regarding the conditions for its actualization. These conditions can be both objective and subjective in nature.

A necessary condition for the effective implementation of any policy is the existence of a coordinator for the implementation process. The role of such a coordinator, apart from policy realization, would be to silence any conflicts of interests that might arise, support the concluding of agreements between the participating actors and evaluate policy application.

Coordination of Policy Processes

The reform of policy-making and implementation structures and systems is one of the most difficult elements of the administrative development process, even more so in the specific historical context in Central and Eastern Europe. The policy-making and implementation processes still show many features of the previous systems: top heavy co-ordination, leaving little or no space for conflict resolution before issues reach the government, duplication of functions (especially in the legislative process) and a lack of clearly defined accountability structures. Even in new states, such as the Baltic States, the division of labor between ministries and the core executive unit in the policy process still shows some of the features of the former system. (Verheijen, 2000.)

The formal picture of national policy making mirrors conventional thinking about how policy processes work. Policy preparation is presumed to work according to a top-down model in which politicians make decisions which are elaborated in more detail by officials. Administrative action is programmed in line with political priorities. This model assumes that governments are monolithic systems with unified political leadership.

"It puts the main emphasis on defining *structures,* especially top-level structures, while assuming that there are adequate *capacities,* and the appropriate *processes* to manage policy preparation within them. Often, as discussed later, these assumptions are not justified. The top-down model makes the designation of a particular part of government as "the coordinator" the crucial issue." (Metcalfe, 1996.p.31.)

The central control model of coordination in the CEE countries pays too little attention to the contributions of horizontal coordination between ministries. There is an inherent suspicion of the willingness and ability of functional ministries to coordinate with each other. But in practice the effectiveness of a coordination system depends enormously on "coordination without a coordinator". That is direct, often informal, horizontal coordination without a central coordinator to supervise what is happening. If these capacities are inadequately provided, and functional ministries cannot share the workload of preparation and coordination, too much will fall on top level coordinating institutions, which will soon be overloaded and clogged with large numbers of problems which require detailed decisions. Thus the structural approach runs the risk of over-centralization and slow responses. This is an important weakness because especially international policymaking can often require quick responses. The pace of change and the timing of decisions are not so much under national control as they are with domestic decisions.

As Metcalfe said, another problem is the difficulty of agreeing where coordinating authority should be located. At the political level, presidents, prime ministers and cabinets also claim a role, and economics and finance ministries are invariably involved. If they each press their claims to try to establish dominance, disagreements about where responsibility for coordination should be placed may degenerate into a bureaucratic power struggle. In reality, no single ministry or central institution can exercise a monopoly. Coordination cannot be simply equated with unitary central control. In a well managed system of government, there is a division of labor in coordination as well as operational responsibilities. Coordination is a collaborative process to which the expertise of functional ministries as well as the overview of central institutions contribute. Coordination is how the efforts of different parts of the system mesh with each other, rather than how one part of the system attempts to control the rest. In this perspective it is more important to consider *capacities* and *processes* for coordination rather than the more conventional emphasis on *structures.* In particular, it is important to consider the information flows required to prepare negotiating positions and strategies, and the capacities and processes required to make informed governmental decisions. Often, the required information must be acquired from a wide variety of outside

sources, domestic and foreign, and then assembled and disseminated within and among ministries responsible for different facets of policy. The process of coordination is an inherent part of the successful policy making process. Coordination can provide policy coherence, what is vital for an effective and efficient governance.

Evaluation of Results and Policy Analysis

The countries in Central and Eastern Europe are still undergoing a significant overhaul of their existing structures, systems and legal frameworks. Whatever the task, be it adapting to a market economy, updating social security and health systems, or preparing for EU enlargement, governments and their administrations must further develop their policy capacities and attempt to ensure that laws and programmes meet the needs of society and are effectively and efficiently designed and implemented.

> "In developing their policy capacity, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe face the challenge that improvements are still needed in all phases of the policy cycle: defining policy objectives; development of policy options; elaboration of the policy instrument; implementation and evaluation." (Improving Policy Instruments…, 2001.)

Policy evaluation and analysis is an important tool for improving policy capacity and thereby improving the quality of political decision-making and policy instruments. In general, CEE countries have been historically lagging behind in developing their policy analysis capacity. Policy evaluation have always been a politically controlled tool in the hands of the political incumbents, and it has not changed yet too much. Governing political parties may monopolize or classify the information on policy implementation, and a good quality, non-partisan capacity for policy analysis is emerging only with great difficulties. Because of this political environment, such policy analysis, which is "in" the process might be more feasible than an independent analysis from "outside" the process. Over-politicization resulted in some post-communist countries, that the policy evaluation became a policy advocacy, and - using the terms of Hogwood and Gunn: - political actors are playing the role of the analysts, same time analysts are acting as political actors. (It is very important to recognize that the 'analysis of policy' is serving the understanding of policy, or the 'analysis for policy' is serving a better quality policy making. (Hill, 1997.)

Apart from the political factors, a very important application of the policy analysis is the impact assessment. It directly serves the better policy design as well as the more effective

coordination and harmonization of the policies. There are three phases in the policy cycle where impact assessment is particularly useful:

- In the policy development phase. Once the political decision has been taken to pursue certain objectives and goals, impact assessment is used to develop policy options and to select the most appropriate policy instrument to achieve the objective.
- In the instrument development phase. Once the instrument has been chosen, impact assessment is used while drafting the instrument, to ensure that it is well-designed and will meet the given objectives in an efficient and cost-effective manner.
- In the evaluation phase *(ex post* evaluation). Once the instrument has been implemented for a certain time, impact assessment is used to verify the real impact; assess to which extent the objective has been met and initiate amendments/corrections, if necessary.

Building a policy analysis capacity is an important tasks for the near future in the CEE countries. It raises parallel tasks: supporting the development of the training and research capacities, which cultivate the required expertise, and establishing evaluating capacities in the public administration and using the independent capacities out of the government bureaucracy.

Sources

Aberbach, J. Putnam, R. Rockman, B.: Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Aberbach, J. – Rockman, B.: Image IV Revised: Executive and Political Roles. In: Governance, 1998, 1, pp. 1-25.

Hogwood, Brian W. - Gunn, Lewis A.: *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. Oxford University Press, 1984.

Cox, T.-Vass, L.: Government-Interest Group Relations in Hungarian Politics since 1989. *Europe-Asia Studies*, Volume 52, No.6. September 2000. pp.1095-1114.

Easton, David: *The Political System.* Knopf, New York, 1953.

Grochowski, Miroslaw - Ben-Gera, Michal: H*ow to be a better Policy Advisor?* Manual. UNDP-NISPAcee, 2002.

Hill, Michael: *The Policy Process in the Modern State*. Third edition. Prentice Hall, 1997.

Improving Policy Instruments through Impact Assessment. SIGMA Papers: No.31. OECD, Paris, 2001.

Lipsky, M.: *Street-Level Bureaucracy.* Russel Sage, New York, 1980.

Metcalfe, L.:National Preparation for International Policy Making. In: *The Internationalisation of Policy Making.* SIGMA Papers: No.6. OECD, Paris, 1996. pp.29-55.

Page, E. Bureaucratic Elites in Western European States. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Page, E. Political Authority and Bureaucratic Power. Herfordshire,, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

Rabrenovic', Aleksandra: Review of Theory on Politico-Administrative Relations. In: *Politico-administrative Relations: Who Rules?* Tony Verheijen ed. NISPAcee, 2001. pp. 10-25.

Simon, H.A.: *Administrative Behavior*. Macmillan, London, 1947.

Verheijen, A.J.G.: *Administrative Capacity Development: A Race against Time?* WRR, Working Document 107. The Hague, 2000.

Marshall, T.H.: Sociology at the Crossroads. London, Heinemann 1963.

Friedman, M. – Friedman, R.: Free to Choose. London, Secker and Warburg 1980.

Hayek, F.A.: Law, Legislation and Liberty. Chicago – London, University of Chicago Press 1976.

Streeten, P.: Mobilizing Human Potential. The Challenge of Unemployment. New York, United Nations Development Programme 1989.

Schäffle, A.: Über den wissenschaftlichen Begriff der Politik. Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, sv. 53, 1897.

Addo, H.: Outlines of a Possible Integration Methodology for the Findings of the Goals, Processes, and Indicators of Development Project. St. Augustine, The University of the West Indies 1986.

Arrow, K.J.: Společenský výběr a individuální hodnoty. (Social Choice and Individual Values, in Czech) Praha, Svoboda 1971.

Lane, J.-E.: The Public Sector. Concepts, Models and Approaches. London, Sage 1993.

Lindblom, Ch.E.: Politics and Markets. New York, Basic Books 1977.

Nozick, R.: Anarchy, State and Utopia. Oxford, Basil Blackwell 1974.

Popper, K.R.: Otevřená společnost a její nepřátelé. (Open Society and its Enemies, in Czech) Praha, ISE 1994.

Popper, K.R.: Věčné hledání. Intelektuální autobiografie. (Never-ending Inquiry. Intellectual Autobiography, in Czech) Praha, Vesmír 1995.

Potůček, M.: Pojetí lidského potenciálu. (The Concept of Human Potential, in Czech) Psychologie v ekonomické praxi, 1991, Vol. 26, No. 3., pp. 115-124.

Potůček, M.: The Concept of Human Potential and Social Policy. Acta Universitas Carolinae Oeconomica, 1992, No. 1, pp. 51-67.

Rawls, J.: Teorie spravedlnosti (The Theory of Justice, in Czech) Praha, Victoria Publishing 1995.

Sen, A.: Individual Freedom as a Social Commitment, New York Review of Books, June 14, 1990.

Sen, A.: Resources, Values and Development. Oxford, Basil Blackwell 1984.

Vavroušek, J.: Závod s časem. Hledání lidských hodnot slučitelných s trvale udržitelným způsobem života. (The Competition with Time. Search for the Human Values Compatible with a Sustainable Way of Life, in Czech) Literární noviny, 1993, IV, No. 49 (9.12.), pp. 1,3.

Weimer, D.L. – Vining, A.R.: Policy Analysis. Concepts and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall 1992.