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**Public Policy**

Hoofdstuk 1: Introduction

The **study of policy** seeks to understand their production and effects, and focuses on two fundamental issues: **policy variation** → explanation of differences between public policies across sectors and countries, and **policy change** → the explanation of stability and change.

**Polity**: institutional structures characterizing a political system.

**Politics**: political processes, such as party political cleavages and voting behaviour.

**Policies**: the outputs of a political system, such as the decisions, measures and courses of action adopted by the government.

**Public policy**:a course of action (or non-action) taken by a government or legislature with regard to a particular issue.

**Beleid** kan **ongelijkheid** vergroten of tegengaan, **opinies** institutionaliseren of niet intervenieren, **sociale relaties** versterken of ondermijnen.

Different **scopes** of public policy:

- Sector-specific measures

- Subfield-specific measures

- Specific issues in the subfields

- Regulatory instruments connected to the issues

**Rationalist approach**: policy-making is a process of problem-solving. It entails a normative perspective. **Lasswell**: **intelligence** (collecting of all relevant information) → **promotion** (identification and support of selected alternatives) → **prescription** (imposition of a binding decision) → **invocation** (policy enforcement) → **termination** (abrogation of policy) → **appraisal** (evaluation of policy effects).

**Theory of incrementalism**: rejected the idea of public policy being made on the basis of a fully rational decision-making process, **bounded rationality**. Policy-makers act within the context of limited information. Decision-makers apply their rationality only after having simplified the choices available, which then makes them seek a satisfactory solution rather than the optimal one.

**Garbage can model**: decisions do not follow an orderly process from problem to solution, but are the outcomes of several relatively independent streams of events, namely problems, solutions, choice opportunities and participants. Solutions exist and develop independently of problems.

**Policy cycle**:

- Problem definition and agenda setting

- Policy formulation and adoption

- Implementation

- Evaluation

Hoofdstuk 2: The nature of public policies

**Beleidstypologieën** tonen de veelheid aan soorten beleid, helpen na te denken over alternatieve opties, bieden een shortcut om verwachtingen te formuleren over herkomst en impact van beleid, en geven dus grip op de strijd en politiek van beleidsvorming.

**Lowi’s policy typology**: over de soort maatregel en de aandacht en strijd.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Voorbeeld** | **Ervaren belangen** | **Aandacht/strijd** |
| **Herverdeling** | Progressieve inkomstenbelasting | Veel ervaren belang | Veel |
| **Reguleren** | Arbeids-  omstandigheden | Invloed op mogelijkheden velen | Matig |
| **Verdelen** | Kinderopvang | Iedereen wint, niemand verliest direct | Beperkt |
| **Onderliggend** | Referenda | Alleen beleidsmakers | Weinig |

Maar: niet al het beleid valt onder deze archetypes en de mate van aandacht kan ook van invloed zijn op de keuze tot een bepaald soort beleid.

**Wilson’s policy typology**: over wie er van profiteert en voor wie er kosten zijn.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Kosten/ baten** | **Geconcentreerd** | **Diffuus** |
| **Geconcentreerd** | Belangengroeppolitiek | Entrepeneurspolitiek |
| **Diffuus** | Cliëntelistische politiek | Meerderheidspolitiek |

Maar: het gevolg van het beleid kan in een andere categorie vallen dan waar het in eerste instantie toebehoorde.

**Hood’s policy typology**: over instrument en effectiviteit. Refers to specific groups of policy instruments and sheds light on how they might bring about changes in the behaviour of the target group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Principe** | **Instrument** | **Invloed via** | **Voor-en nadelen** |
| **Nodaliteit** | Publiekscampagne, keurmerken | Indirecte stimulans met kennis | + Goedkoop  - Beperkte en onzekere effectiviteit |
| **Autoriteit** | Wetten, regels | Direct voorschrijven en straffen | + Relatief goedkoop  + Voorspelbare effecten  - Hoge kosten controle  - Remt innovatie  - Expertiseval |
| **Schatkist** | Subsidies, boetes | Indirecte stimulans met geld | + Makkelijke implementatie  + Stimulans innovatie  + Politieke acceptatie  - Hoge kosten (bij verdeling)  - Inschatting stimulans  - Kan overbodig zijn |
| **Organisatie** | Voorzieningen | Direct creëeren van mogelijkheden en faciliteiten | + Directe impact  + Publieke goederen ontstaan  - Mogelijk inefficiënt  - Gevoelig voor cliëntelisme  - Controle management beperkt |

Maar: scheidslijnen zijn niet altijd even helder.

**Policy outputs**: the direct result of the decision-making process, which usually involves the adoption of a certain programme, law or regulation.

**Policy outcomes**: related to the stages of policy implementation and evaluation. The focus is on the way policies induce behavioural change on the side of the targeted actors.

**Policy impacts**: focuses on the extent to which a policy decision and its subsequent implementation have actually brought about the expected results, assessed at evaluation.

**Hall’s policy outputs typology**:

- Policy paradigms

- Policy instruments

- The precise setting of these instruments

**Policy styles**: the standard operating procedures of governments in the making and implementing of public policies. It seeks to identify stable country- or sector-specific patterns of policy-making and implementation.

There are two dimensions determining **national policy styles**: a government's approach to problem-solving → ranging from anticipatory/active to reactive, and a government’s relationship to other actors in the policy-making and implementing process → characterized by their inclination either to reach consensus with organized groups or to impose decisions on them.

Hoofdstuk 3: The context for policy-making: Central institutions and actors

The most essential **institution** in a political system is its **constitution** → a set of fundamental principles and formal rules according to which a state is governed.

The constitution determines the centralization of power, that is whether a state is organized in accordance with **unitarism** → sovereignty is concentrated at the level of a single central government, of **federalism** → sovereignty is shared across several levels of government.

The horizontal **division of powers** of the state:

- Executive

- Legislature

- Judiciary

The **executive** branch is in charge of implementing public policy, the **legislature** (parliament) branch is endowed with the competency to make legislation, the **judiciary** branch interprets and applies the law and resolves disputes emerging amongst private and public actors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Federalism** (shared rule and self rule) | **Unitarism** (one level of government) |
| + Prevents abuse of power  + Desirable policies because better understanding of regional problems  + Policy innovation and learning  - Decisions at the federal level require consent of subnational units  - Maintaining individual parliaments etc. is expensive | - Quick policy-making  +/- Change policies to a greater extent (radicalism) |

Electoral systems determine how votes are transformed into seats in legislative assemblies.

**Majoritarian systems**: based on single-member constituencies, in which the strongest party in each constituency wins the seat. The one who receives the highest number of votes is awarded the seat.

**Proportional representation systems**: characterized by multi-member constituencies, in which the seats are shared amongst parties in proportion to the share of votes they have received.

Types of **party systems**:

- Dominant-party system

- Two-party system

- Multi-party system

- Bipolar system

**Dominant-party systems**: one large party, with an absolute majority of parliamentary seats, dominates all others over long periods. This party holds a hegemonic position and does not need to enter into a coalition. They should be able to respond immediately to emerging policy problems.

**Two-party systems**: two equally strong parties which dominate the party system and alternate in holding power. These systems tend to be very competitive. Policy-making might occur swiftly, but a change in the majority situation could entail drastic changes in existing policy arrangements.

**Multi-party systems**: none of the parties is majoritarian, leading to the necessity of forming coalitions. The policy-making process can be expected to take longer due to the need to receive the consent of other parties for a policy proposal.

**Bipolar party systems**: parties form relatively stable electoral alliances. Policy-making might occur swiftly, but a change in the majority situation could entail drastic changes in existing policy arrangements.

**Intergovernmental organizations**: organizations operating in an international context. It consists of member states, but they remain independent and engage in voluntary cooperation and coordination.

**Supranational organization**: has powers that its member states do not have because they have delegated a limited amount of their sovereignty to it. Best example is the EU.

**The United Nations System**: UN organizations can affect public policy through data gathering and the dissemination of information, the definition of benchmarks and good practice, and financial or other forms of aid.

**The World Trade Organization**: It monitors the national trade policies of its members. As a consequence of the reviewing process and the obligation to communicate relevant modifications of trade policy, the WTO has the potential to affect domestic policy arrangements.

**Actors** might determine policy outputs through their **capabilities** → the action resources at their disposition to influence the policy-making process, **perceptions** → citizens will review potential solutions according to their ideological orientations, and **preferences** → the choice they make between alternatives

**Public actors**: elected officials appoint additional actors who equally represent the state and are involved in various aspects of policy-making.

**The executive**: the head of government and the ministers who form the cabinet.

**The legislature**: provide legitimacy for the political system, have control and oversight functions, and legislate.

**The judiciary**: constitutional courts.

**The bureaucracy**: the layers of hierarchically appointed officials. Three characteristics needed to make it effective: personnel stability, organization, procedure.

**Political parties**: perform four core tasks: coordinating, conducting electoral campaigns, structuring competition, representing.

**Private actors**: are central to policy-making, on the grounds that they bring valuable information to policy-makers that might eventually guide the way to solving social problems.

**Interest groups**: organizations that make policy suggestions to governments in orders to bring public policies more in line with the interests of their members. Three reasons for becoming members: to benefits that are exclusively accessible to members, to pursue their specific goals, as a political statement.

**Private interest groups**: seek to affect policy-making in a way that pursues the special preferences of their members.

**Public interest groups**: seek to pursue goals that are not exclusively limited to their members, usually non-profit organizations.

**Social movements**: a group of individuals with a conflictual orientation towards an opposing group, with a collective identity and sharing common beliefs and objectives, and with a repertoire of collective actions.

How can **interest groups** affect policy-making: **inside lobbying** → based on personal contacts between interest groups and politicians and involves various strategies such as meetings, **outside lobbying** → activities of interest groups that take place outside the actual policy-making areas such as campaigning, **exchange** → establish a specific structure for political exchange with policy-makers, and **private interest government** → private interest groups make legally binding decisions, thereby taking over a central function of the state.

**Experts**: individuals or groups that can have an impact on policy-making on the grounds of information they supply to policy-makers.

Hoofdstuk 4: Theoretical approaches to policy-making

**Structure-based models**: socio-economische (en culturele) ontwikkelingen en problemen zijn de aanleiding voor overheidsbeleid. Verklaart: de hoeveelheid beleid, de overheidsomvang (“the law of increasing state activity”), het ontstaat van het politieke-en partijsysteem, dus de instituties → **macroniveau**: de grote lijnen, welke problemen opkomen.

**The cleavage approach**: certain enduring socio-economic problems exist in societies and affect policy choices by means of creating lasting divisions between social groups which possess different perceptions about these problems and the ways of solving them.

**Cleavages**:

- centre-periphery

- state-church

- rural-urban

- workers-employers

- materialists-post-materialists

- open-closed societies

**Varieties of capitalism approach**: a perspective that examines how economic processes influence policy-making. Different forms of capitalistic economies (e.g. liberal market economies and coordinated market economies) vary according to the coordination of public and private actors.

**Institution-based models**: instituties begrenzen en faciliteren beleid. Institutions empower en constrain actors. Beleid is (daarom) historisch afhankelijk. Verklaart: beleidsvariaties tussen landen (inhoud en stijl), diffusie tussen organisaties (vorm en inhoud), historische overeenkomsten en traagheid van verandering (incrementalisme) → **mesoniveau**: de grove beleidsrichtingen.

**Classic approach**: emphasises the role that governmental organisations play. The functioning of the state not only depends on economic and social conditions, but also on the design and effectiveness of political institutions.

**New approaches**: different streams of argument. There are a variety of conceptions of how, why and to what extent institutions make a difference.

**Sociological institutionalism**: individual’s actions are determined by their sense of obligation as structured by the appropriate institutional rules and routines rather than by self-interest. It is by influencing actors’ preferences and perceptions that institutions shape a polity and thereby the context in which policy-making occurs. Organisations are culturally specific practices. Institutions will most likely be patterned after existing institutional templates: **institutional isomorphism**.

**Historical institutionalism**: the former choices about policies or institutions affect the range of subsequent policy options. Existing institutions or policies are considered as independent rather than as merely intervening variables in explaining policy choices.

**Discursive institutionalism**: emphasises the importance of ideas and discourse. Coordinative discourse amongst policy actors and communicative discourse between policy-makers and the public. It conceives of institutional change as an endogenous process.

**Interest-based models**: actoren hebben gerangschikte doelen en handelen om doelen optimaal of naar tevredenheid te verwezenlijken. Verklaart: de uitkomsten van beleidsprocessen en collectieve irrationaliteit → **microniveau**: specifiek beleid.

**Fully rational behaviour**: a rational actor is broadly perceived to make choices about public policy that tend to maximize his or her expected utility. For a choice to be rational, an actor must be faced with alternatives that can be rank-ordered according to some degree of utility or desirability. First all alternatives must be ranked in order. Second, they should be transitive.

**Bounded rationality**: assumes that actors are goal oriented, though it equally takes into account their cognitive limitations. The amount of information actors can gather and process in a meaningful way is thought to be limited. It relies on the concept of **satisficing**.

**Public actors**: political parties and therefore elected officials can be seen as **vote-seeking** → parties maximize their electoral support for the purpose of controlling the government, **office-seeking** → parties maximize their control over political office, for instance by acquiring the most influential or prestigious ministries, or **policy-seeking** → parties participate in politics in order to further particular policy objectives, often reflecting their underlying ideological positions.

**Budget-maximizing bureaucracy**: (Niskanen, 1971): Bureaucrats will try to maximize their department’s budget in order to increase their salary and prestige. The government defines a department’s budget on the grounds of the quantity of service it supplies. The more services, the higher the budget. Therefore, the bureaucrat’s objective will be to maximize the quantity of services supplied. This can only work due to information asymmetries, the government cannot directly observe the level of service output.

**Bureau-shaping model**: (Dunleavy, 1991): senior bureaucrats are most interested in maximizing the status and quality of their work, which is best pursued through bureau-shaping, rather than budget maximization.

**Private actors**: the relative influence of an interest group depends on the internal organization which includes factors such as income and organizational characteristics. Second, the very topic on which the interest group works might make a difference. Third, the relative influence of an interest group depends on the degree of competition with other interest groups. The intensity of competition is in turn determined by the access of various interest groups to decision-makers.

**Pluralism**: in democratic polities power is widely distributed, creating a marketplace with more or less perfect competition for influence over public policy.

**Corporatism**: the policy-making process is cooperative rather than competitive, and is closed to all but certain privileged interest groups, mainly those representing business and labour. Fewer interest groups participate in policy-making, but the ties between them and the decision-makers are institutionalized.

**Neo-corporatism**: greater constitutional autonomy of the groups involved and voluntary nature of involvement in policy-making.

**Game theory**: a device to analyse decision-making in situations in which two or more rational players interact, and where outcome depends on the choices made by each. E.g. the prisoner’s dilemma.

**Rational choice institutionalism**: based on the logic of consequentialism: that rational actors engage in strategic interactions using their resources to maximize their utility on the basis of given, fixed and ordered interests (a.k.a. preferences). Institutions structure the opportunities for strategic choice and interaction. Institutions affect the strategies of actors in order to get what they want, though they have no impact on the formation of their interests. **Veto point** → a political arena with the jurisdictional power to veto a government legislative proposal. **Veto player** → institutional actor whose agreement is required to adopt a policy proposal.

**Besluitvormingsmacht**: wie besluit?

**Agendasettingsmacht**: waarover worden besluiten genomen?

**Hegemoniale macht**: wat wordt (niet) ter discussie gesteld in de maatschappij en politiek?

Hoofdstuk 5: Problem definition and agenda-setting

**Problem definition**: a causal story which identifies harm, describes what causes it, assigns blame to those causing it and claims that the government is responsible for stopping it. Een probleem is gebaseerd op een empirische situatie, maar is tegelijkertijd per definitie een sociaal construct en een probleem is daarmee per definitie normatief of ideologisch. Een probleem omvat dus een een thema en een normatief concept van de werkelijkheid.

**Process of problem definition**: characterized by objective data and the question of whether and to what extent these objective criteria are actually acknowledged. It is about their social construction. Due to a split in risk perception, public demand might lead to the initiation of a policy-making process despite the absence of a genuine social problem that needs to be solved. In situations in which it is uncertain whether or not a social problem really exists, policy-makers may still prefer to address it. Or policy-makers refuse to see an issue as a problem that warrants a policy response.

**Political problem**: if the social problems can potentially be addressed by public policies. Second, a political problem is characterized by conflict, which is achieved through the scope (who is involved) and the bias (how the audience is involved). A battle between **expanders** → seek to publicize the issue to different societal groups, and **containers** → try to prevent the expanders from reaching the agenda stage.

**Framing**: involves the selective use of knowledge and information about a problem and the causal relationships surrounding it, to give it meaning and render it manageable. It is about emphasising certain aspects of a problem and de-emphasising others.

**Causality**: which actors or factors have caused the problem in the first place?

**Severity**: zijn de consequenties ernstig?

**Crisis**: is er direct actie nodig?

**Proximity**: raakt het het publiek persoonlijk?

**Incidence**: wordt het erger, raakt het meer mensen?

**Novelty**: is dit een nieuwe uitdaging?

**Population**: hoeveel sympathie is er voor de geaffecteerden?

**Agenda types**: distinction between **systemic agenda** → all societal problems that demand public attention and form the discussion agenda, and **institutional agenda** → a set of problems that are up for serious consideration by decision-makers. Further differentiating between **drafting agenda** → a list of subjects that are getting attention within government, and **decision agenda** → issues for which the government has agreed on a draft proposal and hence has decided to put the issue on the agenda of the responsible decision-making body, which has to take the final decision.

**Outside-initiative model**: describes a situation in which an individual actor or a group of actors outside the governmental structures initiates an issue for reform which they then seek to expand into the public domain.

**Mobilization model**: a process of agenda-setting where policy-makers move issues from the systemic to institutional agenda in order to muster the support needed to attain their objectives.

**Inside-access model**: describes a pattern of agenda-setting that seeks to exclude public participation.

**Power distribution perspective**: different groups of actors seek to increase the probability that an issue will receive collective attention by attempting to raise an issue’s salience and/or its support. Issue battles are frequently won or lost over the combatants’ success at either getting the public or other bystanders involved or excluding them.

**Institution-based perspective**: policy stability and policy change are mostly determined by the presence of policy venues and policy images. Actors who have the power to shape the decision agena are more likely to have their proposal adopted than those whose influence is basically confined to reacting to policy.

**Contingency perspective**: conceive of agenda-setting as a process that is affected by chance rather than rational calculation and the characteristics of politics. Policy-making is about the coupling of policy problems and policy solutions. Second, the argument of the garbage-can model. It is only when pre-existing solutions can be successfully coupled with perceived problems that an issue is put on the agenda.

**Elected public officials**: the most obvious agenda builders, since their position enables them not only to make decisions about policies, but also to place certain issues on the agenda.

**Judges**: agenda-setting might result from judicial review of existing legislation.

**Bureaucrats**: have an impact on policy-making, not only at the formulation and implementation stage, but also in terms of placing issues on the agenda. The bureaucracy makes up the largest part of most governments. The bureaucracy has a virtual monopoly and true cost-supply information and knows the demand of the legislature for the services it delivers. Or bureaucracies are ‘stand-in’ agenda-setters in situations where politicians do not have the time or technical knowledge.

**Interest groups**: impact relates to generating awareness of an issue and striving for support. Interest groups are involved in the process by framing issues and providing elected officials with information. Forms of lobbying are **inside advocacy** → information is supplied to those involved in the policy-making process, **outside advocacy** → information is communicated to actors outside the policy-making process, such as through press conferences, and **grass-roots advocacy** → mobilization of the masses. Influence depends on resources and access.

**Citizens**: impact by organizing citizens’ initiatives.

**International organizations**: een extra visie hierbij is dat internationale samenwerking een kans biedt om de nationale agenda te verrijken. Diminished democracy → integratie in internationale organisaties zoals WTO heeft invloed op elke beslissing met betrekking tot handel, en complementary view → internationale organisaties bieden meer kansen voor het verrijken van nationale agenda.

**Media**: emphasis on the relevance of the mass media in forming the image of the issue. There is a strong correlation between media coverage of issues and the public’s level of concern with them. Agenda-setting is essentially about attention dynamics and, as a consequence of it, the coverage of issues by the media is intimately connected to policy-making.

Hoofdstuk 6: Decision-making

**Decision-making** consists of two processes: **drafting** a piece of legislation → government, parliament, ministerial bureaucracy and experts, interest groups and NGO, and its **formal adoption** → entails controversial parliamentary debates and a formal voting process in at least one chamber.

**Determinants of policy formulation**: **bureaucrats** possess special insights into the relation between programmes and their effects. Another important function bureaucrats fulfil is to act as so-called policy brokers or mediators in situations of political conflict. Bureaucrats can use information provided by experts.

**Experts**: can give advice about the likely results of different courses of action. Second, they might help decision-makers to grasp complex interlinkages between issues. Third, they can help to develop fundamental policy principles and fourth, they might provide support for choosing amongst policy alternatives through framing them in accordance with certain norms.

**International organizations**: ministerial bureaucrats can voluntarily employ information provided by international organizations. The involvement of international organizations in policy drafting can also be of a more coercive character, e.g. the World Bank.

**Interest groups**: interest groups are able to supply valuable information concerning the effects of a policy to be proposed, as well as how it might be received by their members. Interest groups are able to provide information about the political dimension of a law proposal. Interest groups also engage in a two-way information-mediation process, which means that they also supply information to their members. In doing so, they can frame policy proposals. Interest groups can attempt to educate the public. Information asymmetries between interest groups and the bureaucracy can lead to problems of **regulatory capture**.

**Political preferences stemming from partisan ideology**: ideological considerations may impose restrictions on the policy alternatives that are taken into account by bureaucrats. The shaping effects of partisan ideology strongly depend upon the extent to which political actors control bureaucrats.

**Pursuit of private interests**: bureaucrats might aim to increase their income and prestige by seeking to realize their private interests when drafting legislation. Or they might be more interested in utility maximization through bureau-shaping than in budget maximization → **public choice perspective**. Or the extent to which self-interested bureaucratic behaviour dominates depends on the personality types present in administrative agencies. Egeberg suggests differentiating between **substantive policy-making** → formulating proposals in the various policy fields, and **administrative policy-making** → the coupling between bureaucrats’ self-interest and policy choices are stronger and thus lead to a situation in which private interests move to the fore.

**How are policy preferences formed**: the actual impact of interest groups depends on the actors’ policy predispositions. Ideology is very likely to guide policy choices.

**How are policy preferences transformed into actual policies**: veto players are defined as individual or collective actors whose agreement is necessary for a change of the status quo. **Institutional players** are those established by a country’s constitution. A higher number of veto players reduces the odds of policy adoption. Second, one has to assess the ideological distance between the actors possessing formal veto power. Third, it is important to assess how cohesive veto players are concerning their policy interests.

**UK**: a parliamentary democracy based on a unitary structure and plural electoral system that often produces a two-party system. Policies are largely determined by the executive and, together with a high degree of party cohesion in the House of Commons and the fact that the majority party and the executive are strongly interlinked, draft legislation introduced by the government is likely to pass with few changes. The opposition parties are ideologically different from the majority party and thus affect decision-making through criticizing and opposing government proposals.

**Australia**: the Senate, which is composed of the representatives of each state, can force the government to modify its policy proposal before agreeing to give its consent to it.

**Canada**: the Senate is a weak player, with federalism unlikely to complicate policy-making at the national levels. Policy adoption can, however, require the government to give up policy positions if it is a minority government relying on the support of other parties.

**US**: the number and power of veto players are much higher. This makes policy adoption more complicated, often leading to substantial modification between the initial policy proposal and the form of law that is adopted in the end.

Hoofdstuk 7: Implementation

**Policy implementation**: the stage in the policy-making process where a policy is put into effect by the responsible actors and agencies. Implementation involves the transformation of a policy output into a policy outcome. Analysing policy implementation always involves a judgement about the intended policy outcomes and about those actually achieved.

**Implementation structure**: the formal organizational arrangements that have been set up for implementing a policy. It is carried out by different levels of state bureaucracy.

**Decision-making within agencies**: the formal authority to make decisions in order to put a policy into practice. Agencies can have differing degrees of decisional discretion.

**Target group behaviour**: only if the target group changes its behaviour in the intended manner can a policy be said to be implemented effectively.

**Top-down models of policy implementation**: het uitvoeringsproces is een serie/keten van top-down schakels tussen het beleid en de uiteindelijke uitvoering. In elke schakel tussen betrokken actoren kan er een ‘implementatiedeficit’ optreden. En hoe langer de implementatieketen en hoe groter het aantal actoren, hoe meer afwijking van oorspronkelijk doel en hoe lastiger implementatieproces. (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980): first the model addresses the extent to which the actions of implementing officials and target groups were consistent with the objectives and procedures outlined in a public policy. Next, they focus on the extent to which the objectives were attained over time. Third, they evaluate the principal factors affecting policy outcomes and finally, they suggest analyzing whether and how the policy was reformulated on the basis of experience.

**Criticism top-down perspective**:

- veel nadruk op de uiteindelijk geformuleerde beleidsdoelen/output;houdt weinig rekening met de acties/het proces hieraan voorafgaand gedurende de beleidsvorming.

- implementatie wordt gezien als een ‘administratief proces’ zonder politieke aspecten/politieke inkleuring (van ambtelijk betrokkenen); niet realistisch, verloopt eerder ‘niet-Weberiaans’.

- er wordt geen rekening gehouden met betrokkenen op lokaal niveau en met lokale omstandigheden, op ‘streetlevel’.

**Bottom-up models of policy implementation**: meer sprake van een procesgerichte benadering, doelen en instrumenten liggen minder op voorhand vast en kunnen tijdens de implementatie wijzigen, meer belang gehecht aan invloeden en keuzes van lokale actoren en aansluiting bij doelen van (lokale) betrokkenen; ‘microlevel implementation’, en minder centralistisch gedacht; meer flexibiliteit in relatie beleid en implementatie; ‘multicentrische benadering. Effective implementation is not measured by the attainment of a certain centrally defined objective, but judged by the extent to which the perceived outcomes correspond with the preferences of the actors involved.

**Criticism bottom-up perspective**:

- succes van beleidsimplementatie is moeilijker te meten; minder duidelijk verband tussen oorspronkelijke doelen en feitelijke opbrengsten en uitspraken over specifieke ‘lokale omstandigheden’.

- ook normatieve kritiek gezien politieke, democratische context: lokale functionarissen en uitvoerders dienen zich ook te voegen naar centraal (politiek-democratisch) vastgesteld beleid.

- vaak (te) veel aandacht en nadruk op de lokale autonomie, terwijl de politiek (toch) veelal definieert hoe de implementatie dient plaats te vind.

**Hybrid models of policy implementation**: seek to integrate the macro world of the policy-makers with the micro world of the implementers. (Matland, 1995): **beleidsambiguïteit** → ontbreken van heldere doelen in het beleid en/of van middelen om doelen te kunnen bereiken; mate van onduidelijkheid/vaagheid en **beleidsconflict** → conflict/onenigheid over het doel dat men wil bereiken en/of welke middelen men het beste kan inzetten; mate van onenigheid

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Conflict** |  |
| **Ambiguïteit** | **Gering** | **Groot** |
| **Gering** | Administratieve implementatie.  Reguliere toepassing van middelen; kennis en techniek bepalend (top down). | Politieke implementatie.  Politiek debat, macht bepalend (top down). |
| **Groot** | Experimentele implementatie.  Contextuele condities; ervaring en evaluatie bepalend (bottom up). | Symbolische implementatie.  Vaak onenigheid over doel en methode tussen groepen actoren; coalities in netwerk bepalend (bottom up). |

**Criteria for implementation success**: **formal transposition** focuses on the entirety of the specific provisions of a given public policy and their incorporation into the existing legal and administrative system. This stage is about the steps necessary to make a policy implementable so that it can actually be put into practice. **Practical application**: the actual putting into practice of a policy. Richt zich op de organisatorische en administratieve structuren en procedures praktische invoering en uitvoering van geformuleerd beleid.

**Determinants of implementation success**: explain variation in implementation effectiveness.

**Choice of policy instruments**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Complexity of policy envir** | **onment** |
| **Capacity of the state** | **High** | **Low** |
| **High** | Directive instruments | Authoritative instruments |
| **Low** | Subsidy instruments | Informative instruments |

**Soorten beleidsinstrumenten**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Soort beleidsin** | **strument** |  |  |
| **Dimensie** | **Juridisch** | **Economisch** | **Communicatief** | **Fysiek** |
| **Algemeen** | Wet  Tabakswet en arbeids- omstandighedenwet | Prijsregulering  Verhoging prijs tabak | Massamedia  Antirook- campagne | Voorzieningen  Verboden te roken ruimtes handhaving |
| **Individueel** | Beschikking  Bouwvergunning | Subsidie op aanvraag  Subsidie op zonnepanelen | Advies  Het juridisch loket | Bestuursdwang  Sloop illegaal gebouwd object |
| **Verruimend** | Legalisering  Abortuswet en wietproductie | Subsidie  Subsidie zonnepanelen | Voorlichting  Kennisvermeerderend: wat te doen bij... | Nieuwe weg  Capaciteitsvergroting |
| **Beperkend** | Verbod/gebod  NIX18 | Heffing  Energiebelasting | ‘Spinning’ manipulatief  Campagne OV chipkaart en verwijderen kaartautomaten | Toegangspoortje  Beweegbare paal in wegdek |

**Precision and clarity of policy design**: implementatieproblemen ontstaan door onduidelijke en vage omschrijvingen van beleidsdoelen waardoor soms geen gerichte actie mogelijk is. Ook is er invloed van het aantal actoren met vetomacht en de complexiteit van beslissingsstructuur. Hoe meer sprake hiervan is, hoe vaker compromissen met open formuleringen en inconsistenties in het beleidsontwerp. De policy accumulation moet rekening houden met bestaande regelgeving.

**Control structures**: **principal-agent theories** → het delegeren van beleidsvormgeving en beleidsuitvoering aan intermediaire organisaties, kan leiden tot bureaucratic drift.

**Institutional design**: beleid uitgevoerd door één of door meerdere bestuurslagen of organisaties.

**Administrative capacities**: voorgaande factoren zijn vooral gericht op bereidheid van actoren om effectieve implementatie mogelijk te maken en ook hun macht om beslissingen mogelijk te maken. Deze factor gaat om de mogelijkheden: personele capaciteit (omvang, expertise), maar ook financiële, technische en organisatorische middelen.

**Social acceptance**: de belangrijkste succesfactor voor succesvolle implementatie (legitimiteit). Invoering van mooie maatregelen leveren geen probleem (belastingverlaging voor iedereen). Impopulaire maatregelen daarentegen leveren mogelijk veel verzet (korting op bijstandsuitkering, verkorting WW-duur, verhoging van de pensioenleeftijd, afschaffing basisbeurs voor studenten). In deze gevallen worden ook belangengroepen (‘interest groups’) betrokken voor vergroting acceptatie bij achterban, zij krijgen daarmee ook (meer) invloed.

Hoofdstuk 8: Evaluation

**Evaluation** tackles questions about expected and unexpected policy outcomes. Some of the factors that can complicate evaluation activities include the identification of policy goals, the appropriate definition and measurements of performance indicators, the isolation of a policy’s effects from other factors and the political context.

**Beleidsonderzoek versus academisch onderzoek**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Kenmerken** | **Academisch onderzoek** | **Beleidsonderzoek** |
| Primair doel/intentie | Theorie, hypothesetoetsing, cumulatie wetenschappelijke kennis | Verbetering beleids/praktijksituatie |
| Methode | Precies, gestandaardiseerd, veelal kwantitatief | Minder gestandaardiseerd, mixed methods, kwantitatief en kwalitatief |
| Voorbeeld karakteristieke vraag | Verband tussen crimineel gedrag van vader en zoon = fundamenteel kennisniveau | Welke training is bij deviant gedrag goed toepasbaar = praktisch, gericht op toepasbaarheid |
| Geldigheid van inzichten | Gericht op algemene geldigheid | Beperkter geldig, vaak afhankelijk van context |
| Wie onderzoekt | Academische onderzoeker | Externe beleidsonderzoeker, soms interne beleidsonderzoeker |
| Belangrijkste verdienste | Betrouwbaar, precies, harde conclusies | Relevant/bruikbaar, specifiek, levensecht |

**Administrative evaluation**: is usually carried out within government bodies and examines the delivery of public policy and government services. The main objective is to ensure that public policies attain their goals at the least possible cost and least burden on the target groups. **Process evaluation** is about exploring possibilities for making operating procedures more efficient. **Effort evaluation** assesses the amount of effort governments put into attaining their policy objectives (e.g. in terms of budgets and personnel resources). **Efficiency evaluation** is about a public policy’s costs and the ways of accomplishing the same goals at lower costs. **Effectiveness evaluation** compares the intended goals of a policy with the ones actually achieved.

**Judicial evaluation**: is principally concerned with legal issues relating to the way in which policies are developed and implemented. Judicial evaluation is either initiated by the judiciary or when requested by individuals or organisations presenting a legal complaint.

**Political evaluation**: not an evaluation activity in the classic sense, but rather a tool for depicting (framing) public policy in a positive or negative way.

**Scientific evaluation**: a social scientific activity which aims to provide neutral answers to the question of whether a given public policy is effective or not. **Formative evaluation** has the purpose of improving a certain policy measure by providing advice to implementing actors and stakeholders. **Summative evaluation** takes place at the end of policy implementation and assesses whether the policy has attained the intended objectives. **Outcome evaluatie** is het bepalen van bepaalde resultaten/opbrengsten, zonder een directe relatie te leggen met de beleidsmaatregelen. **Impact evaluatie** is het bepalen van de causale relatie tussen het gevoerde beleid en de effecten.

**Formatief versus summatief**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Formatief** | **Summatief** |
| Doelgroep | Programmamanagers, uitvoerende professionals | Beleidsmakers, financiers, algemeen breed publiek |
| Focus dataverzameling | Verheldering doelen, aard van implementatie, identificeren van opbrengsten | Meting van effecten |
| Rol van onderzoeker | Interactief, in wisselwerking met project/programma | Onafhankelijk, op afstand |
| Toegepaste methoden | Kwantitatief en kwalitatief | Nadruk op kwantitatief |
| Frequentie dataverzameling | Tussentijdse metingen, monitoring | Beperkt aantal metingen (nul- en eindmeting) |
| Wijze van rapportage | (In)formele verspreiding via werkgroepen en bijeenkomsten | Formele effectrapportages |
| Frequentie van rapportage | Meerdere malen tijdens onderzoek als tussentijdse input | Bij afronding evaluatie |

**Economic evaluation**: involves the identification, measurement, evaluation and then comparison of the costs (inputs) and benefits (outcomes/impacts) of two or more alternative policies. Used for administrative evaluations.

**Performance evaluation**: meting van prestaties en output, als managementtool voor verbetering van effectiviteit publieke dienstverlening.

**Carrying out evaluation**:

1. Identification of the clients of the evaluation

2. Formulating clear-cut evaluation questions or criteria

3. Assessment of the resources available to carry out the evaluation project

4. Detailed analysis of the intended effects of the policy measure

5. Selection of the most appropriate evaluation strategy

6. Development of measures and gathering the data

7. Carrying out the data analysis

8. Publication of the results and presentation of recommendations

**Motives**: **instrumentality** → the search for effectiveness, and **legitimacy** → the construction of a shared sense and common acceptance of a policy.

**Problems**: policies might unfold their effects only under certain context conditions and policy spaces are rarely empty, but consist of policy mixes that have been accumulating over time.

**The conventional attribution problem**: the question of which factors are responsible for an observed effect. Conceptual tools for policy design, such as strategy maps, reflect hypotheses about cause-and-effect relationships that ideally try to include all factors affecting the relevant outcome. The methodological toolkit for policy evaluation - including comparative case study designs and quantitative methods - attempts to isolate the actual impact of public policy by controlling for potentially confounding influences.

**Complex policy mixes**: policy spaces are rarely empty, but typically represent configurations of complex policy mixes that are continuously accumulating over time.

**Approaches to problems**: the effects of policy mixes can be assessed ex ante on theoretical or conceptual grounds. Interactions within complex policy mixes can be explicitly modelled. Quasi-experimental approaches perform rather well in ensuring the internal validity of findings.

**Political evaluation**: utilizing formally or informally derived information about public policy for political purposes. The objective is helping elected officials to stay in power or to induce a change in the partisan composition of government.

**Evidence-based policy**: comparing the expected and observed effects of a public policy. It is about using experience or new information to avoid a repetition of the errors of the past or to find better resolutions to policy problems by means of policy-oriented learning.

Hoofdstuk 11: Policy change and policy convergence

**Policy change as change in preferences and beliefs**: **Advocacy coalition framework** (Sabatier, 1988): it employs the structure of beliefs in governing coalitions of so-called policy subsystems to predict changes in shared beliefs that lead to changes in policy. **Policy oriented learning** corresponds to a process in which new information on the policy issue concerned becomes available and induces actors who are part of the dominant advocacy coalition to change their beliefs according to the new information. **External events** cause subsystem instability and increase the potential for rapid and more far-reaching policy change. External events may include the election of a new government or focusing events like crises or shocks. An internal shock refers to event-triggered changes within a coalition’s belief system. An external shock has the added element of competition.

**Social learning**: (Hall, 1993): policy-making is a process that is about making decisions along three dimensions. First is the overarching goal that guides a policy in a particular field, second is the policy instrument used to attain those goals and third is the precise setting of this instrument. This forms the policy paradigm. Policy change is most likely for the policy setting, more difficult when it comes to policy instruments and even more with goals.

**Linking policy change and institutional change**: **Punctuated equilibrium theory** (Baumgartner and Jones, 1993): seeks to explain why political processes are usually characterized by stability and incrementalism, but occasionally produce fundamental shifts from the past. Policy stability is disrupted every now and then by substantial punctuations.

**Policy change by chance**: **Multiple streams framework** (Kingdon, 2003): underscores the possibility of policy change through agenda-setting. The notion of three independent streams: ‘problems’, ‘policy’ and ‘political’. For an issue to be placed on the political agenda, these independent streams need to come together at some point. The opportunity to bring these streams together arises if a ‘policy window’ or ‘window of opportunity’ opens (e.g. elections or natural disasters). A policy entrepreneur has to bring the streams together, which is known as the process of ‘coupling’.

**Temporal issues regarding policy change**: to receive the most convincing empirical evidence of policy change, the number of observations should be as large as possible. The main problem arises from censoring, i.e. the incomplete recording of information at the beginning or end of the event that is of interest.

**Policy change at different levels of abstraction**: when is change fundamental and when is it incremental? Two degrees of change, namely changes in core beliefs and changes in secondary aspects. Hall (1993) differentiates between policy paradigms (the overarching goal that guides policy in a particular field), policy instruments (the means used to achieve these goals) and the precise setting or calibration of those instruments.

**Policy density and policy intensity**: change is defined as any departure from the status quo. Policy involves two directions, namely expansion and dismantling. The dimension of **policy density** describes the extent to which a certain policy area is covered by governmental activities. The second indicator is defined by the number of policy instruments. **Policy intensity** refers to the level of policy intervention. On the one hand it is defined by the setting of the applied policy instruments. On the other hand policy intensity varies with the scope of policy intervention.

**General patterns of policy change**: instances of expansion should occur more frequently than those of dismantling. The adoption of new policies generally meet less political resistance.