Public Policy Implementation: A Theoretical Review

[1]Kurhayadi

[1]Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Bandung ; kurhayadi@stiabandung.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation is to contextualize the theoretical discussions that have been had by various authors regarding the concepts and models of public policy and their respective execution, with the intention of provoking questions and thought. It is the focus or role of public policy as a mechanism for solving societal problems. Public power seeks to anticipate the need for planning and implementing actions that can create structural conditions for socioeconomic development. This work takes the form of a bibliographic study, and it regards the focus or role of public policy as a mechanism for solving societal problems. Discussion focussed on competing for top-down and bottom-up perspectives regarding the various implementation options investigated. In addition, he cites a significant body of explanatory variables that help improve one's comprehension of implementation. One example of this is the 5-C protocol, a conceptual framework that, in the opinion of several academics, is becoming increasingly recognized as an important factor in the chain of causation. The relevance of implementation in the planning process was acknowledged by the literature later than it should have been due to the typical view scholars have of political science, which is to concentrate on examining legislative or executive administrative procedures. Because of the numerous unsatisfactory outcomes, it is clear that the implementation and the elaboration stages needed to be coordinated.

Keywords: Public Policy, Top-down and Bottom-up Approach, Implementation.

Introduction

Policies have always been a polemic that has never stopped being questioned, both policies made by the government and policies issued by the business world, profit or non-profit agencies or organizations (Nur & Guntur, 2019). The community is always actively discussing policies, both policies in the organization and policies outside the organization, and continuously highlights any problems that arise to get good and correct policies (Nur & Guntur, 2019). Before discussing further public policy analysis, it is necessary first to understand the policy concept. This needs to be done because of the wide use of policy concepts and terms, so it will lead to different perspectives in understanding policy concepts and terms and give birth to a new paradigm.

The public policy emerged as a way of equating economic and social issues to promote state development (Riskiyono, 2015). The importance of the field of public policy knowledge arises primarily from economic questions, not from restrictive spending policies; only then did the social sector enter the government's agenda (Zaenuddin, 2018). More recently, the study of public policy has emerged in the United States as an academic field of knowledge, emphasizing government action without establishing any connection with the theoretical underpinnings of the state's role. Returning to Europe, studies and research are more focused on analyzing the state and its institutions than government production. The development of the two works is based on the explanatory theory of the state's role and government (Tahir, 2014).

Various models, both elaboration and implementation of public policies, are presented by various authors. However, the relevance of this research lies in its trajectory so that it can achieve the expected results. Whatever the vision of the dynamic and complex process through which it becomes public policy, it is clear that implementation is needed because it is in the execution stage that the goals set in the formulation process can be successfully achieved (Anwar, 2022).

10

There is a vision that separates the elaboration of the implementation of public policy in the planning process and places it as a planning process. The dissociation between planning and implementation or lack of attention to implementation requirements increases the likelihood of public policy failure. Regardless of whether it is a policy or a formal authority structure, it depends on the implementer or the success or failure of the program. They can mobilize the necessary resources to overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles if they are well-prepared and motivated. If not, they can sabotage the program, even though the control system is tighter (Sahir et al., 2022).

In the broadest sense of implementation, the literature is based more on case studies in developed countries than in industrialized countries, as it is characterized by the absence of generally valid groups of works. Indonesian literature is limited and nonexistent in this regard, focusing more on elaborating, controlling and evaluating public policies. Thus, almost all the content found refers mainly to the latest works of authors from abroad. In this sense, this article represents the main concepts and models of Public Policy and their implementation, seeking to synthesize state-of-the-art. It also seeks to build bridges between different public policy implementation models.

Methods

Writing this article aims to review and synthesize the available literature related to the implementation of public policy to contribute to an understanding of the implementation of public policy in the public sector. Therefore, by writing this article, the author examines some of the literature from books, research journals and other sources of information from electronic mass media and relevant website pages to understand policy implementation in public sector organizations. This article also highlights the 5-C protocol by Brynard (2000) because this model is very useful for planning and evaluating policy implementation, where the variables must be strategically interrelated to create a favourable environment for effective implementation. Managers, professionals and academics from public institutions and development management must have adequate knowledge and understanding of these variables, such as the structure, operation and dynamics of planning and policy implementation systems.

Results And Discussion

1. Public policy

For example, in many definitions of public policy, Hill & Head (1997) analyze the properties of the two concepts vary. Note that the discussion has a focus or role as a mechanism for solving community problems. Critics of these definitions, which exaggerate the rational and procedural aspects of public policy, argue that they ignore their essence, what they say, or the conflict around ideas and interests. The author also adds that, by focusing on the role of two governments, this definition ignores the aspect of the conflict and the limitations surrounding the decisions of the two governments and leaves out the possibility of cooperation between the government and other institutions and social groups.

In Peter & Piere's (2006) conception, the state becomes an agent that hands over the decisions made in the power correlation between power agents to civil society. Thus, the authors formulate public policy, giving the following form: Public policy is understood as the result of the dynamics of the power play that is intertwined within the scope of power relations, relations formed by economic and political groups, and social class. And other civil society organizations. This relationship determines the series of actions associated with state institutions, which lead to

the direction (and diversion) of the two directions of action of State administrative intervention in social reality and investment.

According to Maloney et al. (1994), a public policy must at least have an information flow concerning a goal that aims to meet the needs of society. Public power seeks to anticipate needs by planning and implementing actions that create the structural conditions for a country's socioeconomic development. Another definition of Public Policy is put forward by Erridge & McIlroy (2002), a series of collective actions guaranteeing two social rights, forming public commitments that aim to account for certain demands in various fields. It reveals the transformation of what is from the private sphere into collective action in the public space.

Every political process begins when one or more societal actors identify a need or problem or feel that government action negatively impacts some segment of society. These actors try to mobilize support to convince political decision-makers to act in terms of changing the status quo in their favour. The political decision phase is critical for two main reasons: it determines who influences or controls the political decision process; and determines how stakeholders influence the political agenda. The initial process of instituting or changing policy is usually called "agenda-setting policy" (Brynard, 2000).

Forester (1993) analyzes public policy from planning and argues that the political-social decision process is the most important part of planning. For the authors, planning "depends on the right information, transparency, ethics, simplicity, acceptance of different visions and a willingness to negotiate and seek common solutions that are acceptable to the whole of society, especially the parties involved, continuously leading to learning". Among the various views put forward by the author, he first links the activity of making plans with the planning process. Others recognize the role of implementation, although they still emphasize planning as a fundamental key to the success of the public policy. Third, a more modern vision seeks to add an implementation component to the plan, prioritizing several management mechanisms for implementing both plans, such as monitoring, auditing, and counterpart technical meetings, as assurance that the objectives will be achieved. Another more recent vision is popular or populist with a total emphasis on the participation of the population or civil society in the implementation of the two plans, where the beneficiary tries to monitor the project, denounces it, and accompanies the process as a whole.

2. Public Policy Implementation

Literature on the implementation of public policy was developed starting in 1973, with the publication of the work of Pressman & Wildavsky (1973) entitled implementation. Starting from this work, several papers elaborated on debates ranging from techniques for studying and managing implementation to the differences between developed and developing countries. Najan (1995) defines implementation as a state of achieving policy goals, and implementation (as a verb) is a process where everything happens to achieve policy goals. Implementation is a dynamic stage. It is a process of its meaning, not limited to translating certain policies into action but can change politics. Implementation is a process of interaction between setting goals and the actions taken to achieve them. It consists of planning and organizing administrative tools and two human, financial, material and technological resources needed to implement a policy (Brynard, 2005).

In this process, public policy is influenced by circumstances outside the planning and implementing agencies, so it becomes possible or not to be implemented. According to Hogwood (1995), this circumstance involves adequacy, adequacy and availability of time and resources; political characteristics in terms of cause and effect, external linkages and dependencies; understanding and specification of the two objectives and tasks; communication; coordination

and compliance. Najan (1995) suggests that the failure of public policy implementation can be attributed to two antagonistic approaches: top-down - a perspective in which political decisions are authoritative at a central level and bottom-up - an approach that takes complexity into account. Of the implementation process. Taking contributions from other scholars, the authors bring out the characteristics of the process: mapping on the back and not on the front; focus on execution structures and negotiation processes; actions between and between implementing networks; ability to accommodate unexpected and unpredictable events, ability to adapt.

Implementation can also be seen as a policy decision-making process (Alexander, 1985)). In this case, the intervening variables are Inter-agency communication and implementation of activities - which involve technical assistance and information and which are controlled by remuneration, coercive or normative; Agency characteristics - team size and competence, hierarchy and control, autonomy, vitality, degree of opening and chain of communication; Political, economic and social conditions - available economic resources, reflecting economic and social conditions, public opinion, elite positions, opposition parties and private (non-institutional) groups.

In his work Najan (1995) presents several implementation models put forward by researchers both abroad:

a. Edwards Model (1980) – Top-down. It seeks to know the conditions mentioned above and the main obstacles to its successful implementation. In this model, we will identify four factors that interact simultaneously: communication, method, layout and structure.

b. Model Van Meter & Van Horn (1975) – Top-down. It deals with causes of non-implementation: subordinates do not know what the boss wants, cannot do it or refuse to do it. The authors suggest six variables: relevance of political norms and goals; political resources; inter-organizational communication and implementation of activities; characteristics of implementing agencies; The economic-socio-political environment of the implementing agency; and the provision of two executors for the realization of political decisions.

c. Model by Mazmanain & Sabatier (1983) – Top-down. He considers three critical observations: policy formation is an interactive process of formulation, implementation, and reformulation; focus on realizing the two objectives of the stated policy; And its implementation can be seen from three different perspectives – or formulators, or executors and or public-alvo. The writer will present six variables collected in three groups: traceability of two problems, Political decision-making capacity according to its structure, and implementation also has its dynamics.

d. Model Rein & Rabinovitz (1978) – Bottom-up. Focus on practice. At least three formal imperatives govern implementation policy: respect for legal rationality mediated by a concern for instrumental rationality defined by officials and remaining informed by the knowledge that such action requires internal and external consensus. The means of resolving any conflict between these requirements is a function of the two goals, resources and complex administrative implementation processes.

e. Model Berman (1978) – Bottom-up. Successful implementation depends on a complex interaction between policy and institutional characteristics. Work with both macro and micro implementation approaches. Macro is the central federal government, where policies are translated into project plans, and micro is when local organizations plan and implement their internal policies in response to government actions. For these scholars, implementation can

13

follow four different paths: a) not aligning policies with behaviour; b) co-optation – behavioural adaptation, but political adaptation to accommodate existing routines; c) technology learning – less adaptation to politics, more adaptation to modified behaviour; and e) adapting to each other, both in behaviour and politics.

f. Elmore's Model (1979) – Bottom-up. Considering that understanding the organization is essential for implementation analysis, the authors present four different models for this process: (1) systems management model – organization as a unit of value and maximization – implementation is seen as an organized activity with a specific purpose; (2) a model that emphasizes the bureaucratic process – emphasizes rules or decision-making criteria and routines of organizational behaviour and understands implementation as an ongoing process to control the two criteria of choice and changing routines; (3) the organizational development model – the need for individual participation and commitment; and (4) the negotiation model – treating the organization as an arena of conflict.

Najan (1995) concluded that implementation means transition. To execute programs, implementers must constantly deal with users, the environment, clients, and each other. Organizational formalities and administrative mechanisms are important as (secondary) background plans, but the constant confrontation with contexts, personalities, alliances, and events is the key to success. Adapting or acknowledging and correcting these mistakes, changing direction, and learning are very important.

Furthermore, O'Toole (2000) states that there are three models of public policy implementation, namely:

a. The classical policy cycle model (formulation and implementation) does not consider aspects related to implementation and the feedback effect on policy formulation. Well, do not think of it as a process. In this aspect, implementation is understood as a one-shot game, where government actions are implemented from top to bottom – from top to bottom.

b. The model is a linear process in which formulation and implementation are seen as a process that proposes monitoring and evaluating policies to be considered instruments that allow gap corrections to occur. According to this model, changes, obstacles and implementation problems stem from aspects related to the institutional capacity of implementing agencies; They are generated by problems of a political nature and also stem from resistance and boycotts by groups or sectors that are negatively influenced by politics. Another serious problem is the excessive priority given to formulation activities and seen as not problematic. Assume that: the diagnosis must be correct; The formulator has all the necessary information to develop a program proposal and has a valid causal model. This causal model consists of hypotheses and assumptions about certain social phenomena.

c. Implementation is seen as a game: networks, institutional learning and stakeholders – it is a game between implementers where parents are negotiated, levels of adherence to programs vary, and resources between actors become the object of a bargain. According to empirical analyzes of public policies, their formulators operate in an environment of uncertainty which manifests itself at several levels: a big limitation of knowledge about the intervening phenomenon: a lack of controls and conditions to foresee contingencies that may affect the policy environment, not in the future; plans and programs are documents that limit only the set of actions and decisions to be followed; and programs or policies are expressed by the individual or collective preferences of their formulators.

Brynard (2000) proposed the 5C protocol - a model of five groups of explanatory variables that allows a better understanding of implementation. The five interrelated variables are:

Content. See what you would like to do to solve the perceived problem. It is the choice of ends and means, as well as the definition of ends and the actions taken to achieve them. According to this protocol, a policy can be characterized as distributive once it creates public benefits for the general welfare, as a regulator – which prescribes rules of conduct with penalties for non-compliance – and as a redistributive – which seeks to shift the allocation of wealth or power from some groups to others. Three important variables are highlighted here: (1) the purpose – or what the policy is supposed to do; (2) embedded causal theory - how to problematize the question proposed to be handled; and (3) method - how to solve or perceived problem. The definition of these three variables will impact the other four protocols. Each type of policy (distributive, redistributive or regulatory) requires different levels of capacity and context and tends to generate different levels of commitment between preferred actors and clients and alliances. In this way, the evidence is the need for a relationship between 5C protocol variables, where, for example, in the absence of commitment between two implementers, highly adversarial clients and colleagues, lack of administrative capacity or favourable context, situations arise according to established policies not being executed from Context – This is considered the organizational environment within which the policy will be implemented and constrains the implementation process, sometimes structured as operational procedures.

We include social, economic, political and legal aspects related to institutions. Grindle (1980) in Najan (1995) defines a broader context which includes: a) the power, interests and strategies of the two actors involved (according to clients and colleagues); b) institutional and regime characteristics, which are generally identified as environmental factors; and c) compliance and response capacity (as committed). Not that it depends on environmental factors, but at least three tasks will be required for successful implementation: (1) identify the main institutional actors influencing or being affected by the process; (2) map the interests and relations of internal and external forces towards the institution; c) recognize the institutional characteristics that are influenced by the global structure of social, economic, political and legal definitions in which they operate.

Commitment - Regardless of this protocol, the discussion between the two authors revolves around top-down and bottom-up approaches. For defenders, the top-down approach, or commitment, is shaped mainly by political content and lack of capacity, and both can be controlled from the "topo". Já bottom-up perspective, or commitment, even with content and capacity influences, is more influenced by institutional context, clients, and partners. However, despite the differences between these two approaches, the authors cite that commitment is important not only for the street level but for all levels as past politics and that, according to the interweaving of the five Critique variables, commitment will be influenced by and will affect the four the remaining variables: content, capacity, context, client, and colleague. Brynard (2000) asserts that the commitment of street-level bureaucrats is so important because of their privileged position of proximity to problems, thus, implying that their priorities are determined not only by institutions but also by realities and concerns. That we deal with clients, and also because of the degree of discretionary power they generally enjoy giving them the ability to not only influence the implementation of policies but also to constrain policies in action.

Capacity – It is agreed among scholars that this protocol is so important that a great deal of administrative resources or capacity is required. Variables that must be considered are the workload of two officials, training in carrying out tasks, information flow, adequate financial resources, physical facilities (buildings, supplies, technology, etc.), and the time available for implementation. As Brynard (2000) cites, the difficult task is identifying what types and capacity

15

levels are required at particular points of the administrative hierarchy. This is the point at which the issue turns, from the evaluation of logistical capacities - such as implementation itself, the supply of resources with questions of availability of whom to receive or what, when, how, where and from what, to the policy appreciation of Capacidade - how it can be maintained and operational. Only the agency has the requirement to assess implementation capacity due to limited information on actual needs, which are often fully known because the process has already started. This way, the need for change can emerge in policy content to respond to new needs.

Client and Coalition– According to Najan (1995), this protocol relates more to a bottom-up approach, as scholars view that the ultimate effectiveness of any implementation process potentially depends on two groups—unless the policies are transferred. In the same way, it is influenced by alliances of interest groups, opinion leaders, and other external agents. As well as support from external clients and partners, together, are the final critical variables.

Although the literature presents little orientation, not saying respect for alliances, it is necessary to identify local leaders, economic elites, opinion leaders, media, and reference groups who can sometimes voice the fears, doubts and concerns of two clients. The author highlights the importance of these variables and the degree of interrelationship between them, starting from the principle that they are applied in different thematic areas, at different levels and under different forms of government. However, each institution has its characteristics that may influence the implementation process. According to Najan (1995), the dynamics of the interrelationship of the 5 Cs protocol suggests that execution should not be seen as an activity that is planned and carried out according to a predetermined and simple blueprint, as a process that can only be under the best hypothesis.

Conclusion

Public policy implementation can be understood as a process where goals can be changed, and resources are mobilized to meet and achieve goals. This can be seen as the process of changing the policy you want to apply. If planned, it can prevent the failure of a policy. Several factors can interfere with implementation, changing the expected path. Due to circumstances outside the executing agency related to adequacy, adequacy and availability of time and resources; political characteristics in terms of cause and effect, external linkages and dependencies; to understand and determine the two goals and tasks; for communication, coordination and compliance. The success of implementation will also be related to the adequacy of top-down or bottom-up direction to the type of policy and the environment in which it is implemented. There are also factors related to the characteristics of the negotiation process, the nature of the policy focus, actions and relationships between executors and their ability to adapt and accept and accommodate contingencies, team characteristics, and political, economic and social conditions. There are so many influencing factors that implementation cannot be separated from the public policy planning process. It must be foreseen and anticipated which implementation model will become relevant. This model will serve all policies and not all circumstances and organizations. On the other hand, they are not exclusive models. Previously, they were providers of relevant information about the implementation process. In some cases, one model may be more important than another, as it offers different types of information needed at different stages of the implementation process.

References

Alexander, E. R. (1985). From idea to action: Notes for a contingency theory of the policy implementation process. *Administration & Society*, *16*(4), 403-426.

Anwar, K. (2022). Implementasi dan Relevansi Kebijakan Dalam Pemerataan Pendidikan: Studi Literatur Pelayanan Publik. *Coopetition: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, *13*(3), 419-428.

Berman, P. (1978). The study of macro-and micro-implementation. *Public policy*, *26*(2), 157–184.

Brynard, P. (2005). Policy implementation: Lessons for service delivery. *Journal of Public Administration*, *40*(si-3), 649–664.

Brynard, P. A. (2009). Policy implementation. *Administratio Publica*, *17*(4), 13-27.

EDWARD III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.

Elmore, R. F. (1979). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political science quarterly*, *94*(4), 601–616.

Erridge, A., & McIlroy, J. (2002). Public procurement and supply management strategies. *Public policy and administration*, *17*(1), 52–71.

Forester, J. (1993). *Critical theory, public policy, and planning practice*. Suny Press.

Hill, G., & Head, C. C. A. (1997). of Policy. *Process-A Reader, London et al.: Prentice Hall*.

Hogwood, B. W. (1995). Public policy. *Public Administration*, *73*(1), 59–73.

Maloney, W. A., Jordan, G., & McLaughlin, A. M. (1994). Interest groups and public policy: the insider/outsider model revisited. *Journal of public policy*, *14*(1), 17–38.

Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott Foresman.

Najam, A. (1995). Learning from the literature on policy implementation: a synthesis perspective. *International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis – IIASA. A-2361 Luxwnburg. Austria.*

Nur, A. C., & Guntur, M. (2019). Analisis Kebijakan Publik. *Makassar: Publisher UNM*.

O'Toole Jr, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, *10*(2), 263–288.

Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (Eds.). (2006). Handbook of public policy.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1973). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland, Or why it is amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation* (Vol. 708). Univ of California Press.

Rein, M., & Rabinovitz, F. (1978). *American politics and public policy*. New York: Plenum Press.

Riskiyono, J. (2015). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pembentukan perundang-undangan untuk mewujudkan kesejahteraan. *Aspirasi: Jurnal Masalah-masalah Sosial*, *6*(2), 159-176.

Sahir, S. H., Firdausy, S., Simarmata, H. M. P., Kurniullah, A. Z., Sinaga, L. R., Hendrayani, Y., ... & Pratiwi, I. I. (2022). *Dasar-dasar public relations*. Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Tahir, A. (2014). *Kebijakan publik dan transparansi penyelenggaraan pemerintahan daerah*. Penerbit Alfabeta.

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, *6*(4), 445-488.

Zaenuddin, M. (2018). *Isu, Problematika, dan Dinamika Perekonomian, dan Kebijakan Publik: Kumpulan Essay, Kajian dan Hasil Penelitian Kuantitatif & Kualitatif*. Deepublish.