

POLICY CURRENTS

The University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy

NEWSLETTER OF THE PUBLIC POLICY SECTION
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Back to the Future: The Rediscovery of Implementation Studies

by James P. Lester, Colorado State University and
Malcolm L. Goggin, Michigan State University

Authors' Note: An earlier (and much expanded) version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, September 3-6, 1998. It is part of a larger book project entitled, Public Policy Implementation: Theory and Practice. We gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments on this article given to us by Ann O'M. Bowman and Laurence J. O'Toole.

I. Introduction

One of the perennial problems confronted by contemporary policy analysts, as well as political life more generally, is the inevitable tension between theory and practice. As William Glazer once remarked, "if the study of theory and the study of fact do not fertilize each other, both will be barren."¹ Others argue that "if there is no link between theory and practice, political science cannot help and may even harm the political life that it studies."² Yet, all too often, research that is theoretically profitable has little or no practical utility to decisionmakers. On the other hand, research that is practical and useful for decisionmakers often has little or no theoretical payoff for the discipline of political science.³ However, the study of public policy implementation, we argue, is both theoretically beneficial and it has practical utility for those who must implement federal (or subnational) policies.⁴

Nevertheless, beginning in the mid-1980s, and continuing into the late 1990s, many contemporary scholars began to dismiss the study of public policy implementation for various reasons. Some of these scholars believed that the "stages heuristic" (including

the concept of implementation) had "outlived its usefulness as a guide to research and teaching."⁵ Thus, according to Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, little more could be said about policy implementation; rather, they believed that we must move on to the study of "policy change and learning." In that vein, they introduced a model and a research agenda to move scholars toward that area of research.⁶ Others argued that the field of implementation studies "had not yet achieved conceptual clarity," and they moved on to the study of policy design.⁷ Still others, labeled implementation studies as an "intellectual dead-end," or a literature "lacking in any consensual theory."⁸ Finally, many postpositivists argued that the analysis of policy implementation was simply too complex for a logical-positivist approach and they suggested that a more intuitive (or sometimes a more participatory) approach would advance our understanding of this concept to a greater extent.⁹

After this array of rather fustian dismissals, the study of policy implementation appeared to lie dormant for some time. It was as if a consensus had been reached (however erroneous it may have been) that the analysis of policy implementation had gone about as far as it could, both conceptually and methodologically. Yet, in spite of these excessive dismissals, public policy implementation continues to hold much practical interest for policymakers because it is a major stumbling block in the policy process; indeed, policy analysts find research on policy evaluation and implementation to be one of the most heavily utilized areas of policy analysis.¹⁰ In addition, there have been a number of important theoretical contributions in the 1990s that have been largely ignored by many public policy scholars.

One would hope that the discipline of political science would continue to contribute something of use to decisionmakers in the contemporary “implementation era” of the 1990s and beyond. Thus, in this paper, we are motivated both by a desire to advance the theoretical understanding of this concept as well as to continue to assist policy implementors in carrying out their responsibilities during the period of the “devolution revolution” in the 1990s.¹¹

Before we propose a means of energizing the study of public policy implementation, we need to reconsider past evaluations of implementation research as well as to re-establish the importance of this area of the policy cycle and the need for a discipline like political science to contribute toward a more complete understanding of that process. What follows is our attempt to stimulate a renaissance of interest in policy implementation research and to redirect research in more fruitful ways.

II. Looking Backwards: Evaluating the Evolution of Implementation Studies

As we suggested above, a number of policy scholars have dismissed the study of public policy implementation for various reasons. As we see it, various researchers may be categorized according to a typology that differentiates among them across two dimensions. The first continuum is whether (or not) they are positive about the continuation of implementation studies, and the second concerns whether (or not) they advocate modifying the conceptual or methodological approaches to implementation studies. In other words, implementation scholars tend to take either a positive or a negative view about the utility of continuing research in this area and they either see a need to change our conceptual or methodological approaches or not to do so. Based on this typology, it appears as though there are at least four archetypes of scholarship. Our typology is presented in Figure 1 and we discuss each of these implementation types, with prime examples, below:¹²

Figure 1: A Typology of Implementation Scholars

		Continuation of Implementation Research	
		Positive	Negative
Modifications Needed	Yes	“Reformers”	“Skeptics”
	No	“Testers”	“Terminators”

Source: Compiled by the authors.

The Reformers

Reformers are those who are quite positive about the need to continue implementation research, but they also see the need to modify our conceptual or methodological approaches. These individuals have consistently supported implementation research, but they also see the need to build upon and/or modify what exists in the extant literature.¹³

Other reformers include Robert Stoker, who argues that his “implementation regime framework,” provides a useful framework to invigorate the study of public policy implementation.¹⁴ He suggests that “a new perspective is required if implementation is to be seen as a problem of governance in which cooperation between independent authorities must be induced.”¹⁵

Finally, Richard Matland, in an effort to reconcile the two major schools of thought on policy implementation (i.e., the “top-downers” versus the “bottom-uppers”), provides an alternative conceptual framework based on the theoretical significance of ambiguity and conflict.¹⁶ Collectively, these scholars have never doubted the utility of implementation research; however they see the need to reform it in constructive ways.¹⁷

The Testers

Testers appear to be quite comfortable with the way policy implementation has been studied in the past. Examples of the “testers,” include such scholars as Mazmanian and Sabatier (in their earlier works)¹⁸ and a number of individuals who tested their implementation framework.¹⁹

For example, Deborah McFarlane tested their model in the context of federal family planning programs.²⁰ In addition, Lester and Bowman applied both the Mazmanian-Sabatier framework and their own framework toward an explanation of the implementation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 in the fifty American states.²¹ Fundamentally, these scholars are rather neutral as far as any criticisms of implementation research are concerned; instead, their primary purpose is to test a particular framework and to identify the “crucial variables” believed to affect policy implementation.²² Whatever criticisms they voice are placed within the context of the model they are testing; they do not advocate new directions in methodological approaches or conceptual frameworks.

The Skeptics

The skeptics are quite negative about continuation of the study of implementation as it is currently being conducted. They see no need to continue this line of research unless significant changes are made in the way it will be studied in the future. For example, Peter DeLeon, (either quoting Helen Ingram or speaking exclusively for himself), recently labelled implementation studies as an “intellectual dead-end,” or a literature “lacking in any consensual theory.”²³ After

jettisoning the contemporary approach to implementation research, he advocates combining the “participatory approach” to policy analysis with the “post-positivist approach.” Both of these developments, he argues, “can be seen as being strongly contrary to most implementation research and could have a direct effect on a renewed study of policy implementation.”²⁴

In addition, he is joined by some postmodernists who argue that the analysis of policy implementation is simply too complex for a positivist approach and instead they advocate a more intuitive or interpretive approach.²⁵ For example, Charles Fox argues that implementation has been far too preoccupied with positivist epistemology and that future research would greatly benefit from the application of more intuitive approaches.²⁶

The Terminators

The terminators are those who want to discontinue implementation research and/or change the approach to analysis of this part of the policy cycle altogether. They are distinguished from the skeptics in that they have no desire at all to see research on policy implementation continue. The best-known example of the “terminators” category is Paul Sabatier, who in the late-1980s, argued that “the implementation literature seems to have reached somewhat of a dead end.”²⁷ Instead of a continuation of research on policy implementation, Sabatier believes that we must move on to the study of “policy change and learning,” and he and his colleague, Hank Jenkins-Smith, have introduced a model and a research agenda to move scholars toward that area of research.²⁸

Other terminators, like Helen Ingram, argue that the field of implementation studies “has not yet achieved conceptual clarity,” and she (together with Anne Schneider) moved on to the study of policy design.²⁹ In that sense, then, they share the perspective of other terminators that the study of policy implementation is passé (at best) or not at all worthwhile (at worst). After these assorted dismissals, the study of policy implementation appeared to have died a quiet death (or so it seemed).

III. The Rumor of Our Death is Greatly Exaggerated: The Premature Demise of Implementation Studies

We will argue in this article (and later in a forthcoming book), that the study of public policy implementation is very important at this particular time, that it has great practical utility to decisionmakers who must implement public policies, and that it is clearly not at an “intellectual dead-end.” To the contrary, there are a number of useful theoretical insights from recent research that can be put to work to further assist our understanding of this important concept in policy

analysis. As we view implementation research, it has made significant progress since its inception in the early 1970s and it is on the verge of major theoretical breakthroughs today. Our major concern is that far too many scholars of public policy have seemingly ignored the promising leads advanced by a number of implementation researchers and have instead opted to pursue other lines of research inquiry, such as policy change or policy design. This behavior is not unique to the field of public policy, but it has serious consequences for the advancement of the study of implementation, multiple consequences for the discipline of political science, and far-reaching consequences for decisionmakers who are responsible for the successful implementation of policies adopted in the last thirty years.³⁰

The Importance of Implementation Research in the Next Millennium

For several reasons, the late-1990s are a particularly exciting time to examine policy implementation in the American context (or foreign contexts for that matter).³¹ First, the 1980s-1990s were a period of implementation of many federal policies enacted during the previous two decades. For example, in the environmental area, these policies included the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, and the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Like the 1980s, the decade of the 1990s has been an “implementation era” in environmental policy, as well as in many other areas of public policy.

Second, intergovernmental relations have recently taken on greater significance than ever before. During the 1980s, and continuing into the 1990s, the doctrine of “New Federalism” has stressed devolution of authority from the federal level to the state and local levels in many areas of public policy. As part of the legacy of the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton presidencies, states and local communities are taking on many responsibilities that were previously the province of the federal government.

Third, the states themselves have undergone a number of important transformations in terms of their institutional capacities for implementing federal programs. For example, the states have improved their revenue systems, strengthened the Governor’s office, professionalized their legislatures, reformed their courts, consolidated their bureaucracies, etc.³² Presumably, states are no longer the “weak link” in the intergovernmental system of the United States. These

enormous changes of the past two decades are so far-reaching as to constitute a definite break with the past and they suggest that the states are now more able than ever before to assume important roles in the delivery of public policies in environmental (and other) area(s). Therefore, it is essential that we better understand the theoretical and practical implications of federal devolution of authority. As Robert Putnam once remarked, "America is in the midst of an historic transfer of authority from the federal government to the states, without any serious assessment of the possible costs (as well as benefits) and there may be cause to wonder whether the current bipartisan consensus on the virtues of devolution may not be profoundly and dangerously misguided."³³ Scholars over the next few decades will likely be engaged in the study of intergovernmental relations (and especially federal-state relations) as they affect the formulation, implementation, and impact of many public policies. For example, these future investigators are likely to be concerned with the extent to which the fifty American states are providing leadership in the environmental area or conversely, the extent to which they are not effectively implementing federal laws dealing with pollution or other areas of public policy.³⁴

Fourth, the literature on knowledge utilization has undergone tremendous growth over the past fifteen years or so. Most of the work has been concerned with answering the following question: What are the characteristics of social science research studies that make them most "useful" for decisionmaking? According to Weiss and Bucuvalas "useful" involves: (1) whether the content makes an intrinsic contribution to the work of an agency; and (2) whether government officials say they would be likely to take that research into account in decisionmaking.³⁵ Both national and subnational implementors continue to seek useful policy research and guidance for policy implementation. Due to the above considerations, implementation research is particularly relevant and much sought after at the present time. Indeed, it is one of the most useful areas for decisionmakers who seek policy analysis and advice.³⁶

Finally, there are a number of insights from implementation research conducted in the 1990s that, while useful to both the theory and practice of policy implementation, have nevertheless been largely ignored. Beginning in the early 1990s, a "third generation" of implementation researchers (including both senior scholars and younger members of the profession) began a concentrated effort to better understand the policy implementation process.³⁷ Some of their contributions were theoretically-driven in terms of their research goals,³⁸ while others were empirically-based studies of federal-state implementation.³⁹ While the

former sought to introduce new theoretical constructs into the analysis of interorganizational implementation, the latter sought to examine whether devolution of policies and programs to the states was a good idea. Both lines of inquiry, we argue, have provided us with a number of fresh theoretical insights that could energize the study of public policy implementation in the remainder of this century and beyond.

For example, in *Implementation Theory and Practice*, Malcolm Goggin and his associates utilize "communications theory" as a theoretical guide to the study of policy implementation.⁴⁰ Communications theory provides a means of understanding the relationships in intergovernmental (especially federal-state) policy implementation. State level implementors form the nexus for the communications channels and these implementors are the target of implementation-related messages transmitted from both federal and local level senders. As recipients, state level implementors must interpret a barrage of messages. Structuring the interpretation process are the form and content of the message and the legitimacy and reputation of the sender. Therein lies the key to implementation's variability. More specifically, they incorporated in their conceptualization of implementation a recognition of the joint nature of decisions and actions of interdependent institutions at the subnational level of government, and the bargaining that takes place among them and between them and the national level of government. Given the assumptions underpinning their model of intergovernmental policy implementation, communications theory offers a means of synthesizing the "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches that dominate (and divide) the implementation literature today.

In *Reluctant Partners*, Robert Stoker introduces the concept of "regime theory" as a theoretical guide to the understanding of implementation.⁴¹ He argues that "a new perspective is required if implementation is to be seen as a problem of governance in which cooperation between independent authorities must be induced."⁴² A "regime perspective" establishes an arrangement among implementing participants that identifies the values to be served during the implementation process and provides an organizational framework to promote those values.⁴³ He further argues that the key misconception that exists in the implementation literature is that the likelihood of cooperation is inseparable from the intensity of conflict of interest. Thus, cooperation from the implementors is unlikely whenever conflict exists over the objectives of national policy. In response, one must either suppress conflict or surrender control of policy in order to realize cooperation. Implementation regimes may thus be arranged so that cooperation is more likely.⁴⁴

Laurence O'Toole has suggested the possibilities (as well as the constraints) posed by the use of rational choice theory (especially game theory) as a useful way to analyze interorganizational implementation.⁴⁵ More specifically, he argues that rational-choice approaches have been essentially neglected in the study of policy implementation. Perspectives like game theory offer several advantages to the study of policy implementation, such as including the rigor of deductive theory, the potential to unite strengths of both "top-down" and "bottom-up" perspectives, and an apparatus to assist in conceptualizing interdependence across "games" as well as across actors and decisions.⁴⁶

Finally, several other scholars prefer to discuss theoretical frameworks based on contingencies, rather than to try to build a combined or synthetic model.⁴⁷ For example, James Lester suggests that successful state implementation of environmental policy depends upon two crucial factors: a) a state's overall commitment to environmental protection, and b) a state's overall institutional capacity to implement federal environmental laws. Based on this typology, Lester argues that the states may be divided into four categories with different patterns (i.e., levels of success) of implementation. These four categories include the "progressive" states (with high commitment and high capacity), the "struggler" states (with high commitment but low capacity), the "delayer" states (with low commitment and high capacity), and the "regressive" states (with low commitment and low capacity).⁴⁸ Similarly, William Lowry develops an implementation framework based on "vertical" involvement by the federal government and "horizontal" potential for interstate competition.⁴⁹ His basic thesis is that state leadership in environmental policy implementation is affected by intergovernmental dimensions of the policy involved. To wit, "policies are not simply created by national officials and then routinely implemented by state and local governments as if they were unquestioning automatons in some Weberian machine. Rather, state officials make policy and adjust national efforts to match parochial circumstances."⁵⁰ His typology thus produces four different styles of implementation.

In addition, Richard Matland argues that the "ambiguity-conflict model," which he developed, presents us with a more comprehensive and coherent model of policy implementation than what has existed heretofore. More specifically, four implementation perspectives are developed in the model, based on a policy's ambiguity and conflict levels: 1) administrative implementation, characterized by low levels of conflict and ambiguity; 2) political implementation, characterized by high conflict and low ambiguity; 3) experimental implementation, characterized by low conflict and high ambiguity; and 4) symbolic implementation, characterized by high levels of conflict and ambiguity.⁵¹

Finally, Denise Scheberle argues that implementation success depends upon differing levels of "trust among implementing officials" and "involvement by oversight personnel."⁵² She suggests that four patterns are likely under these conditions: 1) "pulling together and synergistic," characterized by high trust and high involvement; 2) "cooperative but autonomous," characterized by high trust and low involvement; 3) "coming apart with avoidance," characterized by low trust and low involvement; and 4) "coming apart and contentious," characterized by low trust and high involvement.⁵³

Collectively, these scholars present us with an array of potentially important variables that are believed to affect implementation success or failure and should be taken into account in future implementation research.

IV. Where Do We Go From Here? Charting a New Direction in Implementation Research

Despite the potential utility of implementation research, a new direction for implementation research cannot be charted until we accomplish three things. First, we must clearly define (and collectively agree upon) what we mean by implementation. One of the most intractable problems in implementation research has been how to measure the concept of successful implementation.⁵⁴ In our view, policy implementation is a **process**, a series of subnational decisions and actions directed toward putting a prior authoritative federal decision into effect. The essential characteristic of the implementation process, then, is the timely and satisfactory performance of certain necessary tasks related to carrying out the intent of the law. This means rejecting a dichotomous conceptualization of implementation as simply success or failure.

Second, we must identify the implementors and their respective roles in the larger political and administrative system. The primary responsibility for implementation rests with administrators in the executive branch. But rarely is it the case that administrators act alone. The President, members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, state legislators, judges, spokespersons for organized interests, community organizations, and members of the public often constrain the choices of administrators during the policy implementation process. While all these actors are involved in policy implementation, we still need to ascertain their relative import.

Moreover, in order to understand more fully the strategic choices of implementors and to be able to explain and predict implementation outcomes, we also need to know what are the interests, motives, and resources of individual implementors and to whom are implementors accountable?⁵⁵ In other words, what role orientations do they ultimately adopt and whose interests are served? For example, in performing implementation tasks, the bureaucrat acts as an agent,

responding to directives from principals such as the President, the Congress, the Courts, and the public. The conventional wisdom is that politicians exercise considerable power and control over bureaucratic decision making.⁵⁶ But with multiple constituencies in the implementor's external environment, whose interests are to be served? A number of recent empirical studies attempt to answer this question.⁵⁷ While we are aware of various role orientations adopted by bureaucrats, we still do not know which roles are paramount and which are less important.

Finally, and most importantly, we must develop a parsimonious, yet complete, theory of policy implementation and a set of testable hypotheses that explain variations in the way implementors behave. In other words, what accounts for variations in the behavior of implementors across time, across policies, and across units of government? By incorporating the insights of communications theory, regime theory, rational choice theory (especially game theory), and contingency theories, a "meta-theory" may perhaps be developed. While this new theory of policy implementation should build upon previous work to chart a path to the future, it should also recognize the contributions of those involved in the study of implementation in the decade of the 1990s.

In conclusion, we suggest that policy scholars who stress the challenging theoretical aspects of implementation studies are more likely to save or strengthen it than are the critics who diminish it (or terminate it) by their premature and excessive dismissals. As John Stuart Mill reminds us, the meaning of a doctrine is in danger of being lost if it ceases to be discussed or if a "public truth" is not reexamined over and over again.

Notes

- ¹ See William A. Glazer, "The Type and Uses of Political Theory," *Social Research* Vol. 22 (1955): 275-296.
- ² See Richard S. Ruderman, "Aristotle and the Recovery of Political Judgement." *American Political Science Review* 91 (June 1997): 409-420.
- ³ See Stuart Nagel, "Evaluating Public Policy Evaluation," *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 16, (Winter, 1987): 219-233.
- ⁴ Indeed, this was the point made by some of the first scholars to write about public policy implementation. See, for example, Martha Derthick, "Defeat at Ft. Lincoln," *The Public Interest*, Vol. 20, (Summer, 1970): 3-39; Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky, *Implementation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973); Eugene Bardach, *The Implementation Game* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977); George C. Edwards, *Implementing Public Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980); Carl Van Horn, *Policy Implementation in the Federal System* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1979); Robert T. Nakamura and Frank Smallwood, *The Politics of Policy Implementation* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1980); Walter Williams, *The Implementation Perspective* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980); and Steven Kelman, "Using Implementation Research to Solve Implementation Problems," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 4, (1984): 75-91.
- ⁵ See Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993), p. 1.
- ⁶ See Paul A. Sabatier, "An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change Within Subsystems: The Effects of Exogenous Events, Strategic Interaction, and Policy-Oriented Learning Over Time," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 28, 1985; see also Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993).
- ⁷ See Helen M. Ingram, "Implementation: A Review and Suggested Framework," in Naomi Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky, eds., *Public Administration: The State of the Art* (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, 1990); see also Helen M. Ingram and Anne Schneider, "Social Construction of Target Populations," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, (June, 1993): 334-346; and Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram, *Policy Design for Democracy* (Lawrence, KN: University of Kansas Press, 1997).
- ⁸ See Peter DeLeon, "The Missing Link Revisited: Contemporary Implementation Research," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 27-31, 1997.
- ⁹ See, for example, Charles J. Fox, "Implementation Research: Why and How to Transcend Positivist Methodologies," in Dennis J. Palumbo and Donald J. Calista, eds., *Implementation and the Policy Process: Opening Up the Black Box* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990), pp. 199-212; see also DeLeon, op. cit.
- ¹⁰ See James M. Rogers, "Social Science Disciplines and Policy Research: The Case of Political Sci-

- ence," *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 9, (Autumn, 1989): 13-28. It is interesting to note, however, that a recent survey of public policy scholars did not even mention policy implementation, per se, as an important component of a good public policy program. Rather, they emphasized only policy formulation. See Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, "Designing Public Policy Programs," *Policy Currents*, Vol. 8, (June, 1998): 1.
- ¹¹ See Richard P. Nathan, "The Devolution Revolution," in *Symposium: American Federalism Today* (Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute, 1996), p. 5; and Enid Beaumont, "Status of the Devolution Revolution," *The Public Manager*, (Winter, 1996-97): 23-26.
- ¹² This typology does not mean to imply that these implementation scholars are static in terms of their research agendas. It is possible, and indeed quite common, for implementation scholars to move from one category to another category over the course of their professional lifetimes. For example, Paul Sabatier has moved from the "tester" category to the "terminator" category; Lester and Bowman have moved from the "tester" category to the "reformer" category. This fact, however, does not diminish the utility of the typology because at any given point in time, individual implementation scholars tend to occupy a single cell of the typology.
- ¹³ See Malcolm L. Goggin, et al., *Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation* (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 1990); see also James P. Lester, et al., "Public Policy Implementation: Evolution of the Field and Agenda for Future Research," *Policy Studies Review* Vol. 7, (Autumn, 1987): 200-216. Reprinted in Stuart S. Nagel, ed., *Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management* (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1995).
- ¹⁴ See Robert P. Stoker, *Reluctant Partners: Implementing Federal Policy* (Pittsburgh, PA: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991); see also Robert Stoker, "A Regime Framework for Implementation Analysis," *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 9, (Autumn, 1989).
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ¹⁶ See Richard E. Matland, "Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 5, (April, 1995): 145-174.
- ¹⁷ See also Yeheskel Hasenfeld and Thomas Brock, "Implementation of Social Policy Revisited," *Administration and Society*, Vol. 22, (1991): 451-479; and Soren Winter, "Integrating Implementation Research," in Palumbo and Calista, op. cit.
- ¹⁸ See, for example, Daniel A. Mazmanian and Paul A. Sabatier, *Implementation and Public Policy* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1983).
- ¹⁹ For a list of the scholars who applied their framework, see Paul A. Sabatier, "Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis," *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 6, (1986): 21-48.
- ²⁰ See Deborah McFarlane, "Testing the Statutory Coherence Hypothesis: Implementation of Family Planning Policy in the States," *Administration and Society*, Vol. 20, (1989): 395-422; See also Kenneth Meier and Deborah McFarlane, "Statutory Coherence and Policy Implementation: The Case of Family Planning," *Journal of Public Policy* (September-December, 1995).
- ²¹ See James P. Lester and Ann O'M. Bowman, "Implementing Environmental Policy in a Federal System: A Test of the Sabatier-Mazmanian Model," *Polity*, Vol. 21, (Summer, 1989): 731-753; see also James P. Lester, "Hazardous Waste and Policy Implementation: The Subnational Role," *Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials*, Vol. 2, (Fall, 1985): 381-397; and Ann O'M. Bowman and James P. Lester, "Policy Implementation in a Federal System: A Comparative State Analysis," in Fred Meyer and Ralph Baker, eds., *State Policy Problems* (Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall, 1993), pp. 156-176.
- ²² See Thomas A. Sinclair, "Implementation Theory and Practice: Uncovering Policy and Administration Linkages in the 1990s," *International Journal of Public Administration* (Forthcoming, 1999); Charlyn Cassady, et. al, "Measuring the Implementation of Injury Prevention Programs in State Health Agencies," *Injury Prevention*, Vol. 3, (June, 1997): 94-99; Malcolm Goggin and Steven Laubacher, "Administrative Initiative in Policy Implementation: Mental Retardation Deinstitutionalization Policy in Texas," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 5-7, 1990; Lucinda M. Deason, "Bureaucratic Discretion: An Examination of External Influences on State Implementation of Federal Mandates," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 23-25, 1998; Marjorie Sarbaugh-Thompson, "Change From Below: Integrating Bottom-Up Entrepreneurship Into a Program Development Framework," *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 28 (March, 1998): 3-

- 25; and N. Ryan, "Some Advantages of an Integrated Approach to Implementation Analysis," *Public Administration*, Vol. 74, (1996): 737-753.
- ²³ See Peter DeLeon, "The Missing Link Revisited: Contemporary Implementation Research," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 27-31, 1997, pp. 3-4.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15. see also Peter DeLeon, "Participatory Policy Analysis: Prescriptions and Precautions," *The Asian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 12, (June, 1990): 29-54; and Peter DeLeon, *Advice and Consent: The Development of the Policy Sciences* (New York, NY: Russell Sage, 1988).
- ²⁵ See Fox, *op. cit.*; see also Dvora Yanow, "Tackling the Implementation Problem: Epistemological Issues in Implementation Research," in Palumbo and Calista, *op. cit.*, pp. 213-227.
- ²⁶ See Fox, *op. cit.* These suggestions, it seems to us, would add very little in the way of conceptual improvements since they are more concerned with epistemological preferences that lean toward "bottom-up" approaches. As such, they do not present us with a reconciliation of the two opposing approaches; rather, they continue the debate. Moreover, critics of participatory approaches to policymaking often argue that increased citizen involvement in policymaking and implementation would lead to an increase in group dissensus over program goals and procedures; that it will also lead to needless delays in policy formation and implementation; that the costs of policymaking and implementation would increase dramatically; and that disaffected interests would seek to obstruct programs through litigation or recourse to Congress. In addition to these concerns, where such participatory experiments have been tried in Europe, confusion and conflict among public participants increases. On these two points, see Walter A. Rosenbaum, "The Paradoxes of Participation," *Administration and Society*, Vol. 8 (1976): 355-383 and Dorothy Nelkin, *Technical Decisions and Democracy* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977).
- ²⁷ See Paul A. Sabatier, "Beyond Implementation: The Need for a Longer Time Perspective," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 13-15, 1989.
- ²⁸ See Paul A. Sabatier and Hank Jenkins-Smith, eds., *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993).
- ²⁹ See Helen M. Ingram and Anne Schneider, "Improving Implementation Through Framing Smarter Statutes," *Journal of Public Policy* (1990); see also James E. Garrett, "Public Administration and Policy Implementation: A Social Work Perspective," *Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 16, (1993): 1247-1263.
- ³⁰ See Nagel, *op. cit.*; and David Ricci, *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).
- ³¹ This section borrows heavily from James P. Lester, "A New Federalism? Environmental Policy in the States," in Norman Vig and Michael Kraft, eds., *Environmental Policy in the 1990s* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1994).
- ³² See Ann O'M. Bowman and Richard C. Kearney, *The Resurgence of the States* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986).
- ³³ See his comments on John D. Donahue's *Disunited States: What's at Stake as Washington Fades and the States Take the Lead* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1997) as reported in the *American Political Science Review*.
- ³⁴ See James P. Lester and Emmett N. Lombard, "The Comparative Analysis of State Environmental Policy," *Natural Resources Journal*, Vol. 30 (Summer, 1990): 301-319.
- ³⁵ This section draws on James P. Lester, "The Utilization of Policy Analysis by State Agency Officials," *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, Vol. 14 (March, 1993): 267-290; see also C. Weiss and M. J. Bucuvalas, "The Challenge of Social Research to Decisionmaking," in C. Weiss, ed., *Using Social Research in Public Policymaking*. (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1977).
- ³⁶ See James M. Rogers, "Social Science Disciplines and Policy Research: The Case of Political Science," *Policy Studies Review* (1989): 13-28.
- ³⁷ The idea of "three generations" of implementation research has been popularized by Goggin, et al., *op. cit.*; see also T. Younis and Ian Davidson, "The Study of Implementation," in T. Younis, ed., *Implementation in Public Policy* (Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth, 1990).
- ³⁸ See Goggin, et al., *op. cit.*; Stoker, *op. cit.*; O'Toole, *op. cit.*; Matland, *op. cit.*
- ³⁹ See William Lowry, *The Dimensions of Federalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992); Evan Ringquist, *Environmental Protection at the State*

- Level* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1993); Donahue, op. cit.; Susan Hunter and Richard W. Waterman, *Enforcing the Law: The Case of the Clean Water Acts* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1996); Caroline M. Orth, "State Implementation of Air and Water Pollution Control Policy: An Analysis of State Ecological Capacity," A Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 10-12, 1997; and Denise Scheberle, *Federalism and Environmental Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1997). For a review of the primary contributions of some of these studies, see James P. Lester, "Comparative State Environmental Politics and Policy: The Evolution of a Literature," *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 22 (Winter, 1994): 696-700.
- ⁴⁰ Goggin, et al., op. cit., pp. 31-41; see also Richard J. Stillman, *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1992), pp. 391-403. While we find that our previous work has been heavily cited during the period from 1991-1998, few have taken up the challenge to do "third generation" implementation research. This type of implementation research is very expensive in that it requires a combination of field work and extensive data analysis. Few, if any, scholars have been able to secure the necessary funding thus far from the National Science Foundation (or other sources) to undertake such a study.
- ⁴¹ Stoker, op. cit., pp. 95-110.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- ⁴⁴ See Stoker, op. cit., pp. xiv.
- ⁴⁵ See Laurence J. O'Toole, "Rational Choice and Policy Implementation," *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 25, (March, 1995): 43-57; see also John Chubb, "The Political Economy of Federalism," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 79, (1985): 994-1015.
- ⁴⁶ See O'Toole, op. cit., p. 54.
- ⁴⁷ See, for example, Andrew Dunsire, *Implementation in a Bureaucracy* (Oxford, UK: Martin Roberson, 1984); Harald Saetren, *The Implementation of Public Policy* (Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1983); and Matland, op. cit.
- ⁴⁸ See James P. Lester, "A New Federalism? Environmental Policy in the States," in Norman J. Vig and Michael E. Kraft, eds., *Environmental Policy in the 1990s* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1990), pp. 59-79. A revised version was published in the second edition in 1994.
- ⁴⁹ See William Lowry, *The Dimensions of Federalism: State Governments and Pollution Control Policies* (Duke University Press, 1992), especially pp. 1-26.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
- ⁵¹ Matland, op. cit., pp. 159-162.
- ⁵² See Denise Scheberle, *Federalism and Environmental Policy: Trust and the Politics of Implementation* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1997).
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-23.
- ⁵⁴ See Dennis J. Palumbo, Steven Maynard-Moody, and Paula Wright, "Measuring Degrees of Successful Implementation," *Evaluation Research*, Vol. 8, (1984): 45-74; see also, Goggin, et al., op. cit., pp. 44-47 and 173-174; and Scheberle, op. cit., pp. 24-26.
- ⁵⁵ This issue has been taken up by a number of authors. See, for example, Emmette S. Redford, *Democracy in the Administrative State* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1969); Charles S. Hyneman, *Bureaucracy in a Democracy* (New York, NY: Harper, 1950); and Douglas Yates, *Bureaucratic Democracy: The Search for Democracy and Efficiency in American Government* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).
- ⁵⁶ For recent studies on these questions, see Robert F. Durant, "Public Policy, Overhead Democracy, and the Professional State Revisited," *Administration and Society*, Vol. 27, (1995): 165-202; see also B. Dan Wood and Richard W. Waterman, *Bureaucratic Dynamics: The Role of Bureaucracy in a Democracy* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994); Rosemary O'Leary, *Environmental Change: Federal Courts and the EPA* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1993); Richard Waterman and Kenneth J. Meier, "Principal-Agent Models: An Expansion?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 8, (1998): 173-202; For a brief overview of these materials, see Scott R. Furlong, "Political Influence on Bureaucracy: The Bureaucracy Speaks," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 8 (1998): 39-65. For an alternative view, see David B. Spence, "Agency Policymaking and Political Control: Modeling Away the Delegation Problem," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 7 (1997): 199-219.
- ⁵⁷ See Furlong, op. cit.

Announcement:

The University Press of New England seeks manuscripts for its new Middlebury College Series in Environmental Studies, which will explore a bioregional approach to environmental topics. Natural and human history will accordingly be viewed as a continuum that is illuminated through closely focused attention on particular ecosystems. These books will bring the scholarly disciplines into dialogue with one another, conveying current ecological, historical, literary, and political thinking to a broad, non-specialist audience. The inclusiveness of bioregionalism is a natural outgrowth of the complex environmental history of New England and the Adirondacks. A new, and healthy, irony can enter into environmental discourse through focusing on such a turbulent history and such a surprising present. The editors of this Series believe that the natural environment of New England itself thus provides particularly rich topics for environmental research and reflection, and will especially encourage books in this area. However, bioregionally oriented authors who work on a different scale or who study other regions will also be most welcome to submit their manuscripts for consideration. Manuscripts dealing with ecological and environmental history and the institutions and politics of conservation are of special interest. Inquiries should be addressed to:

Christopher McGrory Klyza
Associate Professor of Political Science and
Environmental Studies
Middlebury College
Middlebury, VT 05753
(802) 443-5309
klyza@middlebury.edu

Skewered

by *Joseph Stewart, Jr.*

This issue's contribution comes from the reflections of Ann Bowman and Dave Hedge, this year's program co-chairs for the Section, augmented some by my recollections of having served on various program committees. Ann and Dave report being stuck by the subtleties (but, fortunately, not by anyone in the Section) of both the proposal process and the process of putting together the program. The following rotisserie scheme is offered for the consideration of future proposers, presenters, and those tapped to be program chairs. If you find any of these entries particularly objectionable, you can be sure that I, not Ann nor Dave, am the source.

- +3 Naming a former president of the association as a panel chair
- 3 Naming a former, but deceased, president of the association as a panel chair (Penalty is waived if meeting is in Chicago, where the dead have some electoral clout, or Oklahoma, where the dead can be candidates in run-off elections)
- 1 Informing the section chair that you will not receive tenure if your proposal is not accepted
- 2 Threatening the tenure of the section chair if your proposal is not accepted
- 3 Threatening the tenure of the section chair if s/he is tenured
- +1 For each faculty member a graduate student adds as a co-author to enhance the proposal's chances of acceptance
- 1 For each faculty member added after 3
- 5 Adding a faculty member whose presence as a co-author gets the proposal rejected
- 10 Adding Paul Sabatier as a co-author
- 2 Asking someone to chair or be a discussant on a panel after having just rejected his/her proposal to present a paper or chair a panel or roundtable on the same topic
- +3 Graciously agreeing to chair or be a discussant on a panel after your proposal is rejected
- +2 Chairing or being a discussant on a panel and not suggesting that your rejected proposal was better than anything you heard on the panel
- 10 As chair, "disinviting" participants and replacing them with people you had on the panel you proposed
- 1 Changing the title of your paper after it is listed in the preliminary program
- 5 Changing the topic of your paper so it does not fit on the panel
- 1 FedExing your paper to the discussant a month in advance of the meeting (it puts too much pressure on your colleagues and increases the odds that the paper will be lost.)
- +2 Mailing the final version of your paper to the discussant two weeks before the meeting
- 5 Mailing your paper to the discussant as your leave for the airport to go to the meeting
- 10 FedExing your paper to the discussant after you return from the meeting
- 5 Leaving a message on the section chair's voice mail after s/he has left for the meeting indicating that you will not be able to present/chair/discuss after all

Joseph Stewart, Jr., Professor
Department of Political Science
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
phone: 505-277-7390, fax: 505-277-2821
e-mail: joestew@unm.edu

Public Policy Section Officers

President

Peter Eisinger
Wayne State University

President-elect

Paul Quirk
University of Illinois

Secretary/Treasurer

Mark Schneider
State University of New York-Stony Brook

Council Members

Frank Baumgartner
Texas A&M

Christopher Bosso
Northeastern University

John Hird
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Rosemary O'Leary
Indiana University

Evan Ringquist
Florida State University

Elaine Sharp
University of Kansas

David Leo Weimer
University of Rochester

Susan Welch
Pennsylvania State University

Pietro Nivola
Brookings Institution

Paul Peterson
Harvard

Gary Bryner
Brigham Young University

Mary Ann Steger
Northern Arizona University

Personals:

Policy Currents is now accepting personal ads for our new Personals column. If you would like more information on the column or would like to submit a personal ad, please contact:

Leo Jaramillo
PC Personals
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
(505) 277-1099
leoj@unm.edu

Visit the APSA Public Policy Section www home page!
The URL is: <http://www.fsu.edu/~spap/orgs/apsa.html>

Editor

Hank C. Jenkins-Smith

Managing Editor

Kristin E. Kenyon

Assistant Managing Editor

Leopoldo V. Jaramillo

Abstracts, announcements, and other information to be printed in the next issue of *Policy Currents* should be sent on 3-1/4" diskette to:

Editor, *Policy Currents*
University of New Mexico
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
Institute for Public Policy
1805 Sigma Chi Rd., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
(505) 277-1099

NON PROFIT - ORG.
US POSTAGE
PAID
Albuquerque, NM
PERMIT NO. 39