Review Article

Public Policy Implementation: Mix of All Approaches

Dr. Hari Bhakta Shahi

Abstract:
Top-down approach focus on direction and linkage from the top level for the public policy implementation. Bottom-up approach provides local situation, local environment, ground reality and feedback to the top level for public policy implementation. However, these two approaches are not adequate for public policy implementation. Later policy action model focus on policy guidelines, policy contents, organization and its institutional context are influenced by interaction with outside world. In a similar vein, policy actor behavior is crucial to the execution of public policy. The Inter-Organizational Interaction Approach centers on the process of implementing public policy through interactions with many organizations. Synthesis Implementation Approach: The method of implementing policies is identical to that of creating policies. The process of creating policies is continued through policy implementation. That is how success seems to appear. Various approaches are employed to execute policies, including top-down, bottom-up, policy-action, managerial, interorganizational interaction, and synthesis implementation. Therefore, cooperation amongst all parties involved—actors, levels, organizations, groups, stakeholders, concern organizations, and so forth—is necessary for the successful implementation of public policy.

Keywords: *Top-Down, Bottom-Up, Interorganizational Interaction, Synthesis, Issue, Approach, And Public Policy Implementation*

Authors Details

Dr. Hari Bhakta Shahi
Associate Professor
Public Administration Campus,
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Concepts of Public Policy Implementation

The entire population is referred to as "public." In its broadest meaning, public administration is seen as such. The national government is in charge of overseeing common objectives. The government is the collective voice of the people, the nation, and society. Government or public policy protects public goods. A deliberate course of action taken by individuals to achieve objectives for their communities, governments, nations, and organizations is known as public policy. Anderson (1975, p. 2) [1] defined public policy as "a purposeful course of action followed by an actor or a set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern." The actors execute the objectives stated in the policies. Administrators implement the decisions taken by the local political elite. Edward III and Sharkansky (1978, p. 2) [5] defined public policy as "what governments say, do, or do not do." It is the intention behind government activity. Acts, rules, regulations, directives, and instructions are examples of policies that are used to carry out government projects. Public policy is defined as "authoritative allocation of values for the whole community" by Easton David (1953, p. 129) [4]. The government distributes resources, justice, and social ideals throughout the community through public policy. Thomas R. Dye defined public policy as "whatever government chooses to do or not to do" (1975, p. 1). Formal decisions are how the government puts public policy into action. Lasswell and Kaplan (1963, p. 71) [11] define public policy as "a projected program of goals, values, and practices." Programs for government activity are well specified. The objectives remain unchangeable. The work schedules are available already. Therefore, public policy is a methodical attempt to either control or resolve political disputes or provide rational incentives to accomplish preset goals. Public policies are required to solve societal concerns.

Corresponding Author

Dr. Hari Bhakta Shahi
Associate Professor
Public Administration Campus,
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Acts that give precise definitions to the rules and assign funds and employment to the appropriate industries. Public policy issues are complex and subject to performance criteria. Periodically, policies may be revised. Policies can be proclaimed (explicitly stated) or implicit, overt (open) or covert, obvious (emerge, unveil) or latent, explicit (well defined) or implicit, and spoken (unspoken). According to Cochran and Malone (2007, p. 1) [2], "public policy is the study of government decisions and actions designed to deal with a number of public concerns." Stated differently, policies are government directions, acts, laws, policies, and programs. Public policy analysis is described as the "political process and system action of government decisions" by Frohock (1970, p. 8). Power, authority, negotiation, and gaming all have an impact on the formulation and application of policies. The creation and application of policies are related to input, process, and output. Perception, identification, organization, demand, support, and apathy are all factors that go into policy. Regulation, distribution, redistribution, capitalization, and moral judgment comprise the policy-making process. Application, enforcement, interpretation, assessment, legitimation, adjustment, and retreat are the outputs of policy (Frohock, 1970). "A fundamental policy decision is implemented when it specifies the goals to be pursued and identifies the problem(s) to be addressed" (Hill and Hupe, 2014, p. 7) [8]. Presumptions about how a job connects to previous goals are the foundation of implementations. The intended result and specific actors are put into practice during implementation. Many academics have provided conceptual justifications for how policies are applied. Policies are carried out by putting plans, goals, choices, and actions into action. A policy is meaningless until it is implemented and achieves its objectives. One way to describe it is "putting a policy decision into action" (Howelt *et al.*, 2009, p. 160). According to Dye (1975) [3], policies are determined by the relationship between the bureaucracy's responsibilities and the laws. He makes the case that the government might establish new departments to convert legislation into practical rules and regulations. The implementing agencies have very few alternatives when it comes to how these laws are interpreted since administrators must make judgments that essentially define policy. The agencies themselves must then determine the significance of the policy and the propriety of any restrictions. These implementation responsibilities, which are essential to the policymaking process, are handled by the bureaucracy (Dye, 1975) [3]. Adopting policies is easy to say, but in developing countries, it's important, difficult, and complicated. A number of factors, such as a lack of dedication, poverty, a negative mindset, pressure from interest groups, foreign involvement, careless stakeholder conduct, party turmoil, and more, make it difficult to implement public policy.

Apporach to Public Policy Implementations

Implementing policies is a difficult undertaking in underdeveloped nations. Putting policies into action can be challenging in developing nations like Nepal for a variety of reasons. The Foreign Employment Act of 2007, the Foreign Employment Regulation of 2008, and the Foreign Employment Policy of 2012 were all inadequately executed, according to Hari Bhakta Shahi's book Policy Implementation Capacity of Nepal, since relevant organizations did not coordinate with one another. Likewise, monitoring, feedback, and supervision don't work. There isn't a robust system of checks and balances in place for the industry that implements foreign hiring policies (Shahi, 2021) [17]. Therefore, rather than being the responsibility of a single individual, implementing policies is a priority for all government sectors, participants, exports, levels of government, and stakeholders. It is not possible to execute public policies using a single technique, such as an institutional, top-down, or bottom-up method. That is a blend of all strategies; all parties involved are accountable for carrying out public policy. The key concepts of significant strategies are described as follows:

a. Top-down approach

Scholars and specialists such as Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) [18], Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983)[12], and their supporters contend that the highest levels of government make the decisions on policy. The activities that make up policy implementation are based on predefined goals and their degree of achievement. Policy implementation in underdeveloped nations often takes a top-down approach to decision-making. The primary focus of the upper echelons of emerging countries is the formulation and execution of policies. It shortens the time and expense of implementing policies. People at the top are extremely accountable to the country and the organization. Lower level employees in emerging nation public sectors take instruction from higher-level employees. Policies, Acts, Rules, and Regulations are enacted at the local level under the guidance of the highest authority. The top-down approach, for example, is ignorant of contextual factors, dynamic situations, local situations, local understanding, local social environments, local laws, local interests, local economic situations, perceptions, local cultures, local obstacles, and so forth. These are but a handful of the many drawbacks of the device. However, in addition to other methods of implementing policies, this has also been the main strategy used recently. This exaggerated situation highlights how crucial the top-down strategy is. Put differently, state representatives stepped in, as evidenced by the enhanced authority afforded in emergency situations and the centralization of decision-making.

b. Bottom-up Approach

This tactic was created to circumvent the shortcomings of the top-down approach. Among the many disadvantages of the top-

down approach are its inability to account for local context, situation, and perception. Therefore, the need of a bottom-up strategy, the role of street-level officials, and locally based organizations can all help ensure that policies are implemented successfully. Conversely, a bottom-up method was unable to recall neutral. It is a good thing that the grassroots level is participating in the creation and execution of policies. But this approach also embrace the top level. This approach increase ambition, pressure, interest and so on in the organization which causes difficult to policy formulation to policy implementation.

c. Policy Action Model

Lewis and Flynn (1979) established this paradigm, which examines the actions of implementing agents. The world outside of implementation actors' organizations limits their ability to actPolicy rules, policy substance, organization, and institutional framework are all impacted by interactions with the outside world (Lewis and Flynn, 1979, p. 123). According to Barrett and Fudge (1980, p. 25–26),.The ideal way to conceptualize implementation is as a policy-action continuum, wherein people in charge of implementing policies and those in charge of resources engage in an ongoing interactive bargaining process. Additionally, they claim that this model focuses on issues related to authority, dependents, interests, motivations, and conduct. Paul (1981)[15]. This model describes how the extent of an agency's action and its individual members' conduct effect policy implementation. The top-down approach highlights how senior leaders' directives enable policies to be executed successfully. The bottom up approach highlights street level actors. But because policy is dynamic in nature, the policy action model places more emphasis on actor behaviors. As mentioned on page 116 of Mazone and Wildavsky's 1978 book[13]. "Policy implementation will always be evolutionary; it will genuinely reformulate as it goes along." The process's changed tone and style as a result of its creative execution led to the development of new feedback policies.

d. Managerial Approaches

Globalization and privatization are the two most prevalent philosophies in the modern period. In this sense, public administration requires business-like techniques. Three primary methods comprise managerial approaches: according to Sapru (2012)[16], operational, corporate, and personal management Operational management uses the critical path technique to identify tasks that are essential to the timely and successful execution of plans and policies. PERT techniques, on the other hand, reduce implementation uncertainty. The system method emphasizes achieving a high degree of cooperation inside the system by stressing the significance of teamwork for successful implementation, according to Carter (1984, p. 106). (Routledge Kegan & Paul, 1981) [15]. The corporate management method places a strong emphasis on ensuring that an organization's

structure, culture, and styles are in line with its objective. This method likewise places a strong emphasis on establishing PPBS, setting specific targets, organizing, leading, and regulating the implementation process, and reporting back to management on issues and intended outcomes. This strategy was transferred from commercial sector management to the public sector (Sapru, 2012)[16]. Performance appraisal and management by objectives are two methods of personal management. Employee performance in relation to predetermined goals is encouraged. concerning a company (Sapru, 2012)[16]. In order to enable the management of complex societies, Osborne and Gaebler (1992)[14] contend that "managerial approaches involve changes such as more market driven decentralizing process, shift from hierarchy to participation and networks." So, managerial approaches place a focus on novel uses of instruments and combinations of governments to encourage a self-regulating system with self-regulating individuals. The process of implementing policies needs to be made simpler in order to take action.

e. Inter-Organizational Interaction Approach

The process of implementing policies entails interacting with numerous entities. Two sub-approaches are included in this approach: the organization exchange method and the power dependency approach (Sapru, 2012)[16]. According to Aldrich and Mindlin (1978, p. 156), the power dependence method, "Power relationships produce the interaction of organizations." Organizations that rely on other successful organizations must take steps to safeguard and defend their interests while maintaining a certain amount of autonomy. Carter (1985). In regard to the organization exchange approach, White (1974, p. 105) states that "organization relationships are based on dominance and dependence interaction based on exchange is structured by mutual benefit". This tactic states that policies inside an organization may be exchanged if doing so is advantageous to both sides. Hjen and Porter (1981, p. 217)[9] state that "failure to identify Implementation structures is administrative entities distinct from organizations; has led to severe difficulties in administering programs." The complex linkages involved in policy implementation necessitate the involvement of several entities. The top-down and bottom-up approaches are combined in an organization's structure and design, thus implementing policies requires making a number of decisions.

f. Synthesis Implementation Approach

Quoted as "Implementation and policy-making are one and the same process" in Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979)[12] (Sapru, 2012, p. 168)[16]. The implementation of policies completes the process of developing them. The decisions made during the creation of policies include who, where, when, and how they are developed. Likewise, policy implementation proceeds. Six

needs were created by combining the "Top-down and Bottom-up" techniques (1979, referenced in Sapru, 2012, p. 168) [16]: clear and well-defined goals, adequate theory of causation, frameworks for implementing the law, Dedicated and skilled professionals, Lastly, acknowledge that the executive branch, sovereign legislature, and interest groups will support changes in socioeconomic conditions. The synthesis of the inter-organizational interaction approach to policy implementation was realized by Sabatier after 1986. According to Elmore (1978)[6], cited in Sapru (2012) [16], p. 169), "Policy analysis and implementation need to be developed using a variety of approaches or frameworks." That's what success looks like. The methods used to implement policies include top-down, bottom-up, management, policy-action, interorganizational interaction, and synthesis implementation. He suggests implementing the following four models: the model of bureaucratic process, the model of organization development, the model of conflict and negotiation, and the model of system management (Sapru, 2012) [16].

Discussion on Public Policy Implementation Approaches
Scholars and specialists such as Van Meter and Van Horn (1975)[18], Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983)[12], and their supporters contend that the highest levels of government make the decisions on policy. Activities based on predetermined goals and their level of success comprise policy implementation. Policy implementation in underdeveloped nations often takes a top-down approach to decision-making. For developing nations, developing and implementing policies is of utmost importance. However, linking and directing by themselves will not be sufficient to implement public policy. We may say that the execution of public policy is still in its infancy. Although high-level gatherings and decisions offer direction, they are not sufficient to guarantee that public policy is successfully carried out on its own. The bottom-up strategy was developed to get around the drawbacks of the top-down method. The top-down method has a number of drawbacks, including a lack of local context, circumstance, and perception, among others. Thus, the emphasis on a bottom-up approach, the significance of street-level officials, and locally based organizations can all contribute to the effectiveness of implementing public policy. Although the bottom-up strategy is a step ahead of the top-down approach, it is not without its limitations. Locals and grassroots organizations, for instance, are aware of the situation on the ground and can provide information and feedback to higher authorities. Both top-down and bottom-up approaches lessen certain implementation barriers for public policies. However, there are a plethora of additional elements that impact the execution of governmental policies. There are times when the top-down and bottom-up approaches conflict. These two models are comparable to the Nepali proverb "kahile sasuko palo kahile buhari ko palo,"

which refers to the alternate roles of mother-in-law and daughter-in-law in household duties in developing nations like Nepal. The top-down method emphasizes that policies are successfully implemented because of top leaders' guidelines. Street level actors are highlighted by the bottom up approach. However, the policy action model emphasizes actor behaviors, since policy is dynamic in nature. Stated differently, the execution of public policy is contingent upon multiple actors, their dispositions, actions, and outside circumstances. External influences have a strong and dynamic impact on how policies are implemented. Thus, the focus of the policy action model is on the continual process of implementing public policy. The focus of managerial techniques is on the innovative use of a combination of instruments and governments to encourage a self-regulating system with self-regulating individuals. Simplifying the process of implementing public policy is necessary to take action. The management approach, which codifies all players, decision makers, policy export, target group, and other stakeholders, makes public policy execution successful. Inter-Organizational Interaction Approach argued that public policy implementation requires multiple of organizations in the complex interactions. Public policy implementation is not single decision, structure and design of an organization comprised by top-down or bottom-up models. For example rule and regulation are passed from parlament. they are designed from law department. rule and regulation are implemented from various government administrative sector, division and branch. Implementation of Synthesis The process of implementing an approach and creating policies are same. The process of creating policies is continued through policy implementation. The formulation of policies determines who, where, when, and how they are implemented. In a similar vein, the implementation of public policy moves forward with a combined "Top-down and Bottom-up" strategy that develops six conditions: precise and consistent objectives, Sufficient causal theory, Structures for the application of the law, Devoted and adept practitioners, legislative, executive, and interest group backing from a sovereign Accept the shift in socioeconomic circumstances last. at

Conclusion
The process of implementing public policy never ends. In addition to a wide range of organizational characteristics, public policy is impacted by several external factors both during the formulation and execution phases. The effective execution of public policy requires the collaboration of several stakeholders and tactics. That is how success seems to appear. Policies are implemented using a variety of strategies, such as management, policy-action, bottom-up, top-down, interorganizational interaction, and synthesis implementation. In a similar vein, everyone engaged in the process—players, levels, organizations, groups, stakeholders, and concern

organizations—must feel deeply committed to finishing public policy.

Reference

1. Anderson JE. Public Policy Making. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 1975.
2. Cochran CL, Malone EF. Public Policy Perspective and Choices. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited; 2007.
3. Dye TR. Understanding Public Policy. England: Prentice Hall; 1975.
4. Easton D. The Political System. New York: Knoff; 1953.
5. Edward III, Sharkansky I. The Policy Predicament. San Francisco: W. H. Fressman; 1978.
6. Elmore RF. Mapping: Backward and Implementation Policy Decisions. Political Science Quarterly. 1978;94(4):601–616.
7. Frohock. Public Policy: Scope and Logic. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; 1970.
8. Hill M, Hupe P. Implementing Public Policy. London: Sage Publication; 2014.
9. Hjen B, Porter DO. Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis. Organization Studies. 1981;2(3). Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/do%20i/abs/10.1177/017084 068100200301 [Accessed 05 May 2022].
10. Howeltt, *et al.* A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis. Available from: https://www.youthopiabangla.org/skillDoc/Advocacy-ToolKits/Adv_Policy_Analysis_8_fold_path_Eugene_Bar dach.pdf [Accessed 05 May 2022].
11. Lasswell HD, Kaplan A. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1963.
12. Mazmanian D, Sabatier P. Implementation and Public Policy. USA: Foresman and Company; 1983.
13. Mazone G, Wildavsky A. Implementation as Evolution. Policy Study Review Annual. California: Sage Publication; 1978.
14. Osborne DE, Gaebler TA. Reinventing Government. Westley, Mass: Addison; 1992.
15. Paul A, Mazmain *et al.* Effective Policy Implementation. Available from: https://www.google.com/search?q=Mindlin+policy+imple mentatchrome&ie=UTF-8 [Accessed 06 May 2022].
16. Sapru RK. Public Policy Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited; 2012.
17. Shahi HB. Policy Implementation Capacity of Nepal: A Case of Female Migrant Workers. Kathmandu: Radhika Shahi; 2021.
18. Van Meter DS, Van Horn CE. The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework. Administration & Society. 1975;6(4):445–488. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404 [Accessed 04 May 2022]
19. White PE. Introrganizational Studies. Administration and Society. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A._N._Sherwin-White [Accessed 04 May 2022].