

Policy Friction: An Explanation of Policy Implementation Deviation in China

Lei Qian

Abstract: Implementation deviation is common and interesting in the process of policy implementation in China, and many policies are even deviated from the original intention of the policy because of implementation deviation. Implementation deviation mechanism is necessary to solve the challenges of policy implementation. The existing research mainly focuses on the perspective of different levels of government in china, and believes that the local decentralization system of authoritarian regime is the main reason for policy implementation deviation in China.

The research is based on the perspective of government and enterprise, taking the risk compensation policy series of innovation as an example for case analysis.

Combining the performance and mechanism of policy deviation in China, the research puts forward the conception of "policy friction" as a new interpretation for policy implementation deviation in China. The research shows that the policy implementation deviation has three characteristics: more dissatisfaction but less conflicts in policy, action changed but the policy text unchanged, implementation deviation but policy implementation can be sustained. The research argues that the deviation of policy implementation is "policy friction", which is the result of the interaction between the enterprises and government, since public policy is not only a tool of public affairs management but also a tool of government blame-avoiding.

The attribute of government blame-avoiding leads to strong government in the process of policy formulation and implementation. Therefore, the opinions of enterprises can only be expressed in the way of non-implementation or modification. But as a public affairs management tool, the policy would rely on the participation of enterprises. "Policy Friction" is formed.

The research tries to break through the limitations of policy implementation process, taking policy attribute as consideration, further explained the interaction mechanism between government and enterprise.

Key words: Policy Friction Implementation deviation multiple streams framework theory

Introduction

Policy implementation bias is the most common phenomenon in the implementation of Chinese policy and an important issue in policy implementation. There has been a consensus on the concept of "change" as a policy implementation bias.

Policy change is mainly characterized by the following characteristics: inconsistent with the policy content, deviate from the policy objectives, contrary to the spirit of policy, including the replacement policy, boycott policy, perfunctory policy, overhead policy, retention policy, loss policy and additional policies. Such studies focus on different levels of government, different sectors of the policy implementation bias. In addition, there are also concerned about the way entrepreneurs involved in the local policy process, including to meet the performance, sit asking price, interest dredge, leveraging pressure and formal communication, that enterprises more "political embedded" rather than "autonomy" The more policy influence.

There are three kinds of theories about the implementation of the deviation of policy implementation. The first is the theory of policy implementation economics, that the implementation of policy is essentially a kind of interest game between the relevant policy subjects based on the consideration of profit and loss. Behavior is fundamentally driven by the interests of the main interests of the conflict or the objective inevitability of the conflict determines the implementation of the phenomenon of the implementation of the phenomenon of the possibility of blocking.

The second is the theory of policy implementation system analysis. It is argued that the reasons for the deviation of policy implementation are analyzed from the institutional background of policy implementation and the institutional reasons for the deviation of policy implementation from the aspects of government system, power allocation and cadre system. Including the "level of policy", the central game. High-level policy makers are pursuing the overall interests, but the local policy performers represent regional and even personal interests, and thus policy makers and performers may have differences in the interests of the policy. "Multi-attribute of policy": "Island phenomenon" refers to the government agencies in the functions, restructure, information, interests and other aspects because it can not meet the diversity of the main body of the full integration, timely exchange and efficient use of a state. Cooperative dilemma is a kind of rational positioning of "islanding phenomenon". 1 government departments in

the implementation of public policy is often faced with a department's objectives and other departments of the goal is inconsistent, in the implementation of an organization in the implementation of a project, do not want to cooperate with other organizations, the results of public policy implementation of the " Island phenomenon "and cooperation dilemma.

The third theory is the network analysis of policy implementation, corresponding to the implementation of the third generation of policy research, emphasizing the relationship between government agencies and the implementation of policy performance. On the implementation of the network structure between the organs of view, the vertical system has a level of intergovernmental relations with the operation of the relationship between the level of government departments, private sector partnership between the formation. The success of the two elements: First, the strength of the key organs of the organization; Second, the relationship between the communication and coordination between organs is good or bad.

The issue of policy implementation research has focused on how practitioners have changed their public policies to meet the common interests of policymakers and policy makers. However, there is a middle part of the study is missing, why some public policy in the makers and implementers have been clear that there is a problem, there is no policy changes to meet the actual needs.

In the case of the policy of subsidy between government and enterprises, the binding relationship between government and enterprises is far from the strict relationship between governments at different levels within the government. Therefore, when the policy can not meet the needs of enterprises, many enterprises choose Non-participation, the implementation of this situation is almost difficult to promote the policy, therefore, in this case, why policy changes did not occur, it is even more important. On the basis of this, the paper puts forward the reasons why it is difficult to change after the policy formulation, and points out that the one-way relationship between the policy entrepreneurs and the policy window is not enough to explain the reason why the policy change has not happened. Some of China's policy implementation shows that the policy window will, in some ways, reverse select policy entrepreneurs, so that the same policy entrepreneurs can sometimes push policy in the same policy areas and in the context of convergence Development, and sometimes can not promote policy changes.

Analysis Framework: multiple streams framework

multiple streams framework is the earliest by the American political scientist John Kingdon in the year raised the King of the time spent in-depth interviews and research in the Cohen Ma Qi and Olsen proposed trash on the basis of the model Put forward the multiple streams framework of policy process.

The multiple streams framework suggests that policy formulation is carried out under a vague condition. This ambiguity refers to the state of multiple ways of thinking about the same environment or phenomenon. This theory explains how the policy sets the agenda. How to establish an alternative How the alternatives are elucidated and why these processes play a role in the theory that there are different stream in the policy system. The flow of policy and the flow of political stream have created a problem in various social problems in the social environment. However, not all of the problems are given the attention of policy makers to rise to the policy agenda. We need to understand why some of these issues can be given the attention of policymakers and how they raise the policy of policy makers The existence of a policy community in the policy system Community is a community of bureaucratic congressional committee members and researchers in the network of network members to focus on a policy area of the problem around the problem-solving policy community experts We put forward Many opinions and assertions that they circulate their own ideas and hope that their own policy recommendations can be taken into account. This constitutes a policy system. Policy stream Some policy recommendations in the policy selection process can be paid attention to others but will be abandoned Political stream Political stream include National sentiment Public opinion Reduced party and party ideology, etc. In the political sphere, these factors can motivate politicians to adjust their focus when considering problems and thus influence policy formulation. This stream is independent of their occurrence and development and operation are not dependent on other stream at a critical point in time they converge together with the problem will be put on the policy agenda this critical point in time is the so-called policy window Kingdon defines it as an advocate of policy advice by presenting his most proud solution to the opportunity or the opportunity for them to draw attention to their particular problems to the window of the policy that could either be a social event or a political event The window of policy does not often open and the window of policy is not long The policy advocates need to seize and use the opportunity to open the window of policy to

promote the combination of problem politics and the policies they advocate to ensure their Policy recommendations can rise to the policy agenda and formulate specific policy outcomes. There are also many policy entrepreneurs who are active in policy systems. They are willing to invest their own stream. Time-of-day reputation and money to promote a proposition in exchange for performance for material purposes or achievement. Unity of expected future earnings policy. Entrepreneurs wait for policy Window of opportunity open and try to seize this opportunity to launch their policy proposals and their understanding of the issues in the policy window open.

The division of the stream of the policy process of the most important factors in the effective classification. Through the multiple streams framework theory we can influence the development of the contents of the policy have a clearer understanding of the occasional social events or political events can open the opportunity for the policy. When the flow of policy flow and political flow are more mature, such a window of opportunity is likely to be used to promote policy change. In short, this theory actually tells us the possibility of a choice in policy formulation and Not all problems can be raised to the policy agenda. Not all policy recommendations can be implemented and those that are ultimately resolved are because they have a good chance and have seized this opportunity. Theory of Multiple Streams not only provides a new theoretical perspective in practice can also be widely used to explain the actual case.

Case Analysis

(A) third-rate convergence: the development of funds subsidy policy

The process of globalization has accelerated, and industrial enterprises have returned to two trends. They have formed a serious impact on China's industrial-based industrial production model. The industrial transformation and upgrading has become an important part of China's economic development and industrial development. The innovation drive has been generated and Central to the local level at all levels of government the most important political task. In order to promote innovation, governments at all levels to actively introduce technology, personnel and funding system for the three policy framework for innovation policy. Innovation policy and risk compensation policy is one of the policies under the funding policy system.

This paper analyzes the whole implementation process of the policy after the formulation of the policy, including the problems, the causes of the problems, the

problem solving process and the results, and fully presents the policy makers, the implementers and the target groups in the case of D City Innovation Voucher Policy and Risk Compensation Policy as an analysis case Clearly aware of the policy issues, why not promote the reasons for policy changes.

(B) policy implementation problems

D City innovation policy and risk compensation policy after the introduction of the policy of poor implementation of the problem.

Risk compensation policy policy advocacy stage, the potential policy target groups did not show willingness to participate. After the introduction of the policy, the policy implementing agencies to the city to meet the policy requirements of the service agencies and science and technology park policy advocacy, 30 potential targets, only less than 10 institutions really participated in the policy advocacy, other institutions and more time By refusing to participate.

(C) the reasons for the implementation of policy issues

According to the D city enterprises to reflect, resulting in such funding subsidy policy failure mainly for three reasons:

(1) policy target object does not match actual demand.

(2) policy approval process is too strict

(1) long policy cycle

(Iv) feedback and results after policy implementation

When there is such a problem, the policy of the audience clearly to the needs of enterprises, but the policy makers did not change this, but in the specific implementation process, made a deal with, because the requirements of the enterprise is often not To the policy text requirements, in order to implement the policy, and finally, had to relax the use of innovative coupons, from the policy requirements of the purchase of innovative services to relax the business for all types of qualification applications.

The results of policy implementation have finally developed two deviations:

(1) grants to SMEs for the original intention of the policy innovation vouchers, the ultimate targeted for assistance, mostly state-owned enterprises or institutions.

(2) a large number of innovative subsidies to become a declaration of procedural subsidies. Law firms and accounting firms and other business units instead of innovative institutions, as policy beneficiaries.

Discussion and Conclusions

The above case presents a very interesting question: why policy change does not occur when policymakers, performers and target groups are aware of policy issues? Why in the same context, the role of policy entrepreneurs have produced completely different results.

To answer this question, we need to understand the process of China's innovation policy-making, in which there are two very important phenomenon:

(1) China's policy-making has a clear top-down characteristics, often higher levels of government to develop guidance, subordinate governments in accordance with the views of the refinement, the formation of the implementation of the program, but the policy can be quantified standards are often in the provincial government It will involve, lower levels of government higher levels of government for the policy clearly stated, not change, even if not necessarily suited to their situation. Subordinate governments in the implementation of the implementation of the program, often only increase the higher government policy did not mention the content.

(2) Corruption in the field of science and technology, all capital-related policies are the main place of occurrence. Therefore, the review and reporting procedures of such policies tend to exceed the general policy, and there is no government at all levels to make changes.

Thus, the formation of policy changes, policy makers, performers and target groups in the clear understanding of policy issues, the policy changes did not occur. And eventually evolved into the characteristics of China's policy implementation: the implementation of the policy is not satisfied with the conflict is not the performance of the implementation of behavior changes, but does not change the policy text, policy implementation bias is common but policy implementation can continue. The study called "policy friction".

"Policy friction" is the result of the interaction between Chinese enterprises and government policies in the context of public policy in China as a tool for public affairs management and government risk aversion.

The attributes of the government risk aversion tool lead to the strong position of the government in the process of policy formulation and implementation. Therefore, the views of policy entrepreneurs can only be expressed in the course of implementation

by way of non-implementation or implementation. But as a policy of public affairs management tools, but also dependent on the participation of policy entrepreneurs.

From this point of view, policy entrepreneurs seem to be the promoters of the policy, which is actually the policy being chosen. Policy entrepreneurs can push the policy when it is just when this policy is needed, policy entrepreneurs are found to complete policy promotion, which often occurs when policy is used as a property for public affairs management tools. However, when the government does not want to change the issue, especially when dealing with political issues such as risk aversion, policy entrepreneurs can no longer be able to promote. Thus, to some extent, the multiple streams framework theory of policy entrepreneurs to promote the policy window of the one-way relationship is not enough to explain the reasons for policy changes did not occur, some of China's policy implementation shows that the policy window to some extent also Will reverse the choice of policy entrepreneurs. Policy entrepreneurs are more about improving policies than pushing policies.