

Grasping the Policy Style in an uncertain World

Patrick Hassenteufel
(University of Versailles-Paris-Saclay / Printemps research center)
patrick.hassenteufel@uvsq.fr
Philippe Zittoun
(ENTPE/LET)
philippe.zittoun@entpe.fr

International Conference on Public Policy
Singapore June 28-30 2017
Panel T02P01
Policy Styles in Theory and Practice

Inspired by Lowi's works that proposed a typology of public policies (T. J. Lowi, 1964; Theodore J. Lowi, 1972) and, thus, by a wide range of comparative studies since the 1970s (Smith, 1975; Heidenheimer, Adams and Heclo, 1975; Hayward and Watson, 1975; Feldman et al. 1978), the heuristic concept of "style" aims to qualify a policy or a policy process through the identification of a relevant characterization (policy domain, time period, policy tools, etc.), to allow its commensurability with other singular policy or policy processes and to catch the divergence/convergence issue between "different systems of the decision-making process, different procedures of making societal decisions". (Richardson, Gustafsson and Jordan, 1982, p. 2). One of the best known usages of the concept of "policy style" is the proposal by Richardson, Gustaffson and Jordan (1982) to compare national policy styles across two dimensions: the kind of relationship with interest groups (conflict or negotiation) and the dominant time horizon of public policies (short-term reactive policies or long-term anticipatory policies). Based on this analytical framework, they identified a "British style" corresponding to "broad characterizations of the British (and possibly European) policy processes, particularly in terms of the relationship between government and interest groups" (Jordan and Richardson, 1982). They argued that, irrespective of the policy field, Britain had shared policymaking characteristics that were slightly different from other countries. They thus characterized the British policy style as a kind of "bureaucratic accommodation" producing reactive policies. In contrast, they stressed that in France the relationship with interest groups was more conflict-oriented because the State imposed anticipatory policies.

The notion of policy style, which contributed to the development of the comparability and identification of specificities, took a new turn in the early 2000s following the reflections of Igor Mayer, C. Els Van Daalen and Pieter Bots; they proposed to use the notion to distinguish and characterize different kinds of policy analysis (Mayer, van Daalen and Bots, 2004) rather than policy processes as in the studies mentioned above. They perceived the concept of "style" not only as useful for qualifying different kinds of policy analysis, but also as capable of taking the place of the concept of paradigm and facilitating policy comparability. They presented the different kinds of policy analysis as complementary, contrary to paradigms implying oppositions, i.e. stronger differentiation. In this

perspective they identified six policy analytical styles (rational, argumentative, client advice, participatory, process and interactive) and transformed a long tradition of incompatible approaches into a typology of analytical methods easier to associate and thus find the best analytical practice.

The concept of “style” can be considered as a heuristic method of building a typology and transforming incomparable objects or processes into comparable ones. How, then, might we use it for the study of policy analysis? This question is particularly complex if we consider that the concept of “policy analysis” is itself used in multiple ways; it has been used to identify an applied scientific field, to identify knowledge production by practitioners, and even to speak about a broad field with applied and non-applied dimensions (Wildavsky, 1987; Bardach & Patashnik, 2015; Peters & Pierre, 2006; Majone 1989). The main purpose of this chapter is to underpin the notion that, while the concept of style might be unable to take the place of the paradigm concept in the academic field, it can prove quite useful in comparing the use of different policy analytical methods in relation to the systems of policy advice, policy formulation and public debate. Following the perspective proposed by Craft and Howlett (Craft & Howlett, 2012), we propose that the concept of policy analytical style might provide a heuristic channel to reconsider the whole policymaking process, from the policy analysis shaping public policies to policy formulation and policy debate.

Policy Analysis: a scientific discipline or field of expertise?

To develop the concept of policy analytical style, Igor Mayer, C. Els Van Daalen and Pieter Bots proposed to bridge the gap between the different incompatible “policy analysis” paradigms by combining them into knowledge activities (Mayer, van Daalen and Bots ,2004). By defining what constitutes an academic “discipline” , considering that, “if we are unable to construct cohesion and unity behind this great diversity, we cannot speak of a discipline” (p. 170), and proposing to build a unique model transforming policy analysis into different “styles” , they paved the way for relevant debate on the status of policy analysis and the possibility of defining “styles” .

In our opinion and in the social sciences in particular, it is obvious that all academic disciplines are structured around different non-compatible paradigms and their existence as disciplines is unquestionable. In policy studies for instance, the argumentative approach considers that all policy analyses must be perceived as argumentative activities, even the rational ones. In this perspective, it is impossible to consider that the argumentative paradigm is one “style” that can be combined with the rational paradigm which is a different “style” , because they are based on different conceptions of what a public policy is and how it should be analysed (with different methods).

However, if, like Dobuzinskis, Howlett and Laycock¹, we make a clear distinction between the academic field of policy studies in an attempt to understand the policy process and

¹ “Policy studies, [...] is conducted mainly by academics and relates to ‘meta-policy’ or the overall nature of the activities of the state. It is generally concerned with understanding the development, logic and implications of overall state policy processes and the models used by investigators to analyze those processes. ‘Policy analysis’, refers to applied social and scientific research—but also involves more implicit forms of practical knowledge—pursued by government officials and non-governmental organizations which usually focus on designing, implementing, and evaluating existing policies, programs and other courses of action adopted or contemplated by states.” (p.1)

policy outcomes in different social science perspectives, and policy analysis which is not an academic field, even an applied one, but simply a specific knowledge field regrouping the different kinds of knowledge produced on and for public policies (Dobuzinskis, Laycock, and Howlett, 2007), the perspective changes and the debate on policy analysis style can be renewed.

The debate on the epistemological statute of policy analysis and its ambiguity is not new. Aaron Wildavsky evoked rather late the issue of policy analysis definition² and explained that policy analysis is not a science but, rather, an art and a craft because, “Without art, analysis is doomed to repetition; without craft, analysis is unpersuasive” (Wildavsky 1987) (p. 389). However, he merely challenged the epistemological status of policy analysis as a scientific discipline. When Charles Lindblom developed the paradoxical concept of the “sciences of muddling through”, he criticized “theorists” who developed non-scientific and non-rigorous policy analyses because they forgot that “no one can practice the rational-comprehensive method for really complex problems” (Lindblom 1958b, p. 84) and considered that their “theory is sometimes of extremely limited helpfulness in policy-making” (p. 87). Eugene Bardach also suggested that “policy analysis is more art than science [which] draws on intuition as much as on method” (Bardach, 2008, p. xvi). He thus reinforced the idea that policy analysis as an activity is not scientific and went against the policy science perspective (Lerner & Lasswell, 1951) that was dominant at the time.

Based on these studies, it seems clear that policy analysis is not a science. Indeed, neither is its content based on shared scientific methods, nor is there an academic community responsible for organizing formal procedures to differentiate between “genuine” problem-solving statements and those that are not. As Wildavsky has suggested, the main objective of policy analysis is to persuade decision-makers of its efficiency rather than to be judged by peers through the publication of scientific articles.

It is interesting to note that in countries such as France (Halpern, Hassenteufel, Zittoun, 2017) or Germany (Blum & Schubert, 2013) where there is a clear distinction between the academic community and the policy process, policy analysis is underdeveloped and policy studies are focused on the policy process as a means through which to grasp governmental activities.

Consequently, policy analysis is not a science but, rather, an applied knowledge activity producing problem-solving statements, proposals, arguments, ways of thinking and evidence for the policymaking process. Nevertheless, this definition of policy analysis highlights a new issue. For Wildavsky, policy analysis is not only the art of producing knowledge but is also the craft of persuading decision-makers of its relevance (Wildavsky 1987). This means that this kind of knowledge does not seek validation through the persuasion of peers involving a formal process of scientific evaluation: rather, it seeks the transformation of a proposal statement into a decision by policy-makers (Zittoun, 2014).

Taking this statement into account and based on the epistemological status of knowledge, it becomes impossible to clearly distinguish between a policy analyst academic, a policy analyst expert, a policy analyst bureaucrat or even a policy analyst politician, all of whom produce proposals supported by knowledge, arguments, etc. By considering policy analysis as applied knowledge rather than as scientific knowledge, the academic community is

² “How can you teach (or write a book) on a subject if you can’t say what it is?” (p. 2),

prevented from occupying a specific position with regard to these activities, compared to all the other actors such as experts, bureaucrats and politicians who aspire to influence the policy process by proposing problem-solving statements.

In his article, Lindblom opposed “theorists” who produce policy analysis knowledge and practitioners who produce profane knowledge which is, generally, more useful than and as rigorous as policy analysis knowledge (Lindblom, 1958b; Lindblom, 1958a). Policy analysis may also be considered as knowledge activities and separated from the question of who produces and uses this knowledge, based on empirical observations. This aspect was present in Lindblom’s article when he criticized “theorists” and explained that practitioners generally have their own policy analysis which was more profane knowledge but frequently as rigorous and useful as the knowledge produced by theorists.

Policy analysis must therefore be considered not as an academic field but, rather, as a set of knowledge activities that practitioners, policymakers, academics, politicians and experts produce; the use of the concept of “style” thus becomes relevant to tackle two questions: First, is it possible to identify sufficient specific characteristics to establish a typology of policy analysis independently of who uses it and who produces it? Second, is there a link between this typology and the configuration of the producers and users of this knowledge?

A typology of policy analytical styles

To build a typology of policy analysis as a knowledge-producing activity, we must begin by building on the definition of policy analysis and distinguishing it from others. Although this task is particularly complex, we would like to grasp it through the cognitive operations that make it possible to produce “usable” knowledge in order to influence the policy process (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979). Indeed, taking all kinds of knowledge into account would be too complex a task to organize a typology. We thus focus here on all “usable” knowledge that seeks to support a problem-solving statement and justify it.

A problem-solving statement is a statement that proposes to associate the definition of a problem with the policy instruments aimed at solving it. Drawing on Wittgenstein, we do not focus on the content of these linking operations but, rather, examine the statement as a game of language associating two concepts, public problems and policy instruments, and translating this link into a “causal link” that transforms the choice of an instrument into a way of solving a given problem (Wittgenstein, 2005). To avoid making assumptions about what comes first and presuming that the solution is always the result of the resolution of a problem, we have differentiated the linking operation that Kingdon referred to as “coupling” from the policy analysis process which produces knowledge (arguments, evidence and proofs), justifying this coupling and cementing it (Kingdon, 1995).

In his policy analysis practical guide, Eugene Bardach (Bardach, 2008) considers that “policy analysis” is simply a problem-solving process that can be deconstructed in eight paths which help provide the guidelines of analysis: defining the problem; assembling evidence; constructing alternatives; selecting criteria; projecting the outcomes; confronting the trade-offs; deciding; and telling the story. In his classical style of analysis, the process begins with the identification of the different components of policy analysis (problem, evidence, alternatives, criteria, etc.), followed by their transformation into specific operations for each problem (defining policy, selecting criteria, etc.) which is also some form of analysis, making it possible to solve the problem in a complex way. Like Russian dolls, policy analysis contains different kinds of analysis.

While it is difficult to identify all the operations required by policy analysis in the problem-solving process, all the operations involved are linked to the problem-solving statement which is the most important one. We propose to structure a typology around five types of analysis. Without trying to be exhaustive, we will attempt to understand a large number of policy analysis methods, focusing on the production of usable knowledge to support problem-solving statements. The analyses are not mutually exclusive and they are generally combined.

The first type is policy predictive analysis. The link between a proposal and its consequences is one of the least known and most problematic links. The well-known unexpected consequences of the US prohibition policy constitute a typical case. Taking into account this fragile link, many policy analyses have mobilized different methods and strategies to predict the impact of a proposal. They have thus depicted an image of the future which is actually a reproduction of the present modified by the expected consequences.

One of the best known predictive analyses is based on the rational choice theory and on cost-benefit analysis in order to predict what may happen in the future should a specific policy instrument be chosen (Peters, 2015). By proposing to objectivize human behavior through its constant preference and its calculation scale of interest, the rational choice theory allows the simulation of future behavior. Human behavior, however, is not the only aspect that can be simulated. The cost-benefit analysis largely develops predictive cost evolution. It aims to establish some indicators, principles of evolution and general laws which make it possible to predict different components, discipline human behavior and build fictions. A good example is the “consumer’s surplus” proposed by Mishan and Quah (Mishan & Quah, 2007) who identify some laws to simulate and predict behavior. In this case, the fiction is essentially the present modified by the consequence of the policy measure. For example, to justify the tramway as a solution to pollution, the policy analyst that we studied (Zittoun, 2014) developed a form of behavior modeling which made it possible to build a fiction and simulate the number of people who might take the tramway after its construction. The model is essentially built on behavior laws and preferences that human beings follow in both the present and the future. In this example, the best assumption was that most people prefer to take the fastest transport and the most direct path. Based on this, it was possible to establish the number of people who would take the new tramway and compare different layouts. By simulating the future and comparing it to the present, the analysts justified the problem-solving statement.

Rational choice is not the only method of prediction. Comparative policy analysis can also be used as a method to predict the consequence of a policy proposal. It is of primary importance to establish a link between a public policy implemented in one country and its effects, then transform this link into a predictive link able to sustain a proposal. The link between the flexibility of the labor market and the unemployment rate is a good example of this kind of reasoning.

The second type is problem causal analysis. In this analytical style, the goal is to attach a causal factor to a problem by proposing correlations between some specific phenomena and the problem to be solved. Unlike predictive analysis, which focuses on policy consequences in the future, causal analysis focuses on the past and the present in order to identify the cause of the problem to be tackled. Like medicine, which tries to identify the cause of an illness in order to find the best treatment and eliminate its cause, this analytical style essentially seeks to transform the cause into a new problem which has to be solved. For example, in the case of housing policy, analysis can be based on arguments and evidence, pointing out that the main problem is the insufficient amount of new

housing; hence any instrument that contributes to sustaining housing constructions becomes a solution to the problem (Zittoun, 2001).

Problem causal analysis is expected to develop knowledge to transform correlation into causality between two phenomena. While the context of the phenomenon is specific, the primary objective of the analysis is to find proof and evidence to transform the problem into a cause. This supposes that every time the first phenomenon appears, it provokes the apparition of the second. Comparative analysis is one of the main classical analyses and is based on the idea that one can find the same correlation in the past or in a different country. The main difficulty encountered by this kind of analysis is that, to enable comparability, the specificity of every situation must be transformed. Popper (K. R. Popper, 1916) suggests that, irrespective of the number of cases, confirmation alone is not sufficient to constitute scientific proof. This approximate approach is the most classical one.

The third type is trial/error policy analysis, which associates an experimental approach with evaluative analysis. Inspired by Popper and developed by Dahl and Lindblom (Dahl & Lindblom, 1953), this analytical style primarily considers that it is epistemologically impossible to have a rigorous predictive or causal analysis, that every policy always provokes unexpected consequences, and that studying policy, observing it and analyzing its consequences is the only possibility. The trial and error approach is based on the repetition and multiplication of experiments. This kind of experimentation is often used on a small scale with the purpose of generalization, but it can also be introduced directly on a bigger scale with the purpose of adjustment. The trial/error policy analysis can be incremental, as it seeks to test policy proposals close to the existing policy. This method, which has been inspired by the experimental method in natural science (Popper, 1990), has primarily been developed in public policy with tests carried out at the micro-level. This analysis essentially seeks to build and/or use experimentation as the main evidence to support a problem-solving statement and has been widely developed in the last fifteen years by economists under the label “evidence-based policy” .

The fourth type is policy process analysis producing knowledge on the process itself and is based on the idea that understanding the process is the most relevant way to define an efficient strategy. Since the beginning of policy analysis, social scientists have developed knowledge on the process itself and have attempted to grasp the complexity of the game of actors and the constraints generated by the different stages of this process. Knowledge about the policy process was one of the most important fields nurtured by social scientists in the initial studies on the decision-making process undertaken in the 1950s and 1960s (Lasswell, 1956; Simon, 1944; Bachrach and Baratz, 1963; Lindblom, 1972), on policy implementation (Pressman & Wildawsky, 1973) and on the whole policy process in the 1970s (Jones, 1970; Anderson, 1975; Lasswell, 1971).

The fifth type is normative policy analysis which produces knowledge that makes it possible to legitimize the link between a proposal and the norms, values and references that give meaning to the proposal. For example, a policy analysis may use data and arguments to justify the notion that an instrument contributes to “sustainable development” , “freedom” or “equality” . The relationship between a norm and a proposal can be justified through a complex chain of links.

Although Lindblom distinguished knowledge *for* the policy process from knowledge *on* the policy process (Lindblom & Woodhouse, 1993), he undoubtedly underestimated the fact that the knowledge on the policy process is often used in this process to grasp and

designate a cartography of actors, networks and policy paths; i.e. this knowledge is used to justify a problem-solving statement. For instance, all measures proposed to simplify administration, organize citizen participation or reach a compromise between multiple interests can be supported by an analysis of the policy process that underlines its restrictions and its limits.

The different policy systems in the policymaking process

If policy analysis is “usable” knowledge that supports problem-solving statements, how this analysis is used in the policy process and by whom must also be examined. This will make it possible to differentiate policy analytical styles on the basis of both their content and the manner in which they have been used by policy actors in different governance contexts and at three levels in particular: national traditions, policy sectors and departments (Howlett & Lindquist, 2007).

The first and easiest of tackling these issues is to use the “location-based model” (Craft & Howlett, 2012; Wilson, 2006) which seeks to identify the loci where policy analysis is produced in the form of reports, publications or data. These locations might be universities, academic research units, think tanks, interest groups or governmental offices dedicated to the production of data such as observatories, statistics offices, etc. Craft and Howlett make a clear distinction between locations that produce knowledge and those that make decisions, and between political and technical content. While these authors propose that the content dimension be included and state that there is a need to move beyond the separation between technical and political dimensions, they produce a new category of analysis which gives rise to new challenges such as the differentiation between the short term and the long term based on location. The second limitation of this model is related to the fact that some policy analysts might develop activities other than knowledge production; for instance, they may defend their problem-solving statements within government and try to directly persuade some decision-makers. Third, different kinds of activities might be located in the same institution, meaning that activities do not always define the specificity of an institution. For example, in a governmental office one may find some civil servants who produce knowledge and others who use this knowledge to advise and persuade others. These elements make it difficult to elaborate a completely convincing typology. The idea of a location-based model is interesting but needs to be enlarged to embrace the whole policy making process, i.e., from the formulation of policy proposals to policy decisions.

A second option is to consider the knowledge function-based model by separating different functions: the function of knowledge production, the function of using knowledge, and the function of discussing knowledge. When Wildavsky distinguishes art and craft activities (Wildavsky, 1987), he separates the production of knowledge and its use. However, he focuses mainly on one kind of use, i.e., the manner in which decision-makers can be persuaded to choose between different proposals. This distinction suggests that the knowledge used as evidence to stabilize a problem-solving statement needs to be transformed into arguments to persuade decision-makers. To understand this distinction between policy analysis as evidence to support problem-solving statements and policy analysis as an argument to persuade decision-makers, we must return to Lindblom’s work. Lindblom was one of the first scholars to attempt to understand the role of policy analysis in policymaking. “How far do analysis and reasoning discussion go in policy making?” (Lindblom & Woodhouse, 1993, p. 13) he questioned, and compared “reaching policy choices by informed analysis and thoughtful discussion versus setting policy by bargaining,

trading of favors, voting or otherwise exerting power” (p. 7). He considered, however, that “analysis and politics always intertwine” (p. 7). “Why, given the obvious merits, do governments not make even more use of analysis? Why is there not less decision making on the basis of power and more on the basis of reasoned inquiry?” (p. 15) he queried. The main challenge of this model is first, to epistemologically separate knowledge making from knowledge use. As Perelman has suggested, all knowledge, except in mathematics, is generally developed as an argument to persuade others of the likelihood of the purpose (Perelman et al., 1950). When this knowledge is developed in the academic world, researchers have to persuade other researchers using specific rules and methods. It is clear that the use of knowledge in the political arena always involves some transformation and simplification which can be identified more as production than usage. More generally, separating knowledge production from knowledge use might lead one to overlook the fact that while knowledge is used, there is no additional testing during the argumentative exchange.

The third option that we adopt here involves associating the first two models to identify a third model, i.e., the policy system-based model (Jobert, 1994; Easton, 1965; Edelman, 1988; Bourdieu & Christin, 1990; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Marsh & Rhodes 1992). This model identifies the different policy systems in which a policy statement is formulated, analyzed, negotiated, discussed and tested based on autonomous rules and using specific actors, or more precisely, specific social roles and strategies, a specific distribution of acknowledgement and power, specific institutions and resources, some institutionalized likelihood statements, truth, and some dominant types of critiques. The same actor or the same institution might be involved in multiple policy systems but may play a different role, have different resources, a different position and different authority across policy systems, and may not develop the same kind of arguments. Each policy system is like an autonomous game with its own rules, strategies and roles.

We believe that defining different policy systems is a heuristic way of understanding the dynamics of policy proposal statements within each specific system and to better grasp the circulation between them. Each system can be differentiated based on the rules a policy proposal statement must follow to succeed. Subsequently, one must also take into account the kind of public one needs to persuade and the system of critiques the proposal must evade or resist. The first task therefore is to identify the different policy systems.

The first is the policy academic system, which was largely studied by the sociology of sciences (Latour, 1988) and which has specific rules that revolve around the production and the testing of academic knowledge. This system includes mainly researchers and academics whose careers and legitimacy are built upon their publications and their quotations within the academic system. This system is fragmented as it is composed of different disciplines which attempt to shape careers and rules. While each discipline has its own sub-system, all disciplines share a relatively similar process. Publishing and following an academic career are the keys to recognition and to a good professional position within universities. While public policy is generally not an autonomous field, it is important to identify the dominant disciplines in the academic studies of public policies.

The second is the policy advisory system, which brings together all producers of “usable” knowledge to support problem-solving statements. “Expertise” is the main social role and it can be organized within bureaucracies, think tanks, interest groups and, less systematically, within political parties and non-profit organizations. It has become increasingly complex to determine where expertise begins and ends. The main rules of

this system are the publication of reports, notes, books and communications addressed to different kinds of publics (mostly specialized but also to the larger public via the media) in order to persuade, but also to resist the multiple critiques they reinforce. Generally, the system of expertise is organized into a policy community with its own rules of acknowledgement and its own language. Another key dimension is the degree of differentiation between public expertise (in governmental departments and agencies) and private expertise (in think tanks, interest groups and NGOs which frequently overlap).

The third is the policy formulation system, which generally revolves around a specific policy domain and is related to a specialized bureaucracy, formalized mechanisms of decisions, different official interlocutors and to a multitude of roles, discourses and practices. In this system, the main rules are direct persuasion through discursive interaction and the production of official texts, laws, decrees, budgets, instruments and other policy measures, as well as negotiations and conflicts. For instance, the national housing policy system associates the housing policy with a large number of laws, policy instruments, the Department of Housing, the Minister and the Ministry of Housing, the national spokesmen of owners and renters, the spokesman of building companies and of banks, some dominant discourses and statements about housing.

The last is the public debate system, which refers to the complex public confrontations between different actors (political actors, the media, interest groups, experts, etc.). It is the most visible part of the policy making process during which different actors argue and discuss problem-solving statements. This arena revolves around convictions, conflicts and critiques. While politicians play an important role in this system, they are not the only actors: journalists, experts, interest groups spokesmen, academics and less frequently bureaucrats participate in public debates. One of the main characteristics of this system is that policy proposals and their critiques seek to persuade a large public, unlike other systems where the public to be persuaded is more restricted and specialized.

The structure of policy systems and their interaction

We posit that these four different policy systems can be identified everywhere; hence, the differences across countries can be grasped by analyzing their structure and the relationships between them, based on the identification of the actors who compose the different systems, the circulation (or absence of circulation) between them and the type of interactions they share (i.e., the level of conflict between policy actors). It helps to identify different policy making styles.

The first step in this analytical perspective is to identify the different categories of actors. Principal criteria include the actor's professional position (who is their employer?) and their career. In this perspective, academic actors are employed mainly by universities or research units and most of their career takes place within the academic system. Public experts are bureaucrats employed by government to produce knowledge and policy proposals for the government, and they have mainly administrative careers. Private experts are employed by interest groups or non-profit organizations, and their career paths are often more complex (they can circulate to or from the academic world or governmental agencies). Political actors compete for elective mandates and hold different institutional positions (in the legislative or executive branch of government) at different levels (national or local) during their political careers.

Identifying different kinds of policy actors provides a better understanding of the composition of each policy system. For example, the role of academics inside the advisory system depends on the country (for examples, see below). The proportion of public and

private experts within the academic system can also widely differ. While the number of experts holding positions teaching public policy in universities may be high in some countries, it may be very low in others. Similarly, the significance of political actors in the policy formulation process depends of the relationship between the legislative and executive branches. While political actors play an important role in public debate in all countries, the level of participation of experts and academics can be very different from one country to another.

Adopting an actor-centered perspective also helps us to better understand **the level of compartmentalization** between each system. On the one hand, one can find a high level of compartmentalization: the academic system is mainly composed of academics, policy advisory and formulation systems are essentially composed of experts and public debates are monopolized by politicians. On the other hand, one can find high levels of porosity between policy systems: the academic system includes experts and politicians, academics participate in the policy advisory system and public debates, and politicians play an important role in policy formulation.

In order to grasp the whole policy making process, it is necessary to include another dimension: **the level of conflict or cooperation in every policy system** which depends on the system itself. In the policy formulation system for example, this level is structured by the intensity of conflicts within (between departments or between different levels of government) and outside (between departments, local governments, non-profit organizations and interest groups) management. It is also related to the conflicts between government and parliament. In the policy advisory system, the level of conflict often reflects the diversity of actors (public/private) who produce advice. In the academic system, it is generally linked to the significance of a national academic system, the level of competition for jobs and careers, the dependence of external resources, etc.

Following a knowledge-centered perspective can help us to better understand **the level of controversies inside each system**. In the policy academic system, a main distinction can be made between the situation with a dominant paradigm (low level of controversies) and the situation with the co-existence of two or more paradigms (high level of controversies). In the policy advisory system, this level depends on the amount of divergent expertise (with different policy analytical styles). In the public debate system, the conflict level is usually high in every country because of the distinction between political arenas and policy arenas (Edelman, 1988). However, the significance of media criticism, the degree of political pluralism and the level of public contestation of policy proposals can differ.

It is also important to consider **the openness of the systems**, facilitating (or not) the circulation of policy analysis knowledge. This level is primarily linked to the number of common policy analytical styles between different systems. In a situation where each system develops a specific style of policy analysis, the capacity of knowledge to circulate between the different systems is very weak. At the opposite extreme, the presence of the same type of policy analytical style in the different systems facilitates the circulation and paves way for exchange.

The policymaking style matrix

Integrating these different dimensions leads us to propose an analytical matrix in order to compare the role of policy analysis in the policymaking process. We will use it here to compare the policymaking style in three countries: France, Germany and the United States.

The French policymaking style (Halpern, Hassenteufel & Zittoun, 2017) can be characterized by two main aspects: its high level of compartmentalization and the dominant role of public experts using predictive and causal analytical styles. Academics are restricted to the academic system using causal and process-oriented analytical styles, isolated from the more predictive policy analytical style used in the policy advisory and formulation systems, dominated by public experts (senior civil servants)³ located in ministers' staffs, departments and specific public expertise institutions, mostly related to the Prime Minister (like the former Commissariat Général au Plan recently transformed into France Stratégie). The distinct separation between the different systems explains the high level of conflict in the public debate system where actors excluded from the policy formulation system (especially politicians because of the weak role of Parliament but also academics and private experts) express their criticism of policy proposals and decisions.

The French Policymaking Style

Policy System		Academic System	Policy Advisory System	Policy formulation System	Public debate System
Actors	Academics	X			
	Public Experts	X	X	X	X
	Private Experts		X		X
	Politicians				X
Level of internal Conflict	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Low	Medium	High
Level of compartmentalisation	High/Medium/Low	High	Medium	High	Medium
Policy Analytical Styles	Predictive		X	X	
	Causal	X	X		
	Trial/error				
	Process	X			
	Normative			X	X
Level of internal controversies	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Low	Low	Medium
Level of opening	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Low	High	High

The German policymaking style can be characterized by the importance of cooperation between the different levels of government (cooperative federalism) and between interest groups and government (corporatism) (Blum and Schubert, 2013). Compared to France, the policy systems are more porous: academics and private experts can be involved in the policy advisory system and politicians are highly involved in the policy formulation system (the importance of the political negotiation in Parliament), even if the policy analytical styles are rather similar to France.

³ As the case of healthcare policymaking shows (Genieys, Hassenteufel, 2015)

The policymaking style in Germany

Policy System		Academic System	Policy Advisory System	Policy formulation System	Public debate system
Actors	Academics	X	X		X
	Public Experts		X	X	
	Private Experts		X	X	X
	Politicians			X	X
Level of internal Conflict	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
Level of compartement alisation	High/Medium/Low	High	Medium	Low	Medium
Policy Analytical Styles	Predictive		X	X	
	Causal	X	X	X	X
	Trial/error				
	Process	X			
	Normative				X
Level of internal controversies	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Level of Opening	High/Medium/Low	Low	Medium	Low	Medium

In the United States we find an even greater circulation of actors between the different policy systems, corresponding to a rather complex configuration with some recent evolutions (Radin, 2013). Two other characteristics of the American policymaking style can also be stressed: a high level of conflict in the policy formulation system (especially in Congress but also between levels of government) and the more central place taken by predictive and trial and error policy analysis because of the role of economics in policy studies (in France and Germany, political science and sociology play a more important role in the academic system).

The policymaking style in the United States

Policy Systems		Academic System	Policy Advisory System	Policy formulation System	Public debate System
Actors	Academics	X	X		X
	Public Experts	X	X	X	
	Private Experts	X	X	X	X
	Politicians			X	X
Level of internal Conflict	High/Medium/Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Level of compartmentalisation	High/Medium/Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Policy Analytical Styles	Predictive	X	X	X	X
	Causal	X			
	Trial/error	X	X	X	X
	Process	X			
	Normative			X	X
Level of internal controversies	High/Medium/Low	High	Medium	Medium	High

Conclusion

While we consider, like Mayer, Van Daalen and Bots, that the concept of “style” can be useful to grasp the different types of policy analysis, we do not seek to go beyond the antagonism between different academic policy paradigms as the aforementioned authors suggest but, rather, to categorize different kinds of usable knowledge and to better understand their use, their circulation and their role in the policy process (Mayer, van Daalen & Bots, 2004). To this end, we proposed to associate their categorization of knowledge with two other paradigms: while one is based on the different actors who use the paradigms, the other differentiates policy systems where actors and knowledge interact. It allowed us to propose a policymaking matrix able to characterize the policymaking process in different countries.

This policymaking style matrix can be used to characterize both other countries on the basis of the data collected in the International Library of Policy Analysis series and policy sectors (in order to compare similar policy sectors in different countries or different policy sectors in a given country) and local public policies. It is thus a useful framework for the comparative analysis of policymaking that takes into account the type of policy analysis (studied in policy analytical style literature) and the different policy systems by associating an actor-centered approach with a knowledge-centered approach. Its main limitation in understanding the whole policy process is that it does not directly take into account the implementation stage which is less related to most policy analytical styles; the only exceptions are the trial/error style, which is connected to the systematic evaluation of implementation, and the process style, which has been extended to implementation studies (Hill & Hupe, 2002). The next issue is thus to tackle the integration of policy implementation in the analysis of policymaking styles.

- . 1958b. “The Science of Muddling through.” *Public Administration Review* 19: 78–88.
- . 1971. *The Policy Orientation of Political Science*. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.
- Anderson, James. 1975. *Public Policy-Making*. New York: Praeger.
- Bachrach, P.S., and M.S. Baratz. 1963. “Decisions and Non-Decisions: An Analytical Framework.” *American Political Science Review* 57: 641–51.
- Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik. 2015. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. 5th Revised edition. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Bardach, Eugene. 2008. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. 3rd Revised edition. CQ Staff Directories, US.
- Blum, Sonja, and Klaus Schubert. 2013. *Policy Analysis in Germany*. Policy Press.
- Blum, Sonja, and Klaus Schubert. 2013. *Policy Analysis in Germany*. Policy Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Rosine Christin. 1990. “La Construction Du Marché; Le Champ Administratif et La Production de La ‘Politique Du Logement.’” *Actes de La Recherche En Sciences Sociales* 81-82: 65–85.
- Craft, Jonathan, and Michael Howlett. 2012. “Policy Formulation, Governance Shifts and Policy Influence: Location and Content in Policy Advisory Systems.” *Journal of Public Policy* 32 (02): 79–98. doi:10.1017/S0143814X12000049.
- Dahl, Robert Alan, and Charles Edward Lindblom. 1953. *Politics, Economics, and Welfare: Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes*. New York; Harper.
- Dobuzinskis, Laurent, David H. Laycock, and Michael Howlett. 2007. *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. University of Toronto Press.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York; Wiley.
- Edelman, Murray. 1988. *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. University of Chicago Press Chicago.
- Feldman, Elliot J., Arnold J. Heidenheimer, Hugh Heclo, Carolyn Teich Adams, T. Alexander Smith, Jack Hayward, and Michael Watson. 1978. *Comparative Public Policy: Field or Method?* JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/421650>.
- Genieys William, Hassenteufel Patrick, 2015, “The Shaping of New State Elites: Healthcare Policymaking in France since 1981”, p.208-295, *Comparative Politics*, 47 (3)
- Halpern Charlotte, Hassenteufel Patrick, Zittoun Philippe (eds.), 2017, *Policy analysis in France*, Policy Press
- Hayward, Jack Ernest Shalom, and Michael Watson, eds. 1975. *Planning, Politics, and Public Policy: The British, French, and Italian Experience*. London□; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidenheimer, Arnold J., Carolyn Teich Adams, and Hugh Heclo. 1975. *Comparative Public Policy: The Politics of Social Choice in Europe and America*, by Arnold J. Heidenheimer, Hugh Heclo, Carolyn Teich Adams. Macmillan Press.
- Hill, Michael, Hupe, Peter, 2002, *Implementing Public Policy*, London, Sage

- Howlett, Michael and Lindquist, Everts, 2007, " Beyond formal Policy Analysis: Governance Context, Governance Context and the Policy Analysis Movement in Canada", in Dobuzinskis and al.,
- Jobert, Bruno. 1994. *Le Tournant Néo-Libéral En Europe*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Jones, Charles O. 1970. *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*. Wadsworth Series in Public Policy. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Jordan, G., and J. Richardson. 1982. "The British Policy Style or the Logic of Negotiation?" *Policy Styles in Western Europe*, 80?110–80?110.
- Kingdon, Jonh. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*. New York: Longman.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1956. *The Decision Process; Seven Categories of Functional Analysis*. University of Maryland. Bureau of Governmental Research. Studies in Government. College Park, Bureau of Governmental Research, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Maryland,.
- Latour, Bruno. 1988. *La Vie de Laboratoire*. Paris: La découverte.
- Lerner, Daniel, and Harold D. Lasswell. 1951. *The Policy Sciences; Recent Developments in Scope and Method*. Stanford University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1958a. "Policy Analysis." *The American Economic Review* 48 (3): 298–312.
- Lindblom, Charles Edward, and David K. Cohen. 1979. *Usable Knowledge□: Social Science and Social Problem Solving*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles Edward, and Edward J. Woodhouse. 1993. *The Policy-Making Process*. 3rd ed. Prentice-Hall Foundations of Modern Political Science Series. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Lindblom, Charles Edward. 1972. *Strategies for Decision Making*. University of Illinois Bulletin. Urbana,: Dept. of Political Science.
- Lowi, T. J. 1964. "American Business, Public Policy, Case-Studies, and Political Theory." *World Politics* 16 (4): 677–715.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1972. "Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice." *Public Administration Review* 32 (4): 298–310.
- Majone, G. 1989. *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. Yale University Press.
- Marsh, D, and RAW Rhodes. 1992. *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Mayer, Igor S., C. Els van Daalen, and Pieter W.G. Bots. 2004. "Perspectives on Policy Analyses: A Framework for Understanding and Design." *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management* 4 (2): 169–91. doi:10.1504/IJTPM.2004.004819.
- Mishan, E. J., and Euston Quah. 2007. *Cost-Benefit Analysis*. Routledge.
- Perelman, Cha, x, im, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1950. *La Nouvelle Rhétorique□: Traité de l'Argumentation*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Peters, B. Guy, and Jon Pierre. 2006. *Handbook of Public Policy*. Sage Publications (CA).
- Peters, B. Guy. 2015. *Advanced Introduction to Public Policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Popper, Karl R. 1916. *On the Sources of Knowledge and of Ignorance*. London.
- Popper, Karl. 1990. *Logique de La Découverte Scientifique*. Paris: Payot.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. 1990. "Policy Networks: A British Perspective." *Journal of Theoretical Politics - J THEOR POLIT* 2 (3): 293–317. doi:10.1177/0951692890002003003.

- Richardson, J., G. Gustafsson, and G. Jordan. 1982. "The Concept of Policy Style." *Policy Styles in Western Europe*, 1?16–1?16.
- Sabatier, Paul A., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning : An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1944. *Decision-Making and Administrative Organization*. [n.p.,.
- Smith, T. Alexander. 1975. *Comparative Policy Process*. First Edition edition. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-Clio Ltd.
- Wildavsky, Aaron. 1987. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Transaction Publishers.
- Wilson, Richard. 2006. "Policy Analysis as Policy Advice." *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, 152–85.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2005. *Recherches philosophiques*. Bibliothèque de philosophie. [Paris]: Gallimard.
- Zittoun, Philippe. 2001. *LA POLITIQUE DU LOGEMENT 1981-1995 Transformations D'une Politique Publique Controversée*. Editions L'Harmattan.
- . 2013. "Entre Définition et Propagation Des énoncés de Solution." *Revue Française de Science Politique* 63 (3): 625–46.

Zittoun, Philippe, 2014, *The political process of policymaking, A pragmatic approach to Public Policy*, Palgrave-McMillan