Topic: T06 / Policy Implementation **Chair**: Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Second Chair: Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

By definition, public policies embody attempts to alter individuals' behavior by either forcing or permitting them to do things "they otherwise would not have done" (Schneider & Ingram, 1993, p. 513, see also Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992; Bardach & Kagan, 1982; May, 2004, 2005a; Weaver, 2014, 2015; Weimer, 2006). Targets of policy can be of?cials (Bardach & Kagan, 1982; Carley & Miller, 2012), street-level bureaucrats (May & Wood, 2003), private ?rms or public organizations (e.g., DeHart-Davis & Bozeman, 2001; Edelman & Talesh, 2011), states or countries (e.g. Haeder & Weimer, 2013; Keiser & Meier, 1996), local municipalities (Bondarouk, Liefferink & Mastenbroek, 2016; Treib, 2014; Versluis, 2007), and individual citizens (e.g., Edwards, 2006; Gofen, 2014; Winter & May, 2001; Weaver, 2014, 2015).

Implementation studies often conclude that targets' implementation actions differ from formal stated policy. Specifically, that gap is often attributed either to the willingness of targets to comply, following their motivations, attitudes, or preferences. An alternative explanation attributes the gap to targets' capacity to comply, following their awareness and resources, as well as their autonomy to comply (see also Hupe and Hill, 2014; Weaver 2015).

Although targets' compliance with policy has a central role in successful implementation, policy noncompliance has been rather ambiguously conceptualized as a behavior incompatible with a policy's objectives (Weaver, 2014), and is rarely discussed as a heterogeneous phenomenon (Gofen, 2013, 2014; Weaver, 2014, 2015). Moreover, studies focus on targets' implementation actions as the dependent variable, while their role in policy change is overlooked (Gofen, 2014).

Targets' non-compliance is often followed by governmental attempts to increase compliance by in?uencing policy targets' behavior in order to bring it into line with current policy arrangements. Efforts to increase willingness to comply mostly involve incentives and information. Nonetheless, more recently attention is being paid to responsiveness, flexibility, and creativity as key components in enforcement, as well as encouraging policy targets' collaboration and cooperation. Emphasizing the need to consider the capacity to comply, therefore reflecting a more preventive approach to compliance enforcement, scholars have suggested moving from responding to noncompliance after implementation, to attempting to prevent noncompliance already during the policy design stage.

The aim of this panel is therefore twofold. First, it seeks to allow a more nuanced understanding of targets' implementation compliance and implementation noncompliance among various groups of policy targets. Specifically, how to distinguish compliance and noncompliant implementation actions, how to conceptualize and measure compliance /noncompliance, what are the analytic dimensions of compliance/noncompliance, how to increase compliance, and how to prevent noncompliance already during the policy design stage.

Second, the panel seeks to move beyond the convention of implementation compliance as only following policy change. Specifically, policy change literature and implementation literature rarely interrelate: the adoption of a policy often symbolizes the last stage in policy change literature, whereas it is often the starting-point of policy implementation research. In an attempt to link these two scholarly traditions and to emphasize the reciprocal relationship between policy change and implementation compliance, the panel will also focus on studies that refer to targets' implementation actions as the independent variable.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Although successful implementation depends on targets' compliance with policy, targets' noncompliance with policy is rather ambiguously conceptualized, and often addressed as a homogeneous phenomenon. Moreover, targets' implementation actions are often studied as the dependent variable, while their consequences and outcomes tend to be overlooked.

The panel's aim is therefore twofold. First, it seeks to allow a more nuanced understanding of targets' implementation compliance and implementation noncompliance among various groups of policy targets. Second, it seeks to entwine two research traditions, that rarely relate to each other, namely, policy change literature and implementation literature. In policy change literature, a policy's adoption often symbolizes the last stage, whereas

it is often the starting-point of policy implementation research. Accordingly, the role of policy targets is mainly explored as influenced by the introduction of a new policy, while its role in policymaking is often overlooked.

For this panel we therefore invite papers focusing on implementation actions of policy targets - both as influenced by policy decisions as well as influencing policy decision-making. Our goal is to encompass contributions from different targets' groups, various policy fields, and diverse organizational settings.

To enable a wide-ranging discussion of the role of policy targets in implementation, we invite papers applying theoretical, methodological, or empirical approaches. Papers can focus on compliance/noncompliance as a theoretical framework, and address such questions as how to conceptualize and measure compliance/noncompliance, how to distinguish compliance and noncompliant implementation actions, and how to define the analytic dimensions of compliance/noncompliance. They can also refer to targets' compliance /noncompliance as the dependent variable, and focus on empirical variation between policy targets as well as on mechanisms that increase or avoid compliance, already during the policy design stage. Papers focusing on noncompliance as the independent variable to explore the consequences and outcomes of targets' noncompliance are also welcome.

Chair: Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Second Chair: Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

Session 1 Firms and Institutions as Policy Targets

Thursday, June 29th 08:15 to 10:15 (Block B 5 - 1)

Discussants

Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Targets Heterogeneity, Ambiguity-Conflict and Policy Implementation: The Effect of Ownership on China's Corporate Employee Pension Policy Implementation

Guo Lei (The department of public administration in the School of Economics and Management at Tongji University)

Between Technical Expertise and Wise Counseling: The Role of Law Firms in the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Norms in Singapore

Alain Eloka (Université de Lausanne)

Policy targets' compliance with voluntary agreements: a different story?

Simona Torotcoi (Central European University (Budapest, Hungary))

Missing the target in Swiss "new regional policy": Which factors help to explain the difficulty of addressing private actors as policy target groups?

Stefan Wittwer (ETH Zurich, Switzerland)

Fritz Sager (University of Bern)

Chair: Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Second Chair: Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

Session 2 Governments and Bureaucrats as Targets

Thursday, June 29th 10:30 to 12:30 (Block B 5 - 1)

Discussants

Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)
Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

Policy noncompliance and policy change – the case of local government amalgamation

Oddbjørn Bukve (Western Norway University of Applied Sciences)

Performance Measurement, Policy Compliance and Noncompliant Behavior: The "Fatality Quotas" in China's Work Safety Management

JIE GAO (National University of Singapore)

Gold Monetization in India as a Transformative Policy: A Mixed Method Analysis

Priya Narayanan (Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad)

Balagopal Gopalakrishnan (Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad)

Arvind Sahay (Indian Institute of Management)

Chair: Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Second Chair: Robert Kent Weaver (Georgetown University)

Session 3 Individuals as Policy Targets

Thursday, June 29th 13:30 to 15:30 (Block B 5 - 1)

Discussants

Fritz Sager (University of Bern)

Anat Gofen (Hebrew University)

Getting the full picture: an empirical framework for understanding gaps in targets' behaviors.

Karol Olejniczak (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities)

Pawel Sliwowski (University of Warsaw / Polish Economic Institute)

Magdalena Roszczynska-Kurasinska (University of Warsaw, NIP 525-001-12-66, Krakowskie Przedmie?cie 26/28, Warsaw)

Designing a Performance Measurement System in case of Time Bound Service Delivery Act (SAKALA) in Karnataka

Vishwanathan Iyer (T.A Pai Management Institute)

Varsha Khandker (T.A Pai Management Institute)

Kedar Joshi (T A Pai Management Institute)

Vidya Pratap (T. A. Pai Management Institute)

Securing Compliance: the Collective Aspects

Drorit Gassner (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

The Government Response to Noncompliance and its Limitation on Primary and Secondary Education in the Lao PDR

Atsuo SATO (Kyushu University)