Teaching Policy Analysis:
Policy Styles and Their Implications for Training Policy Analysts

Michael Howlett
Department of Political Science
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC

Evert Lindquist
School of Public Administration
University of Victoria
Victoria, BC

Paper Presented to the Annual Meeting of the
Canadian Political Science Association
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, Manitoba
June 2, 2004

DRAFT April 16, 2004

Abstract:

Recently the basic precept of policy analysis, that one size fits all with respect to analytical technique and context, has come to be challenged. While sympathetic to the basic postulates and aims of the policy analysis movement, prominent critics argue that (a) different styles of policy analysis can be found in different organizations and jurisdictions and (b) these styles are not random or completely manipulable by policy actors but are linked to larger patterns of political behaviour and are, in a sense, quasi-permanent features of the policy analysis landscape. This paper examines this most recent set of concerns raised with policy analysis and explores its paedagogical implications using examples from the Canadian experience. It suggests that one of the most important factors affecting the style of policy analysis found in a jurisdiction is its 'policy style'. That is, that analytical style and policy style will be congruent and, therefore, that an important element of the education of policy analysts is instruction on the nature of policy styles.

Introduction

Policy analysis is a relatively recent movement, dating back to the 1960s and the US experience with large-scale planning processes in areas such as defence, urban re-development and budgeting (Lindblom 1958; Wildavsky 1969; MacRae and Wilde, 1985; Garson 1986). Seen as a social movement, albeit with technical discipline, it represents the efforts of actors inside and outside formal political decision-making processes to improve policy outcomes by applying systematic evaluative rationality. There have been debates about whether policy analysis has improved on the outcomes associated with less instrumental processes such as bargaining, compromise, negotiation and log-rolling (Tribe 1972; Fischer and Forester 1993; Majone 1989). However, there has been no fundamental challenge to the raison d'etre of policy analysis remains: to improve policy outcomes by applying systematic analytic methodologies to policy problems (Meltsner 1972; Webber 1986; Fox, 1990).[1]

There has always been a range of methodologies used in policy analysis, but the policy analysis movement originally revolved around the idea that a generic analytic toolkit (law, economics, quantitative methods, organizational analysis, budgeting, etc.) could be productively applied to a wide range of substantive problems by astute policy analysts inside and outside government (Weimer and Vining 1999). Education and training was for many years therefore largely a matter of familiarization with generic analytical tools, along with cases, workshops, simulations, or real-world projects to illustrate their use in specific circumstances and contexts, and to understand that the "art and craft" had much owed to iterative as opposed to deductive reasoning: matching tools and context, and producing time-sensitive advice that policy-makers could absorb (Wildavsky, 1979; Vining and Weimer 2002; Guess and Franham 1989; Weimer 1992; Bardach 2000; Geva-May 1997). However, empirical studies of how policy research and analysis are generated, interpreted and utilized show how these processes are affected by the needs and beliefs of ultimate users, the delicacy of the political relations, coalitions and conflicts among decision-makers, the history of previous policy reform efforts, individual personalities and agendas, organizational routines and other factors (Weiss 1977a, 1977b; Sabatier, 1987; Shulock 1999). In short, analytic opportunities are idiosyncratic, requiring practical or pragmatic judgments on the best method to apply in specific circumstances.

Recently, scholarly attention has turned to discerning patterns of policy analysis, influence, and effectiveness (Thissen and Twaalfhoven 2001). While sympathetic to the basic postulates and aims of the policy analysis movement, it has been argued that (a) different styles of policy analysis can be found in different organizations and jurisdictions

(Peled 2002), and (b) these can be linked to larger patterns of political behaviour and structures whose condition is not completely manipulable by policy actors (Bevir and Rhodes 2001; Bevir Rhodes and Weller 2003a and 2003b). This suggests that the nature of policy analysis, and the effectiveness of those repertoires and capabilities, depend on how congruent they are with national governance and administrative traditions (Peled 2002, Howlett 2004, Christensen, Laegreid and Wise 2003).

This paper taps into frameworks that have broadened our conception of policy analysis in order to contribute to the growing interest in matching the observed use of tools, repertoires, and capabilities to governance contexts; one which presumes that very different patterns or styles of policy analysis can exist in different jurisdictions, policy sectors, and organizational contexts, including penchant for consultation, participation, and certain policy instruments (Richardson, Gustafsson and Jordan 1982; Van Waarden 1995; Howlett 2000). We argue that successful modes of policy analysis are not simply a matter of the choice and skill of policy analysts and managers, but are conditioned by contextual elements (Shulock 1999; Radin 2000). Whether these larger contextual elements are cultural, institutional, or derive from other aspects of the policy-making context is a point of debate, but it is the combination of these forces that constrain or create opportunities for different policy analysis activities and produce discernable policy analytic styles. While some might argue that "effective" policy analysis arises out of congruence between a nation's governance traditions and policy analytic style, a contrasting view suggests that some distance is desirable if policy analysis, no matter what style predominates, is to speak truth to power and challenge policy actors.

This paper is exploratory in nature and addresses the issue of proper policy analytic paedagogy by way of this question of the linkages between analytical style and analytical context. We begin by identifying ways in which policy analysis can be differentiated, and then review three different governance contexts – national, policy sector, and organization – and consider their implications for affecting the conduct of policy analysis. We use the case of Canada to probe our ability to identify distinctive policy styles and what information might be useful when conducting more systematic, comparative study, which we hope to encourage. Finally, we consider implications for governments seeking to build policy capacity, and university programs that seek to train policy analysts.

Parsing Out Policy Analysis

If we are to explore whether policy analysis might vary in different governance contexts, then we must specify theoretically what are the sources and dimensions of variation. In this section we identify several ways in which policy analysis might be conducted: roles, sources of expertise, capacity, and relative autonomy to those commissioning policy analysis or standing as intended audiences.

Modes of Policy Analysis

Recent empirical work has identified several of the basic parameters of the range of analytical styles found in different locales. Drawing on US experience, Beryl Radin identified two 'ideal types': the rational, 'modern' analyst of the 1960s and 1970s, focused on the quantification of economic costs and benefits, and the 'post-modern'

analyst of the 1980s and 1990s, concerned with the social construction of policy problems, policy discourses and the politics of the policy process (Radin 2000).

Drawing on European experience, Mayer, van Daalen, and Bots (2001) have provided a finer-grained dissection of the policy analysis function. They argue that policy analysis embraces research, clarification, design, advice, mediation and democratization as distinct activities (see Figure 1), and use pairs of these activities to produce six distinct, not mutually exclusive, styles of policy analysis. These are:

- *Rational* – the traditional neo-positivistic style in which researchers apply mainly economic and other empirical methods to specific cases and the generation of new knowledge is the main task of the analyst.
- *Client Advice* – where the analyst provides political and strategic advice to clients.
- *Argumentative* – where the analyst is actively involved in debate and policy discourse as a distinct independent actor both within and outside governments.
- *Interactive* – where the analyst serves as a facilitator in consultations in which key players and participants define their preferred outcome
- *Participative* – where the researcher/analyst is an advocate, aggregating and articulating the interests of silent players in the policy process: the poor, the general interest, or any other actor not represented in the policy process; and
- *Process* – where the analyst acts a 'network manager', steering the policy process towards a preferred outcome defined as part of the analytic task.

Mayer et al framework embraces Radin's two archetypes of policy analysis, and provides additional roles to consider when thinking about different styles of policy analysis. We

could go a step further and identify specific techniques that fall within each skill area, but we do not require this level of detail for the purpose of this paper.

From Skills to Capacities: Organization Perspectives

Mayer et al's framework has the potential to be elaborated in a manner similar to Quinn's (1988) "competing values" framework, which identifies eight broad competencies (and specific skills within each area) needed by managers dealing with organizational challenges and their complexities. While this framework could be interpreted to argue for grooming the "compleat" policy analyst, the reality is that individuals come to their analytic roles with different strengths and weaknesses depending on training and work experience, and, following Quinn (1988), "analyzing" – just like "managing" – is a balancing act, requiring analysts to rely on different skills to address different challenges at different points in time. Moreover, as we discuss later, organizations have recruitment systems, incentive structures, or cultures that cultivate different mixes of analytic skills.

Invoking specific skills and competencies as a way to comprehend different types of policy analytic activity naturally disposes us to think in terms of individuals. But we know that policy analysis is usually an "organized" activity in two senses: first, it is often done <u>for</u> organizations of some sort, and, second, it is usually produced <u>by</u> teams of analysts or researchers, however tightly or loosely-coupled (even single-authored notes and studies are vetted, reviewed, and often commissioned by other actors). Here we see that another aspect of "policy style" concerns how expertise is secured and managed by key actors.

When an organization seeks to address a policy issue, it should have a good sense of the skills required to do a credible job. However, those skills – whether generalist or specialist in the areas we noted earlier – may or may not reside with the organization in question. Organization leaders or project managers make choices in the short term and the longer term about the kind of competencies that they keep on staff on a full-time basis, and what they might secure from internal (rotational or temporary assignment from elsewhere in a larger organization) or external markets on a contract basis (Lindquist and Desveaux, 1998). Some organizations may prefer a relatively small core staff and tap into other sources of expertise as required, and others may retain far more staff with a mix of generalists and specialists, which may be buttressed by different recruitment systems and ways to identify and develop talent. This also suggests that, depending on the mix of expertise, policy organizations may have distinct ways or repertoires for approaching policy work (March and Simon, 1958).

A final consideration involves assessing the capabilities mobilized, and the actual demands of the policy challenge in question. Whether the challenge is a thorny issue or a rival analysis with competing values and evidence, one has to determine if analytic capacities can meaningfully address the challenge; one could have the right mix of skills and expertise, but in insufficient amount to produce a credible response within an allotted time frame.

Values, Politics, and Analysis: Speaking Truth to Power

All policy analysis seeks to "speak truth to power" at some level, and is informed by values (Wildavsky, 1979; Sabatier, 1988). Here we simply want to acknowledge that,

beyond specific skill sets and capacities, policy analysis will vary according to underlying values, aspirations of immediate relevance, and the extent to which it seeks to challenge or reinforce existing policy and administrative regimes. Whatever its specific nature, policy analysis is undertaken to further, support, challenge, or test certain values.

In recent years we have benefited from increasingly sophisticated models of how policy-making processes work, which take into account the dynamics of policy-making and how analysis and research support actors inside and outside the state and prevailing policy orthodoxies (Sabatier, 1987; Kingdon, 1984). Our point is that the extent to which policy analysis challenges those in power or, whoever commissioned it, is an interesting question, one inherent in conduct of policy analysis. We expect that there will be competing perspectives as much from inside government (Allison, 1971; Atkinson and Coleman, 1989) as from outside on policy questions driven by differing values, methodologies, and political aspirations. Policy analysis and research often is produced with very different time horizons (short term or long term) and pathways (direct or indirect) in mind for impact, and sometimes the intention is to play a brokering role (Sabatier, 1987).

Skepticism is an important function of policy analysis, even for the "clients" who commission or fund such work. If policy analysis, of whatever kind, does not play this role, then it degenerates into communications or public relations. The relative autonomy of policy analysis, then, is an important element of discerning a policy style, and this should be the case, whether it is an individual, team, professional or even networked activity. This is a theme to which we return below.

Conclusion: Policy Styles as Mixes of Roles, Skills and Capacities

This discussion shows that policy analysis is highly variegated, even if we have not tried to pursue this point in great detail. We have outlined several dimensions (see Figure 1) along which it might vary including: different roles and techniques to inform policy-making; different ways to mobilize expertise; different degrees of relative capacity; different types of relationships with policy actors; and different aspirations of relevance and immediacy of impact. We also argued that, even when policy analysis is undertaken for specific clients, it necessarily challenges how people conceive and think about how to solve policy problems, thereby creating a tension even when analysis is "aligned" with its intended audience. This range of possibilities suggests that we should be able to identify different patterns in the way the policy function is organized in different contexts.

– Insert Figure 1 about here –

Governance Context, Policy Styles and Policy Training

Patterns in policy analysis ought to be intimately linked with its governance context and analytical culture. A full discussion of the impact of analytical culture is beyond the scope of this article (Peters, 1990). However, in modern polities in which recruitment is standardized and credentials required from professional policy, public administration, management or law schools, the variation in this variable is much muted from times past. The hegemony of the 'craft' model of training and pedagogy points attention away from analytical culture and towards contextual, structural, factors in understanding variances in analytical styles (Wise 2002; Considine and Lewis, 2003). Distinct governance contexts

for policy-making have been identified at different levels of analysis (Howlett 2002c). Here we identify these structural factors and their implications for policy analysis.

National governance traditions. National policy systems can be seen as the offshoots of larger national governance and administrative traditions or cultures (Dwivedi and Gow 1999; Bevir and Rhodes 2001) such as parliamentary or republican forms of government, and federal or unitary states. This leads to different concentrations of power in the central institutions of government, degrees of openness and access to information, and reliance on certain governing instruments.[1] Civil service organizations have rules and structures affecting policy and administrative behaviour such as the constitutional order establishing and empowering administrators, and affecting patterns and methods of recruiting civil servants and how they interact with each other and the public (Bekke, Perry and Toonen 1993). Accordingly, the policy analysis function is influenced by the precepts of the governance and administrative model constituting its operating environments (Castles 1990; Kagan 1991 and 1996; Vogel 1986; Eisner 1993 and 1994; Harris and Milkis 1989). For example, if the top priority of a national government is debt reduction or increasing internal security, then the scope for other new policy initiatives will be reduced, and there may be more of a focus on, review, control and accountability. Or if a country has a more inclusive governance tradition, or is an elected government

[1] A parallel argument can be found in the field of regulation. Knill (1998) has stated that regulatory styles are defined by "the mode of state intervention" (hierarchical versus self-regulation, as well as uniform and detailed requirements versus open regulation allowing for administrative flexibility and discretion) and the mode of "administrative interest intermediation" (formal versus informal, legalistic versus pragmatic, and open versus closed relationships). Franz van Waarden argues that " National regulatory styles are formally rooted in nationally specific legal, political and administrative institutions and cultures. This foundation in a variety of state institutions should make regulatory styles resistant to change, and hence, from this perspective one would expect differences in regulatory styles to persist, possibly even under the impact of economic and political internationalization (van Waarden 1995).

aims to make this a hallmark of its mandate, then a greater premium will be placed on consultation and facilitation. Similarly, countries with weaker central institutions of government will likely provide more scope to departments and agencies in developing new policy ideas, while stronger, more autonomous representative legislatures will create additional demand for policy analysis which can challenge bureaucratic policy expertise. And, if civil service institutions centrally control recruitment and seek "generalists", and place limits on contracting, this may constrain policy units that would otherwise seek specialists to deal with emerging issues.

Policy sectors. Vogel and others have argued that policy-makers work within specific national policy or regulatory contexts. Many policy studies suggest that distinct contexts can be discerned at the sectoral level, and are linked to common approaches taken towards problems such as health, education, forestry, and others (Lowi 1972; Salamon 1981; Freeman 1985; Burstein 1991; Howlett, 2001). Freeman (1985) has observed that "each sector poses its own problems, sets its own constraints, and generates its own brand of conflict." Moreover, the authorities and capabilities for making and influencing policy may vary considerably across sectors. Like Allison (1971), Smith, Marsh and Richards (1993) have argued that the "central state is not a unified actor but a range of institutions and actors with disparate interests and varying resources", and therefore not only may there be different degrees of coherence within the state but also different cultures of decision-making and inclusion of outside actors with respect to policy development (collaboration, unilateral, reactive). In different sectors, societal actors – such as business, labour, and special interest groups, as well as think tanks and university centers – may have different capabilities and policy expertise, different degrees

of independence with respect to funding, and different relationships with state actors. For example, in some sectors, policy expertise might be located with non-state actors and governments might tap into it regularly. Different policy sectors may have higher priority for governments depending on their policy ambitions and circumstances, or the regime may be contested to a greater degree, which may affect not only the appetite for change but also for policy analysis and research (Lindquist, 1988). Some policy sectors, broadly speaking, may be anticipatory or reactive on how to deal with challenges confronting the entire sector, and therefore will differ in their support for analysis and research that challenges existing regimes (Atkinson and Coleman, 1989). Finally, some sectors might only have "thin" policy expertise, which may fuel only partisan or ideological positioning, as opposed to more extensive talent and forums for debating policy issues in the context of research-based findings (Sabatier 1987; Lindquist, 1992).

Organizational factors. Policy analysis is also shaped by the nature and priorities of public sector departments and agencies (Wilson, 1989; Richardson, Jordan and Kimber 1978; Jordan 2003), which have distinct organizational mandates, histories, cultures, and program delivery and front-line challenges (Lipsky 1980; Hawkins and Thomas 1989; Quinn, 1988; Scholz 1984 and 1991). Organizations and leaders might attach different value to policy analysis in light of managerial and budgetary priorities; have different views on how inclusive to be when developing policy with inside and outside actors; demand certain types of policy analysis; have different degrees of comfort with challenges from policy analysis of current policy and program regimes; and have different models of accessing and dispersing policy capabilities across the organization (for example, whether there is a single corporate policy unit, or others attached to

program areas). This may lead to certain repertoires for policy analysis and types of recruitment for the policy expertise: the more operational a department or unit, the more likely its policy style will be rational; the more involved a department is in a major policy initiative, boundary-spanning activity, or liaising with central agencies, the more likely its policy style will be participatory and facilitative; if a policy shop is a corporate entity, as opposed to directly supporting a specific program, the more likely its policy style will emphasize client advising and interaction; and the more involved in regulatory and enforcement oriented, the more likely an agency will have an interactive or process style (Jordan 2003).

Figure 2 summarizes these three levels of governance contexts as well as the constraints and opportunities they present for policy analysis. While policy analysis encompasses a diverse range of activities and techniques, different governance contexts can lead to "grooved" patterns or distinct bundles of policy analysis (including skill mix, capabilities and value congruence) which may reinforce each other, creating a distinct and enduring policy style; or create cross-currents that make the patterns more precarious and highly dependent on what government is in power and who leads key departments in policy networks. Generally, we believe that the concept of policy style should be reserved for aggregate assessment. Teasing through and assessing the extent of influence of these factors on patterns of policy analysis augers strongly for systematic comparative analysis (Freeman 1985; Smith, Marsh, Rhodes, 1993).

– Insert Figure 2 about here –

The important paedagogical aspect of this discussion is that it suggests that only in rare circumstances do analysts choose an analytical strategy that reflects their ideological penchants and methodological skill-set – such circumstances might include academic work, or opportunities in a "skunks work" unit within a public bureaucracy or think tank. Otherwise, we would expect to find persistent patterns of analytical activity over time, this might be due either to how the governance system works, the structure and dynamics of a policy network, the culture and mission of organizations, and the very nature of policy problems, which would affect the funding, mode of analysis, opportunities, capabilities, recruitment, and, ultimately, the training of analysts.

Patterns and Trends in Canadian Governance: Implications for Training Policy Analysts

We have argued that to fully explore how different governance contexts affect policy analysis will require systematic comparative research. In what follows we test some of these concepts by reviewing at a broad level Canada's evolving governing contexts – national, policy sector, and departments and agencies –and explore the implications of these changes for the demand and conduct of policy analysis.

National Level: Westminster Traditions, Competitive Federalism

The critical factor conditioning policy advising found inside and outside the Canadian state is the predominance of British Westminster parliamentary institutions and relationships. The result is executive-dominated government without the checks and balances associated with the US style of government, which established competing branches of government, or with European and other systems where legislatures enjoy

relative autonomy due to proportional representation or upper-house elections (Savoie 1999a and 1999b). Despite vigorous efforts of reformers, particularly from the Western provinces, national governments have steadfastly resisted ideas to convert the Canadian Senate into an elected institution and to adopt forms of proportional representation into either the House of Commons (elected) or the Senate (appointed). The adoption of UK-style institutions also meant that Canadian governments did not have to contend with strong judicial review for many decades (Thomas 1997; Franks 1987; Dunn 1995; Manfredi 1997; Manfredi and Maioni 2002).

This has several implications for the conduct and training of policy analysts. First, interactions among federal and provincial governments (see below) are filtered through and conditioned by parliamentary institutions and incentive systems, resulting in a key policy process being "peak-bargaining" among governments (Tuohy 1992, Atkinson and Coleman 1989). Second, generally non-partisan and professional public service institutions serve governing parties and their executives (Lindquist 2000). The unwillingness of prime ministers and premiers to grant autonomy and to fund competing advice in legislatures meant that, for many years, governments and their public service institutions had analytic capabilities rivaled only by the largest business firms and associations and, to a lesser extent, labour organizations. This led to patterns of closed sectoral bargaining relationships among major government, business, and labour actors, not subject to great public scrutiny (Montpetit 2002; Pross 1992; Atkinson and Coleman 1989; Lascher 1999). The British influence also resulted in a preference for quasi-legal regulation, with more emphasis on education and negotiation than on litigation, although

US influences and the arrival of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 has steadily shifted this emphasis (Howlett 2002a and 2002b; Kagan 1991).

Federalism is the second distinctive feature of Canada's governance landscape. Despite the efforts of Canada's founders to allocate residual powers to the federal government, the unanticipated changes in the challenges confronting the country, as well as key court decisions, ensured that the provinces steadily accrued increasingly more responsibility throughout the 20th century for delivering and designing programs for citizens, including shared jurisdiction with the federal government in almost every policy domain (Smiley 1964, Banting 1982). Aside from political debates over policy directions in different domains, this resulted in a steadily increasing frequency of federal-provincial-territorial committee meetings for premiers and the Prime Minister and their ministers in specific policy domains (health, labour market, transportation, education, finance and many others), and myriad working committees and subcommittees of officials (Simeon 1980). It is difficult to overstate the complexity of Canadian federalism and its supporting policy institutions in such a huge, regionally and linguistically diverse country, with provinces and territories of starkly different fiscal, population and land bases (Howlett 1999; McRoberts 1993).

Ministerial and official intergovernmental committees are instruments of the executive branches of each government, and usually work *in camera* without the direct scrutiny of legislatures and the public (Doer 1981, Radin and Boase 2000). Citizens are typically only engaged if certain governments are attempting to build public support for positions, usually at the agenda-setting stage of the policy process, or if statements or decisions are communicated. Intergovernmental officials – who may be located in

cabinet agencies or line departments depending on the size of government – function like central officials as either primarily process facilitators or actively championing positions and values on behalf of the government. Although some units and individuals might develop considerable substantive expertise, they typically do not rival that of policy units in line departments or in finance or treasury departments.

Discerning Canada's policy style through the lens of federalism does not produce an image of orderly, productive, and co-operative processes. Rather, it is one of increasing distrust and rivalry between different orders of government, particularly since the federal government steadily reduced the real value of transfer payments to provincial governments and the tradition of supporting shared-cost programs in many different policy sectors since the 1960s. Provinces and territories attempt to create a united front against the federal government, but this papers over fundamental regional differences on transfer payment and financial regimes, as well as other policy, regulatory, and representational issues. For these arenas, policy analysis is rational and argumentative, intended to support government positions. Depending on the trajectory of a policy domain, such as environmental policy during the late 1980s and early 1990s, intergovernmental affairs may encourage participation, but this is the exception to the rule (Lindquist 1996b). There is the possibility that several provincial governments may adopt forms of proportional representation, and the current Prime Minister has indicated that standing committees in the House of Commons will receive additional funding and expanded roles in the policy-making process, and this, may create additional demand for independent policy analysis and contestability of bureaucratic policy advice.

The 1960s and early 1970s were a period of rapid growth in government in Canada, the result of a generally buoyant economy. This provided fertile conditions for an activist federal government, which used the power of the purse to induce change through shared cost programs with provincial governments, and fostered an era of cooperative federalism (Smiley 1987). Many of these policy initiatives were informed by social science research and the new field of policy analysis; indeed, as in the US, Canadian governments designed increasingly elaborate planning and budgeting systems predicated on policy analysis and evaluation, although they proved to be exercises in frustration (Prince 1979; French 1980; Hartle 1978). Federal and provincial governments experimented with new structures for informing and coordinating the development of policy: there was liberal use of royal commissions, new cabinet committees and central planning capacities. A range of government councils and other advisory mechanisms were established inside government including the first modern think tanks (the Economic Council of Canada and the Science Council of Canada). Outside government, more independent think tanks were developed: some heavily subsidized by government like the Institute for Research on Public Policy and the Canadian Council on Social Development; others funded largely by business, such as the C.D. Howe Institute, the Fraser Institute, the Conference Board of Canada, and the Canada West Foundation (Lindquist, 1998). In Mayer et al's terms, the predominant policy styles could be said to be rationalistic, client-oriented, and argumentative. And, despite the development of some outside expertise, the capacities for designing public policy and leading public discourse continued to rest almost exclusively with governments across Canada.

The 1980s and early 1990s provided a significant contrast. A sputtering, unpredictable economy, combined with the unwillingness of governments to undertake expenditure cuts, led to growing deficits, increasing debt, and interest payments taking up a steadily increasing portion of public expenditure. An overarching challenge for governments was to contain growth in existing programs, and they resorted to across-the-board reductions and repetitive budgeting ("managerialism"). Less emphasis was put on designing new policy interventions, although framework policies were put in place (e.g., free trade, constitutional reform, tax policy, etc.) that would not have effects until years later. In identifying new executive talent in government, emphasis was put on managerial acumen, not policy capabilities. However, Canadian governments eventually launched concerted deficit reduction strategies and program reviews leading to eliminating and reshaping of programs, often informed by significant efforts to consult the public (Armit and Bourgault 1996). Think tanks and consulting firms continued to proliferate, and this led the federal government to eliminate several councils and other advisory mechanisms. These developments, along with Quebec's nearly successful referendum for sovereignty, dramatically affected federal-provincial relations. The federal government cut transfers and off-loaded decisions to provincial governments (which, in turn did the same to local governments) and aggressively confronted the sovereignty movement. This led to increasingly bitter struggles between federal and provincial governments, and an ever more cynical citizenry.

By the late 1990s, the federal government and several provinces had eliminated their deficits and began to experience surplus positions. The federal government has been reluctant to restore funding for shared cost programs, and actively sought

instruments to address its priorities and showcase its contributions, as opposed to meeting provincial priorities. Increasingly bitter and fractious intergovernmental relations were the result, notwithstanding the Social Union Framework Agreement (SUFA), which attempted to reduce, but did not eliminate federal government unilateralism in areas of shared jurisdiction. These initiatives point to another aspect of the current Canadian policy context. The federal government has attempted to more systematically demonstrate its relevance to Canadian citizens and communities by directly providing services, rather than work through "mediating" organizations such as the provincial and territorial governments. More generally, it has reduced its reliance on traditional shared cost programs for broad purposes with the provinces in different sectors; believing it received insufficient exposure for this policy posture despite considerable outlays of funds. Many other programs – such as the Millennium Scholarships, the Canada Research Chair program, and the Canada Foundation for Innovation – are attempts to deal directly with groups in areas of provincial jurisdiction (Lindquist 2001).

There are several other trends in governance at the national level to consider. First, a highly personalized and centralized federal decision-making system took shape in the hands of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Savoie, 1999), which, in addition to the already "strong" centre tradition in Ottawa (Lindquist, 2000), meant that while ministers and departments could develop policy proposals, much rested on the preference and instincts of the two key ministers in terms of the timing, content and passage of bills and laws. At some stages of the policy process, however, there is greater transparency in priority-setting and policy development, and considerable, although sometimes rhetorical, focus on performance management. Tight budgets and a results

orientation have led all governments to increasingly adopt horizontal and holistic perspectives on problems and to align the initiatives across governments and sectors. A consensus developed inside the federal public service that Ottawa's policy capacity needed re-energizing, particularly if departments were to assist identifying new priorities and strategies for ministers in the post-deficit era (Anderson, 1996; Armstrong et al, 2002). The Policy Research Initiative also called for collaboration not only internally across departments but also externally with university institutes and think tanks, as well as improving efforts to recruit a new generation of policy researchers (Bakvis 2000). Although the latter was a short-lived program, it was complemented by substantial investments in R&D in the sciences, health, and social sciences. Finally, technological, economic, social, and international developments continue to press Canadians and governments to change. Despite regular consultations and political leaders with access to polling data and focus groups, and more access to information, citizens continue to lose trust in governing institutions. More recently, several scandals involving mismanagement and lack of transparency over the use of public funds under Prime Minister Chretien's government have greatly affected the political fortunes of the successor, Prime Minister Paul Martin, and also corroded confidence in the public service and the ability of central agencies to provide oversight (Association of Public Service Financial Administrators, 2003; Lindquist, 2004). We consider the implications of this for the policy function of departments later in this paper.

Policy Sectors: Dispersed Expertise, Selective Consultation, Power Asymmetries

The emergence of an "attentive public" monitoring the "sub-government" of key state and non-state actors actively shaping public policy and existing programs, has been a key characteristic of the development of the governance context of Canadian policy-making in the past two decades which has a significant impact upon the types of policy analytical styles present in the country. The growth of policy-relevant expertise residing with interest groups, think tanks, and universities has also significantly expanded the range of actors present in the networks associated with policy sectors.

Think tanks, for example, began proliferating in the early 1970s, although Canada still lacks a significant, well-resourced cadre of think tanks by US standards. This is due, partly, to insufficient sustained demand for policy research and analysis from actors other than government departments, and, partly, to the lack of a strong philanthropic tradition in Canada (Sharpe 2001). Thus, while think tanks have greatly expanded in number and diversity, their expertise typically does not rival that of federal and provincial governments (Lindquist 1998; Dobuzinskis 1996a; Abelson 2002). The same holds for academics at universities; while institutes have expanded tremendously over the last few years, often serving as home bases for world-renowned specialists in certain fields, they tend to lack the data and specialized expertise required to challenge governments in the policy analytic process. Generally, think tanks, institutes, and public academics monitor and provide commentary on government actions, and may try to influence agenda-setting through framing, critical evaluations and other techniques, but rarely have strong impact on decision and design (Soroka 2002).

The "attentive public" also includes citizens and interest groups, and the literature points to the enduring challenge for governments about how to engage them on specific

issues (Lenihan and Alcock 2000). Canadian governments are often accused of not undertaking enough consultation with citizens and groups, and some such activity rarely constitutes normal business for government. On the other hand, some government departments do regularly consult, and leaders inside and outside government often worry about 'consultation fatigue' of key stakeholders (Howlett and Rayner 2004). The federal Privy Council Office has a small unit that monitors and coordinates consultation activities across the government, and serves as a node for a functional community of consultation specialists across the public service. The perception of insufficient consultation derives from early attempts to solicit advice from outside the bureaucracy: the federal government experimented by creating councils in the 1960s with representatives from different sectors and regularly relied on royal commissions to tackle big policy questions by commissioning research and holding public hearings over several years (Bradford 1999-2000). During the late 1980s and early 1990s it also launched mega-consultation processes for the Green Plan, the Charlottetown Accord, budget-making, and the Social Security Review, including, among other things, public conferences and workshops co-hosted with independent think tanks and other organizations, and receiving exposure as media events (Lindquist 1994, 1996b).

Though somewhat less public, but perhaps less expensive and more effective, current Canadian governments are more likely to opt for more selective and low-key consultations, working with representatives of interests from specific sectors and constituencies (Atkinson and Pervin 1998). There has been interest and flirtation with e-consultation as a new means for engaging citizens, but this has not substantially modified policy-making, though it has increased efficiencies in distributing information and

receiving views from groups and citizens (Alexander and Pal 1998). Think tanks and consultants have been engaged to manage citizen 'dialogues' on issues, but this has not supplanted more traditional decision-making (Lindquist, 1998).

Other orders of government and sectors are increasingly important policy actors. The courts have repeatedly affirmed that major urban municipalities are creatures of provincial governments, but the federal government views them as important drivers of economic growth, anchors for regions and rural communities, and deserving of federal assistance. Such awareness leads to both vertical and horizontal interventions spanning the traditional boundaries of departments and governments, despite federal and provincial rivalries, and has been best illustrated with the new jointly funded Infrastructure Works program. Aboriginal communities increasingly seek resolution of land claims, closure on treaty negotiations, and self-government, including, at the very least, co-management of natural resources (Notzke 1994). These matters, as well as the stark health and social issues confronting their communities, require working across the traditional boundaries of government to better align policy initiatives and dispersed expertise. Progress on land claims and treaties has been mixed, but prodded by impatient courts, governments are exploring new ways of sharing power. Recently, the federal government has sought to increase transparency and accountability for management of the funds received by bands. The federal government also recently launched the Voluntary Sector Initiative, designed to build capacity to better deliver 'public goods' in communities in exchange for better governance and accountability – a clear reversal from the early 1990s when, labeled as "special interest groups", many voluntary and nonprofit organizations lost sustaining funding as part of the Program Review exercise and its precursors (Philips 2001).

Like all countries, Canada has had to anticipate and deal with the challenges of globalization, economic integration, and change. Canada has distinct challenges because of its proximity to the US and the degree of economic integration that existed well before the 1990s, and the ever-present flow of values, culture, expectations, and politics from south of the border. Successive governments have steered Canada towards more integration by supporting the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the GATT and WTO processes (Golub 2003). Conversely, social movements of all kinds – including anti-globalization, fair trade, and environmental groups – also tapped into and fostered international networks to further their causes. All actors in policy communities draw on international experience to inform domestic policy debates – benchmarking, international rankings, and best practices are used to raise awareness, move issues up the agenda, and identify alternatives.[2]

Hence, while there was a time when Canada's policy analytical context consisted of the lead government agencies at the federal and provincial levels, and the main business and labour groups they worked with, In that era, largely coinciding with the introduction of formal policy analysis in the cabinet and expenditure management systems adopted by federal and provincial governments in the 1960s and 1970s, the analytical style followed was very much the rational type identified by Mayer et al (Prince 1979; French 1980). However, by the early 1980s academic observers had concluded that the range of actors and the patterns of power and influence had changed, creating a more complex analytical environment which negated many of the aspirations of purely rational analysis; leaving many of the products of this analysis ignored on-the-shelf (Hartle 1978; Dobell and Zussman 1980). Changes in policy communities – such as

the rise of special interest groups, think tanks, citizens, and international actors – served to complicate agenda-setting and policy-making, and created alternative sources of policy analysis, research and data (Pross 1986; Atkinson and Coleman 1989; Coleman and Skogstad 1990).

Notwithstanding the increasing impact of international influences and technology, as well as more actors in the attentive public with the ability to monitor and conduct policy analysis, however, power over the direction of policy regimes still tends to remain in the hands of lead government departments and key business groups, even if in some sectors coherent policy directions are hindered by rivalry across governments.

The Agency Level: Significant Variations in Analytical Capacity by Jurisdiction and Sector

Departments, ministries, and agencies vary significantly with respect to size and scope of responsibilities but are key suppliers and demanders of policy analysis. They have different institutional histories, styles of executive leadership, and patterns of recruitment that flow from their core tasks and missions (Wilson 1989). Within Canadian governments, the policy analysis capacity of departments and ministries varies widely, and derives largely from the size of the government. Smaller provinces may have less capacity than the largest municipalities, and some of the largest provinces have capabilities rivaling other national jurisdictions (Ontario and Quebec, respectively, have populations of 11 and 7.4 million citizens comparable to the populations of New Zealand and Sweden).

The principles and practices of parliamentary governance ensure that central agencies in each jurisdiction regulate policy development and oversee the activities of

departments or ministries, even if they are not as operationally well informed as the policy analysis and research units of those same departments and ministries (Savoie 1999a and 1999b). In some cases, departments will have corporate policy shops and others attached to specific program areas, and even the smallest departments may have dedicated policy research capabilities (Hollander and Prince 1993). However, since all ministers and deputy ministers are appointed directly by the Prime Minister and premiers (in some provinces, they also appoint assistant deputy ministers), policy analysis in Canadian governments, no matter how professional and non-partisan the public service in question, tends to lack independence. In some cases, efforts to seriously study new or daunting challenges can only be addressed by creating temporary administrative adhocracies to tap into technical expertise, coordinate across departments and agencies, consult with outside groups, and deal with central authorities (Desveuax, Lindquist, and Toner, 1993). If time is not of the essence, then governments can appoint independent inquires, task forces, or Royal Commissions to ensure that research and analysis are at arm's length from the normal pressures on departments by ministers (Salter 1990; Salter and Slaco 1981; Sheriff 1983; Peters and Parker 1993).

During the 1980s and the early 1990s, executives in the Canadian public service did not rise to the top by stewarding policy initiatives, but rather, by handling transition and restructuring departments and programs, better managing resources, and helping the government and ministers deal with difficult political files such as federalism, Quebec and the sovereignty movement, and free trade with the United States. While the policy function did not disappear, governments focused less on thinking broadly about problems and more about achieving focus and specific results, and more resources were allocated

to sophisticated polling and communications organizations inside and outside the government (Bakvis 2000). As noted above, following the June 1993 restructuring of the public service and the 1994-95 Program Review decisions, which resulted in budget cuts, consolidations, and lay-offs, it was generally acknowledged that the policy capacity of the public service had atrophied, in part because deputy ministers allocated scare resources to deal with pressing challenges and because demand for conventional policy analysis had waned considerably. The extent to which the policy functions of departments declined, if at all, varied across the public service, yet probably remained considerably greater than those of provincial, territorial and municipal governments. One result of tighter budgets in the early 1990s was that departments often became more creative in managing policy analysis and research – working with other departments, relying on external consultants to deal with specific demands if internal expertise was insufficient, and cultivating networks of researchers in universities and think tanks – an approach that was accelerated by the Policy Research Initiative. Moreover, in the late 1990s, and now, in early 2004, under a new Prime Minister, federal governments have made it clear to the public service that they are seeking long-term policy thinking. However, it is an open question as to whether the incentives for producing high quality policy advice, and perhaps building long term internal capacity, outweigh the demands to improve service delivery of existing programs while lowering costs, ensure that programs are prudently and tightly managed from the standpoint of financial control, and measure and report on performance.

Canada's Policy Analytic Style and Its Implications for Training Policy Analysts

Our review of different governance trends on the policy function in Canada has shown that parliamentary traditions in a federal context have a defining influence on where policy capacity is concentrated, and ensure that, despite the proliferation of many more policy-capable players in each policy sector – interest groups, think tanks, Aboriginal communities, NGOs, and international organizations – the fulcrum of power among major actors inside and outside government has not changed. However, in a post-deficit environment, the national government has more actively demanded policy advice, which has led to departments seeking creative ways to tap into expertise within and across governments, and with analysts and researchers in consulting firms, universities, think tanks, and associations. It is a far more complicated policy-making environment for government leaders to navigate, and this requires more process-related skills. Figure 2 summarizes our arguments and suggests that the country has shifted from the earlier rational, client advice and argumentative ones, to those based on process management, interactivity and participation.

– **Insert Figure 3 about here –**

Conclusion: Policy Styles and Analytical Styles

Styles of policy analytic are neither uniform, nor static, but evolve in conjunction with changes in governance context at the national, policy sector, and organizational

levels. Our high level and exploratory review of the Canadian case illustrates that the linkages that exist between governance contexts and evolving patterns in policy analysis, and suggests finer grained studies with thick descriptions would provide enormously useful detail on how this dynamic occurs in specific policy sectors and organizations. Such detail would also be necessary for first-rate comparisons across organizations, sectors, and countries, and to explore whether or not national governance traditions reinforce or seem to be in tension with the demands of policy networks and organizations for policy analysis.

Prima facie, similar patterns in governance and policy analysis appear to exist in other jurisdictions, like the Netherlands, the UK, and others (Kickert 2003; Considine and Lewis 2003). However, the Canadian case illustrates similarities between the types of meta-analysis of policy analysis put forward by Radin and others, and those of Mayer et al. Radin's two ideal types of modern and post-modern analyst can be thought of as "bundles" of the analytical styles identified by Mayer et al, operating at different levels of the policy-making context. The 'modern' analytical style in Radin's model is rational at the level of national systems, client-oriented at the level of the sub-government or policy community, and, at the department level, provides argumentative advice. This bundle of analytical styles was appropriate to the governance context in Canada of the 1960s, with relatively top-down centralized national control of policy-making, simple bi-lateral or trilateral sub-government structures and managerial agency activity. However, it was less well suited to the post-1990 context of a fiscally strapped central government, stronger provincial governments, and more complex policy communities and 'intelligent' agencies in an international context. A 'post-modern' bundle of policy capabilities has

thus emerged alongside the more traditional orientations, and features Mayer et al's other three analytical styles: process management, interactivity and participatory analysis. It is these new aspects that schools of public policy must be oriented towards, providing a range of techniques to students along with instruction on the nature of Canada's policy style and its evolution so that students will be able to match policy and analytic style to the context in which they work.

Even though our primary focus has been theoretical in nature, with an ambition of encouraging more systematic comparative empirical research, we believe that there are implications of this analysis for pedagogical practices in professional schools of policy analysis, administration and management. The Mayer et al framework, and the other features of policy analysis that we identified, gives us a better sense of the range of roles and skills potentially required of policy analysis in support of clients and communities, and imply that the skills, knowledge and dispositions required to perform those functions at a high level of competency might be different from the traditional skill set or bundle typically taught in professional schools. Most of our professional programs are currently dedicated to producing generalists to perform the latter roles, but our analysis suggests redesigning or supplementing curricula to deepen knowledge and skill in facilitation, negotiation, or advocacy, and find ways to ensure that our students and graduates can see the value of these approaches and understand how to work productively with specialists in those areas. More generally, our framework might also help graduates better determine how they might begin and build their careers.

Finally, we realize our proposed framework could be interpreted to suggest that governance contexts "determine" patterns and shifting styles in policy analysis. Although

we think that they are important explanatory factors, we believe that policy analysis has always aimed and should challenge assumptions and strategies of policy actors, whether they wield influence and power, or not. Indeed, a key challenge for any "manager " of policy capabilities inside or outside government is to balance the need to respond to immediate demands for analysis that addresses certain problem definitions and the merits of certain types of interventions, with the responsibility to challenge assumptions, inject new data, and explore alternative approaches and practices. The ability to pursue the latter agenda requires some insulation from normal demands of governance and politics at all levels of governance, whether through explicit mandates or organizational slack. We think some autonomy in the policy analysis function can lead to insight and creativity that can better prepare governments, networks, and organizations for new policy challenges. It is an open question as to whether governments, corporate strategies and the proliferation of policy actors in networks are rising to this challenge.

References

Abelson, Donald E. *Do Think Tanks Matter? Assessing the Impact of Public Policy Institutes*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Aberbach, J.D., and B.A. Rockman. "Comparative Administration: Methods, Muddles and Models." *Administration and Society* 18 (1987): 473-506

Anderson, George. "The new focus on the policy capacity of the federal government." *Canadian Public Administration*, v.39, no.4 (Winter 1996): 469-99.

Armit, Amelita and Jacques Bourgualt (ed.), *Hard Choices or No Choices: Assessing Program Review* (Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 1996).

Armstrong, Jim, Nick Mulder, and Russ Robinson. *Strengthening Policy Capacity: Report on Interviews with Senior Managers, February-March 2002*. Ottawa: The Governance Network, April 2002.

Alexander, Cynthia J. and Leslie A. Pal., ed. *Digital democracy: policy and politics in the wired world.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Association of Public Service Financial Administrators, *Checks and Balances: Rebalancing the Service and Control Features of the Government of Canada (GOC) Financial Control Framework.* Ottawa: Association of Public Service Financial Administrators, December 2003.

Atkinson, Michael, and William D. Coleman, *Business, the State, and Industrial Change* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989)

Atkinson, Michael M. and Cassandra W. Pervin. "Sector Councils and Sectoral Corporatism: Viable? Desirable?" In M. Gunderson and A. Sharpe, ed(s), *Forging Business-Labour Partnerships: The Emergence of Sector Councils in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998. 271-294.

Bakvis, Herman. "Rebuilding Policy Capacity in the Era of the Fiscal Dividend: A Report from Canada." *Governance*. 13, no. 1 (2000): 71-103.

Banting, Keith G. *The Welfare State and Canadian Federalism*. Kingston: Queen's University Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, 1982.

Bardach, Eugene. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis : The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. New York: Chatham House Publishers, 2000.

Bekke, Hans, James L. Perry, and Theo Toonen. "Comparing Civil Service Systems." *Research in Public Administration*. 2(1993): 191-212.

Bevir, Mark and R.A.W. Rhodes. "Decentering Tradition: Interpreting British Government." *Administration & Society*. 33, no. 2 (2001): 107-132.

Bevir, Mark, R.A.W. Rhodes, and Patrick Weller. "Traditions of Governance: Interpreting the Changing Role of the Public Sector." *Public Administration*. 81, no. 1 (2003a): 1-17.

Bevir, Mark, R.A.W. Rhodes, and Patrick Weller. "Comparative Governance: Prospects and Lessons." *Public Administration.* 81, no. 1 (2003b): 191-210.

Bradford, Neil. “Writing Public Philosophy: Canada's Royal Commissions on Everything.” Journal of Canadian Studies. 34, no. 4 (1999-2000): 136-167.

Burstein, Paul. “Policy Domains: Organization, Culture and Policy Outcomes.” *Annual Review of Sociology*. 17(1991): 327-350.

Castles, Francis G. “The Dynamics of Policy Change: What Happened to the English-speaking Nations in the 1980s.” *European Journal of Political Research*. 18, no. 5 (1990): 491-513

Christensen, Tom, Per Laegreid, and Lois R. Wise. “Evaluating Public Management Reforms in Central Government: Norway, Sweden and the United States of America.” In H. Wollman, ed(s), *Evaluation in Public Sector Reform: Concepts and Practice in International Perspective,* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2003. 56-79.

Coleman, William D. and Grace Skogstad (eds.), *Policy Communities and Public Policy in Canada: A Structuralist Approach* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1990).

Considine, Mark and Jenny M. Lewis. “Bureaucracy, Network, or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand.” *Public Administration Review*. 63, no. 2 (2003): 131-140.

Desveaux, James A., Evert A. Lindquist, and Glen Toner. “Organizing for Policy Innovation in Public Bureaucracy: AIDS, Energy, and Environmental Policy in Canada.” Canadian Journal of Political Science, v.??, no.? (September 1993): ???

Dobuzinskis, Laurent. "Trends and Fashions in the Marketplace of Ideas." In *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art*, ed. Laurent Dobuzinskis, Michael Howlett and David Laycock, 91-124. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Dobell, Rodney and David Zussman. “An Evaluation System for Government: If Politics is Theatre, then Evaluation is (mostly) Art.” *Canadian Public Administration*. 24, no. 3 (1981): 404-427.

Doerr, Audrey D. *The Machinery of Government in Canada.* Toronto: Methuen, 1981.

Dunn, Christopher. *The Institutionalized Cabinet: Governing the Western Provinces*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

Dwivedi, O.P. and James Iain Gow. *From Bureaucracy to Public Management: The Administrative Culture of the Government of Canada*. Toronto: IPAC, 1999.

Eisner, Marc Allen. “Discovering Patterns in Regulatory History: Continuity, Change and Regulatory Regimes.” *Journal of Policy History*. 6, no. 2 (1994): 157-187

Eisner, Marc Allen. *Regulatory Politics in Transition*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Elmore, Richard E. "Teaching, Learning and Education for the Public Service." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 10, no. 2 (1991): 167-180

Fischer, Frank, and John Forester, eds. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1993

Fox, Charles J. "Implementation Research: Why and How to Transcend Positivist

Methodology." In *Implementation and the Policy Process: Opening up the Black Box*, ed. Dennis J. Palumbo and D.J. Calisto, 199-212. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990; University Press, 1993

Franks, C.E.S. *The Parliament of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1987

Freeman, Gary P. "National Styles and Policy Sectors: Explaining Structured Variation." *Journal of Public Policy*. 5, no. 4 (1985): 467-496.

French, Richard. *How Ottawa Decides: Planning and Industrial Policy-Making 1968-1980*. Toronto: Lorimer, 1980

Garson, G. David. "From Policy Science to Policy Analysis: A Quarter Century of Progress." In *Policy Analysis: Perspectives, Concepts, and Methods*, ed. William N. Dunn, 3-22. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1986.

Geva-May, Iris and Aaron Wildavsky. *An Operational Approach to Policy Analysis: the Craft - Prescriptions for Better Analysis.* Boston: Kluwer, 1997.

Golob, Stephanie R. "Beyond the Policy Frontier: Canada, Mexico, and the Ideological Origins of NAFTA." *World Politics.* 55(2003): 361-398.

Guess, George M, and Paul G. Farnham. *Cases in Public Policy Analysis*: New York: Longman, 1989.

Harris, Richard and Sidney Milkis. *The Politics of Regulatory Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hartle, Douglas G. *The Expenditure Budget Process in the Government of Canada*. Canada: Canadian Tax Foundation, 1978.

Hawkins, Keith and John M. Thomas. "Making Policy in Regulatory Bureaucracies." In K. Hawkins and J. M. Thomas, ed(s), *Making Regulatory Policy*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. 3-30.

Hollander, Marcus J. and Michael J. Prince. "Analytical Units in Federal and Provincial Governments: Origins, Functions and Suggestions for Effectiveness." *Canadian Public Administration*. 36, no. 2 (1993): 190-224.

Howlett, Michael. "Beyond Legalism? Policy Ideas, Implementation Styles and Emulation-Based Convergence in Canadian and U.S. Environmental Policy." *Journal of Public Policy* 20, no. 3 (2000): 305-329.

Howlett, Michael. "Federalism and Public Policy." In *Canadian Politics - Third Edition*, ed. James Bickerton and Alain Gagnon. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1999

Howlett, Michael. "Policy Development." In *The Oxford Handbook of Canadian Public Administration*, ed. Chris Dunn. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002a

Howlett, Michael. "Policy Instruments and Implementation Styles: The Evolution of Instrument Choice in Canadian Environmental Policy." In *Canadian Environmental Policy: Context and Cases*, ed. Debora L. VanNijnatten and Robert Boardman, 25-45. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002b

Howlett, Michael. "Understanding National Administrative Cultures and Their Impact Upon Administrative Reform: A Neo-Institutional Model and Analysis." *Policy,*

Organization & Society. 21, no. 1 (2002c): 1-24.

Howlett, Michael, ed. *Canadian Forest Policy: Adapting to Change.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Howlett, Michael. "Administrative Styles and the Limits of Administrative Reform: A Neo-Institutional Analysis of Administrative Culture." *Canadian Public Administration.* (2004)

Howlett, Michael and Jeremy Rayner. "(Not so) 'smart regulation'? Canadian shellfish aquaculture policy and the evolution of instrument choice for industrial development." *Marine Policy.* 28, no. 2 (2004): 171=184.

Jordan, Andrew. "The Europeanization of National Government and Policy: A Departmental Perspective." *British Journal of Political Science.* 33, no. 1 (2003): 261-282.

Kagan, "Adversarial Legalism and American Government," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 10, no. 3 (1991): 369-406

Kagan, Robert A "The Political Consequences of American Adversarial Legalism." In A. Ranney, ed(s), *Courts and the Political Process*, Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1996.

Kickert, Walter J.M. "Beneath Consensual Corporatism: Tradition of Governance in the Netherlands." *Public Administration.* 81, no. 1 (2003): 119-140.

Knill, Christoph. "European Policies: The Impact of National Administrative Traditions." *Journal of Public Policy*. 18, no. 1 (1998): 1-28.

Lascher, Edward L. *The Politics of Automobile Insurance Reform: Ideas, Institutions and Public Policy in North America.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1999.

Lenihan, Donald G. and Reg Alcock. *Collaborative Government in the Post-Industrial Age: Five Discussion Pieces - Changing Government Volume I.* Ottawa: Centre for Collaborative Government, 2000.

Lindblom, Charles E. "Policy Analysis." *American Economic Review* 48, no. 3 (1958): 298-312

Lindquist, Evert A, "New Agendas for Research on Policy Communities: Policy Analysis, Administration, and Governance" in L. Dobuzinskis, M. Howlett, and D. Laycock (eds), *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996a), pp. 219-241.

Lindquist, Citizens, Experts, and Budgets" in Susan D. Phillips (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends 1994-95: Making Change* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1994).

Lindquist, Evert A. (ed.), *Government Restructuring and Career Public Service in Canada* (Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 2000).

Lindquist, Evert A. "How Ottawa Plans: The Evolution of Strategic Planning" in Leslie A. Pal (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends 2001-02: Power in Transition* (Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001), 61-93.

Lindquist, Evert and James Desveaux, *Recruitment and Policy Capacity in Government* (Ottawa: Public Policy Forum, 1998).

Lindquist, Evert. "A Quarter Century of Canadian Think Tanks: Evolving Institutions, Conditions and Strategies." In *Think Tanks across Nations: A Comparative Approach*, ed. Diane Stone, Andrew Denham and Mark Garnett, 127-144. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998

Lindquist, Evert A. "Reshaping Governments and Communities: Must Program Reviews Remain Unilateral, Executive Processes?" in Amelita Armit and Jacques Bourgualt (ed.), *Hard Choices or No Choices: Assessing Program Review* (Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 1996b), pp.137-146.

Lindquist, Evert A., "A Critical Moment: Framework and Agenda for Monitoring the Canadian Model of Public Service." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, March 2004 draft manuscript.

Lipsky, Michael. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980.

Lowi, Theodore J. "Four Systems of Policy, Politics and Choice." *Public Administration Review*. 32, no. 4 (1972): 298-310.

MacRae Jr., Duncan, and James A. Wilde. *Policy Analysis for Public Decisions*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985

Majone, Giandomenico. *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process*: New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Manfredi, Christopher P., and Antonia Maioni. "Courts and Health Policy: Judicial Policy Making and Publicly Funded Health Care in Canada." *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 27, no. 2 (2002): 213-240.

Manfredi, Christopher. "The Judicialization of Politics; Rights and Public Policy in Canada and the United States." In *Degrees of Freedom; Canada and the United States in a Changing World*, ed. Keith Banting, George Hoberg and Richard Simeon. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997

Mayer, I.S., C.E. Van Daalen, and P.W.G. Bots. "Perspectives on Policy Analysis: A Framework for Understanding and Design." In *Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management*. Washington D.C., 2001.

McRoberts, Kenneth. "Federal Structures and the Policy Process." In *Governing Canada: Institutions and Public Policy*, ed. M. Michael Atkinson. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1993.

Meltsner, Arnold J. "Political Feasibility and Policy Analysis." *Public Administration Review* 32 (1972): 859-867

Montpetit, Eric. "Policy Networks, Federal Arrangements, and the Development of Environmental Regulations: A Comparison of the Canadian and American Agricultural Sectors." *Governance* 15, no. 1 (2002): 1-20

Notzke, Claudia. *Aboriginal Peoples and Natural Resources in Canada*. Toronto: Captus

Press, 1994.

Peled, Alan. “Why Style matters: A Comparison of Two Administrative Reform Initiatives in the Israeli Public Sector, 1989-1998.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 12, no. 2 (2002): 217-240.

Patton, Carl V., and David S. Sawicki. *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993.

Peters, B. Guy. “Administrative Culture and Analysis of Public Organizations.” *Indian Journal of Public Administration.* 36(1990): 420-428.

Peters, B. Guy, and Anthony Parker, eds. *Advising West European Governments: Inquiries, Expertise and Public Policy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.

Phillips, Susan D. “From Charity to Clarity: Reinventing Federal Government-Voluntary Sector Relationships.” In L. A. Pal, ed(s), *How Ottawa Spends 2001-2002: Power in Transition,* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2001. 145-176.

Prince, Michael J. "Policy Advisory Groups in Government Departments." In *Public Policy in Canada: Organization, Process, Management*, ed. G.B. Doern and Peter Aucoin, 275-300. Toronto: Gage, 1979.

Pross, A. Paul. *Group Politics and Public Policy*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Quinn, Robert E. *Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,1988.

Radin, Beryl A. *Beyond Machiavelli: Policy Analysis Comes of Age*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000.

Radin, Beryl A., and Joan Price Boase. "Federalism, Political Structure, and Public Policy in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 2, no. 1 (2000): 65-90

Richardson, J.J., A.G. Jordan, and R.H. Kimber. “Lobbying, Administrative Reform and Policy Styles: The Case of Land Drainage.” *Political Studies*. 26, no. 1 (1978): 47-64.

Richardson, Jeremy, Gunnel Gustafsson, and Grant Jordan. "The Concept of Policy Style." In *Policy Styles in Western Europe*, ed. J.J. Richardson, 1-16. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1982;

Sabatier, Paul A. “Knowledge, Policy-Oriented Learning, and Policy Change.” *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization.* 8, no. 4 (1987): 649-692.

Salamon, Lester M. “Rethinking Public Management: Third-Party Government and the Changing Forms of Government Action.” *Public Policy*. 29, no. 3 (1981): 255-275.

Salter, Liora , and Debra Slaco. *Public Inquiries in Canada*. Ottawa: Science Council of Canada, 1981

Salter, Liora. "The Two Contradiction in Public Inquiries." In *Commissions of Inquiry*,

ed. A. Paul Pross, Innis Christie and John A. Yogis, 175-195. Toronto: Carswell, 1990

Savoie, Donald J. "The Rise of Court Government in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 4 (1999a): 635-664.

Savoie, Donald J. *Governing from the Centre: The Concentration of Power in Canadian Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999b.

Scholz, John T. "Cooperation, Deterrence, and the Ecology of Regulatory Enforcement." *Law and Society Review*. 18, no. 2 (1984): 179-224

Scholz, John T. "Cooperative Regulatory Enforcement and the Politics of Administrative Effectiveness." *American Political Science Review*. 85, no. 1 (1991): 115-136.

Sharpe, David. "The Canadian Charitable Sector: An Overview." In J. Phillips, B. Chapman and D. Stevens, ed(s), *Between State and Market: Essays on Charities Law and Policy in Canada,* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Sheriff, Peta E. "State Theory, Social Science, and Governmental Commissions." *American Behavioural Scientist* 26, no. 5 (1983): 669-680

Shulock, Nancy. "The Paradox of Policy Analysis: If It Is Not Used, Why Do We Produce So Much Of It?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management.* 18, no. 2 (1999): 226-244.

Simeon, Richard. "Intergovernmental Relations and the Challenges to Canadian Federalism." *Canadian Public Administration*. 23, no. 1 (1980): 14-32.

Smiley, Donald. "Public Administration and Canadian Federalism." *Canadian Public Administration.* 7, no. 3 (1964): 371-388.

Smiley, Donald V. *The Federal Condition in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson, 1987.

Smith, Martin J., David Marsh, and David Richards. "Central Government Departments and the Policy Process." *Public Administration*. 71(1993): 567-594.

Soroka, Stuart N. *Agenda-Setting Dynamics in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002.

Thissen, W.A.H. and Patricia G.J. Twaalfhoven. "Toward a Conceptual Structure for Evaluating Policy Analytic Activities." *European Journal of Operational Research.* 129(2001): 627-649.

Thomas, Paul G. "Ministerial Responsibility and Administrative Accountability." In *New Public Management and Public Administration in Canada*, ed. Mohamed Charih and Arthur Daniels, 143-163. Toronto: IPAC, 1997

Tribe, Laurence H. "Policy Science: Analysis or Ideology?" *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 2, no. 1 (1972): 66-110

Tuohy, Carolyn J. *Policy and Politics in Canada: Institutionalized Ambivalence* (Temple University Press, 1992).

van Waarden, Frans. "Persistence of National Policy Styles: A Study of Their Institutional Foundations." In *Convergence or Diversity? Internationalization and*

Economic Policy Response, ed. Brigitte Unger and Frans van Waarden, 333-372. Aldershot: Avebury, 1995

Vining, Aidan R., and David L. Weimer. "Introducing Policy Analysis Craft: The Sheltered Workshop." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21, no. 4 (2002): 683-695

Vogel, David. *National Styles of Regulation: Environmental Policy in Great Britain and the United States*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986

Webber, David J. "Analyzing Political Feasibility: Political Scientists' Unique Contribution to Policy Analysis." *Policy Studies Journal* 14, no. 4 (1986): 545-554

Weimer, David L. "The Craft of Policy Design: Can It Be More Than Art?" *Policy Studies Review* 11, no. 3/4 (1992): 370-388.

Weimer, David L., and Aidan R. Vining. *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1999

Weiss, Carol H. "Research for Policy's Sake: The Enlightenment Function of Social Science Research." *Policy Analysis* 3, no. 4 (1977a): 531-54

Weiss, Carol H.. *Using Social Research in Public Policy Making*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1977b.

Wildavsky, Aaron B. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Boston: Little-Brown, 1979

Wildavsky, Aaron. "Rescuing Policy Analysis from PPBS." *Public Administration Review*, no. March-April (1969): 189-202.

Wilson, James Q. *Bureaucracy*. New York: Free Press, 1989. (check)

Wise, Lois Recascino. “Public Management Reform: Competing Drivers of Change.” *Public Administration Review.* 62, no. 5 (2002): 555-567.

Figure 1 – Dimensions for Policy Analysis

Roles and Styles	**Capacities**	**Values and Politics**
Rational	Generalist, specialists	Value orientation
Client Advice	Internal, external	Support, challenge
Argumentative	Recruitment systems	Time frame
Interactive	Range of expertise	Path of influence
Participative	Amount of expertise	Skepticism
Process		Relative autonomy

Figure 2 –Governance Context and Institutional Focal Points

Level	**Structural Vantage Point**	**Dimensions to Consider**
National Governance Traditions	National and Sub-National Governments	Governance system Civil service traditions Government priorities Strong or weak centers Strong or weak legislatures Recruitment systems
Policy Sectors	Policy Networks and Communities	Distribution of power Distribution of expertise Depth of expertise Dynamics of dominant and other advocacy coalitions Priority of government Moment of crisis
Departments, Agencies	Organizational Culture, Repertoires, Capacities	Organization culture policy, service delivery, control Types of policy capability Distribution of internal policy expertise Critical challenges Priorities of the centre Disposition towards inclusion and engagement External networks for policy expertise

Figure 3 – Governance Contexts and Elements of Canada's Policy Style

Level	**Focal Point**	**Old Context** 1960-1980	**Old Analytic Style**	**New Context** 1980-2000	**New Analytic Style**
National Governance Systems	National and Sub-National Governments	Top-Down, Centralized Parliamentary Federalism	Rationalism	Fiscal Austerity and De-Centralization	Process
Policy Sectors	Policy Communities	Bi-partite and Tri-partite Business/ Labour Peak Associations	Client Advice	More challenge from diverse communities,	Interactive
Departments and Agencies	Organizational Culture, Repertoires, Capacities	Managerialism	Argumentative	Balance tipping away from management back to policy creativity	Participatory

Endnotes

[1] Policy analysis texts usually describe a range of qualitative and quantitative techniques which analysts are expected to learn and apply in specific circumstances, providing advice to decision-makers about optimal strategies and outcomes to pursue in the resolution of public problems (Elmore 1991; Weimer and Vining 1999; Patton and Sawicki, 1993).

[2] This is also consistent with the widespread rhetoric of performance-oriented governments and societies.