Policy Implementation: Challenges in Developing Countries like Nepal

Dr. Hari Bhakta Shahi
haribhaktashahi7@gmail.com
Public Administration Campus, T.U.

Abstract

Policy formulation is directly associated to policy implementation. Policy implementation is action of plan, program, rules and regulation into real ground. Policy implementation in developing countries is weak policy due to poverty, pseudo agenda, weak state, incomplete cycle, unethical behavior, bureaucratic culture, foreign influence, feudal culture and party conflict. Thus, policy implementation is complex task in developing country like Nepal. There are many issues being raised in developing countries like Nepal for policy implementation. Some people blame the government for not implementing policies whereas government blame opposition parties for blocking the policy implementation.

Concept on Policy Formulation

Policies are governmental direction, plan, Acts, rules and regulations. Policies are formulated for their implementation; without implementation the formulation of policy is meaningless. Policy is implemented according to their formulation. Therefore, Policy must be analyzed from the formulation to implementation phase. Policies are to be formulated by the discussion with expert, politicians, stakeholders, target group and so on. Policy formulation starts from problem at first what should be done and secondly making administrative rules. Policy formulation and implementation are highly sensitive, debatable and technical task. There are at least six approaches which are as follows (Reejal, 2003); -

- Political system theory: Policy as System output
- Two-way communication: Policy making as bargaining and compromise
- Reconstructive Leadership
- Policy as group equilibrium
- Elite Theory Group Theory: Policy as elite preference
- Institutionalism: Policy as institutional activity
- Functional Process Theory: Policy-Making as sequential functional activities

These approaches are not comparable to each other. The suitability of these approaches are preferred according to the situation. In the modern age, all these approaches do not exist as a

single approach rather they are a mix of each other i.e. Policies are formulated in the modern are according to the mix of all the approaches.

Concept of Policy Implementation

The word "implementation" is frequently used in discussions among public policy academics today. In Wildavsky's 1973 book "Implementation," Jeffrey Pressman and Aaron provided one of the first definitions. As per Hill & Hupe (2014), on page 7, "implementation is a process of interaction between the settings of goals and actions geared to achieve them." The most influential definition of implementation, as stated in Hill and Hupe's 2009 book "Implementing Public Policy," comes from Mazmanian and Sabatier: "Implementation is the carrying out of a basic policy decision...that decision identifies the problem(s) to be addressed, stipulate the objectives to be pursued" (Hill & Hupe, 2014, p7).

The setting of goals by humans was the first step in the implementation of policies. Implementations rely on presumptions regarding how an action relates to earlier goals. Implementation puts the desired outcome and individual actors into practice. Determining the ancient time of implementation evolution is a challenging task. Implementation literature began to emerge around 1947, based on Max Weaver's authority system. Early Middle Ages Chinese literature is considered ancient literature (Hill and Hupe, 2002). In this way, democracy and the concept of the rule of law came into being. Careful thought must go into how this idea is implemented. Several institutions and barriers are identified in the 19th and 20th centuries following the implementation of this idea (Hill and Hupe, 2002). Three generations of policy implementation are thought to have developed over the course of the policy: the first generation, the second generation, and the third generation.

The early 1970s and early 1980s saw the start of the first generation of implementation resources. The first generation of implementation resources concentrated on carrying out results through the implementation of a single, authoritative decision. Implementation theory was created by Lawrence O. Toole. In a similar vein, James Lester, Ann Bowman, and Malcolm Goggin pioneered first generation resources. Alan (1918). Pressman and Wildavsky identify the relationship between a policy's problem factor and the program, capacity, and commandment that are implemented in its execution.

The implementation of second generation policies began in 1980 and continued until 1990. The creation of the analytical framework was covered in the second generation of implementation resources. This generation identified implementation-affecting factors. The communications model, which is a method for studying implementation, was created by Goggin and his associates. Numerous intervening variables were recognized, including ecological capacity, organizational capacity, policy design, and implementation feedback (Hill and Hupe, 2002). Nonetheless, during this time two schools of thought emerged: the top-down and bottom-up approaches. Top-down approaches emphasize the creation of processes, structures, rules, and mechanisms at the top in order to make policy implementation successful. A bottom-up approach emphasizes the involvement of street-level actors in adopting decentralization to successfully implement policies. Sabatier (cited in Sapru, 2012) pointed out a number of drawbacks for both the top-down and bottom-up approaches. Elmore maintained that different frameworks must be created for the analysis and application of policy. The implementation of the third generation of policies began in 1990 and continues to this day.

As a result, assumptions regarding the relationship between the action and the plan's prior objectives began to be made during implementation. Measurement of governance execution began with the implementation of the rule of low. The entire policy-making and implementation process is viewed as a mystery.

Different scholars have provided conceptual definitions for policy implementation. Policies are carried out by putting plans, objectives, choices, and deeds into action. A policy is ineffective until it is implemented and achieves its objectives. In particular, it can be described as "putting a policy decision into action" (Howelt et al., 2009, p 160).

Policy decisions are made at the highest levels of government, according to academics and scholars like Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983), and their supporters. Policy execution is an activity aimed at accomplishing predetermined goals. "Policy Implementation," as defined by Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), is the set of actions resulting from policy decisions that are taken by both public and private individuals to accomplish policy goals. By definition, implementing policies "encompasses those actions by public and private individuals, groups, and organizations." These are aimed at achieving the objectives mentioned in previous policy decisions. (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975, pp. 447–448). Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) provide a more thorough explanation, stating that the process of putting policy into action involves identifying the problem or problems that need to be addressed, anticipating the goal or goals that need to be attained, and deciding how those directives will be carried out through the issuing of executive orders or court decisions (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1980, p 540-541). "What develops between the establishment of an apparent intention on the part of government to do something, or stop doing something, and the ultimate impact in the world of action," according to O'Toole (1995, cited in Hill & Hupe, 2014, p. 8) is the implementation of a policy. Thus, policy implementation refers to the connection between the government's objectives and the real results.

Policies are made based on the relationship between the law and the bureaucracy's responsibilities, according to Dye (2002). He argues that the government may create new agencies to translate laws into useful guidelines and regulations. Administrators have to make decisions that effectively establish policy in order to interpret these laws, leaving the implementing agencies with very few options. The importance of the policy and the appropriateness of any limitations must then be decided by the agencies themselves. These implementation responsibilities, which are essential to the policymaking process, are handled by the bureaucracy (Dye, 2002).

Research has focused on the roles that government and non-government actors play in putting policies into action, as well as the justification that policy implementation is an action that is done to accomplish the objectives that government bodies have set forth. At different levels of government, this stage usually involves a range of bureaucratic agencies, each with distinct roles, interests, and customs that influence the implementation process and its outcomes. Howeltt et al. (2009) claim that new players and their connections contribute to the continuation of the political game that started with the policy's adoption during implementation. Additionally, it makes clear how various parties use the implementation process to achieve their own goals (Winter, 2006). Therefore, the following is a brief explanation of how policies are implemented::-

- Implementation is a process of interaction between the settings of goals and actions geared to achieve them

- Implementation is the carrying out of a basic policy decision**....** that decision identifies the problem to be addressed, stipulate the objectives to be pursued....
- Policy implementation was started from the human activities with setting of objectives.
- Implementations make assumptions about the relationship between action and preceding objectives.
- Implementation focuses individual actors and desire goal in action.
- Implementation literatures are started about 1947 from Max weaver's system of authority.
- The policy implementation is supposed to have evolved through three generations:
- The first generation of implementation (1970s to 1980s)

- The first generation implementation resources was focus on implementation of single authoritative decision to carry out

- The second generation policy implementation was originated since 1980/1990.

- The second generation implementation resources described the development of analytical frame work.

- The third generation policy implementation was started since 1990 to till now.
- So, Implementation is relation between plan and action

Challenges of Policy Implementation

Policies are formulated for the implementations in particular sector. Developed are seen successful for policy implementation in their countries. But developing countries are not successful in policy implementations. Policy implementations in developing countries are not successful due to various reason. Such as, lack up commitment, weak state, political dispute, pressure of interest group, economic crisis and so on. The environment of developing countries is not stable that is the situation of developing countries are hyperbolic, parabolic, influence by foreign country and so on.

Policy implementation is much more difficult and complex than it was believed. It is continuous process. Senior administrators are mainly responsible for policy implementation. Senior administrators training programs can help to reduce difficulty and complexity policy implementation. Public policy formulation and implementation in developing countries are challenging and copied from developed countries. The factors affecting Public policy implementation in developing countries are due to poverty, political uncertainty, and lack of participation, socio-administrative culture, and low level of people trust on public institution (Saetren, 2005 and Lazin, 1999 cited by Paudel, 2012, p 2-4). The successes of policies formulation and implementation in developing countries are challenging and difficult due to lack of data collection, cultural differences, disagreements (Godwin, 1992). Policy implementation in developing countries are affected by the various factors such as pseudo agenda and issues, uncompleted cycle of implementation, misuse of implementation, ill practices, personal benefit, negative externalities, lack of national will and commitment, low level of M and E, low level of participation, disturbance of policy implementation by the political parties. According to Mannan (2011, p 69), "policy implementation and administration in developing countries are instable due to ruling parties and opposition party conflict". Political interference in bureaucracy has contributed polarization of the administration towards partisan of policies in one side. In the other hand, Extension of political families and nepotism is high which result dysfunctional state and

unaccountable to people (Mannan, 2011). Thus policy implementation in developing like Nepal is complex difficult to implementation due to various reasons. Hari Bhakta Shahi in his book policy implementation capacity of Nepal highlited, weak policy implementation of Foriegn Employment Act 2007, Foriegn Employment regulation 2008 and Foriegn Employment policy 2012 dueto lack of coordination among concern institutions. Similarly, feedback, monitoring, and supervisions are not effective. There is no good check and balance of activities among concerned institutions in the foreign employment policy implementation sector (Shahi, 2021).

Issue of Policy Implementation
There are so many issues for implementing policies in developing countries. Such as; poverty, pseudo agenda, weak state, uncomplete cycle, unethical behavior, bureaucratic culture, foreign influence, feudal culture and son on. Developing country do not believe on research. Policy formulation is highly based on research activities. Similarly why policy are not well implemented in the various sector of a country? These require research on finding weak implementation of policy but developing country never focuses on research activities. An unstable government is one of Nepal's major problems. Hardly any governments have existed for more than a year. The government is unable to fully implement its plans, projects, and policies because of its annual changes. Development projects must be impacted by an unstable government since the political party in power determines the government's priorities. Another trend is that the following government completely scraps the plans and development projects carried out by the previous one. Implementing policies successfully is hampered by such unhealthy politics. Instead of praising the good deeds, Nepal's political parties prefer to place the blame and attempt to undermine one anotherThe opposition party always opposes the government, regardless of whether it is doing good or bad works, which results in improper cooperation and beliefs between political parties when one party is in power. Nepal also uses unethical selection methods for political appointments, including favoritism, nepotism, and the influence of businessmen in politics. The nation is not the commitment of policymakers. In a similar vein, policy implementers lack professionalism. In Nepal's public sector, academics, practitioners, and professional exporters are not given priority.

Nepal's political situation is so dire that there is very little possibility of agreement on anything. Political parties do not back one another. All Nepalese are aware that there are certain concessions made behind closed doors when they offer support. Political parties lack conviction and constantly engage in destabilizing behavior, which makes Nepal's government unstable and prone to change before it can serve out its entire mandate. Rather than addressing the needs and demands of the people, the political parties are more concerned with achieving their own personal and political goals is an illustration of the dishonest politics being played by Nepali political parties. All political parties have used violence and protests in the past. They take these actions to challenge the government if the circumstances do not meet their demands. Such circumstances weaken the state, and they also make it difficult to implement policies. As a result, we may conclude that Nepalis' attitudes are unpredictable. They altered their hue based on what benefited them. However, foreign organizations and nations also make interruptions in Nepal. Policies are haphazardly translated into Nepal; how can they be implemented? Monitoring, evaluation and feedback system in each sector of government is very poor. In such situation how policy are implemented? For example, foreign employment of Nepal, health sector of Nepal, education

sector of Nepal are facing the failure of policy implementation. Nepal's plan and policy focus on sending skilled workers to foreign employment. However, according to an economic survey in 2019, in foreign land, only 1.5 percent of workers are found fully skilled and trained. In the same way government of Nepal put down a policy that the principal (Head Master) in the school must have an M.Phil in education. However, in practice, this is not well implemented in community schools of Nepal. The Tribhuvan University also has a policy that university lecturers must be M.Phil. or Ph.D. holders in their subject. This policy was passed by Tribhuvan University's executive body 18 years ago but it is not implemented until 2022. These are examples of how policies are implemented in developing like Nepal.

Conclusion

The policy is formulated according to their implementation. Developed countries are implementing policies in their country successfully. Research on policy implementations is highly focused in developed countries. However, developing countries are facing so many problems from policy formulation to implementation. Policies are formulated carelessly and implemented haphazardly. There are so many policy implementation barriers such as poverty, pseudo agenda, weak state, incomplete cycle, unethical behavior, bureaucratic culture, foreign influence, feudal culture, and party conflict. In Nepal, there is not only party conflict but also inter-party leader conflict is high. Thus, the country is becoming a weak state, and policy implementation is a failure in every sector of Nepal.

References

Dye, Thomas, R., (2002), *Understanding Public Policy.* England, Prentice Hall.

Godwin, R. K., (1992), *Policy Formulation and Implementation in Less Industrialized Countries*:
	A Comparative Analysis of Institutional Effects, The Western Political Quarterly,
	University of Utah, Vol-45, no.2, 419-438).

Howeltt, et al., (2009), A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis in https://www.youthopia
	bangla.org/skillDoc/Advocacy-Tool Kits/Adv_Policy_Analysis_8_fold_path_
	Eugene_Bardach.pdf retrieved on, 26 May 2018.

Ministry of Finance, (2019), *Economic Survey FY 2018/19,* Kathmandu, Ministry of Finance.

Hill. M. & Hupe. P., (2014), *Implementing Public Policy,* London, Sage Publication.

Mazmanian, D. & Sabatier, P., (1983), *Implementation and Public Policy.* USA, Foresman and
	Company.

Poudel, N.R., (2012), *Public Policy Implementation*: *A Case Study of Reproductive Health
	Service Delivery at Local Level in Nepal,* Kathmandu, PhD Thesis.

Reejal. P., (2003), *Fundamental of Public Policy Analysis,* Kathmandu, Pairavi Prakashan.

Sapru R. K., (2012), *Public Policy Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation.* New Delhi,
	Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Shahi H.B. (2021), *Policy Implementation Capacity of Nepal: A Case of Female Migrant Workers*, Kathmandu, Radhika Shahi.

Winter, C., (2006), *Handbook of Public Policy*, London, Sage Publication.

Alan, (1918), Politics and Economic Policy in https://books.google.com.np/books?id=-pdRAwAAQBAJ, retrieved on, May 25 2018.

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975), The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Frame Work, Administration & Society, 6 (4), 445–488. In https: //doi.org/10.1177 /009 539977500600404 retrieved on, 27 May 2018.