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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Different implementation structures affect public policy implementation process in different ways. Top-down and bottom-up are primary implementation structures that have been discussed by scholars for years. A top-down implementation structure is related with the decisions and actions of top-level decision makers while a bottom-up structure is engaged with those of street level bureaucrats at frontline. These two different implementation structures have some features that create some differentiations and similarities during the practice of implementation. This study is all about an examination of differentiations and similarities between top-down and bottom-up structures in terms of their practice of implementation process. So, the central question of this study stresses on the structure of implementation. To do so, the study uses implementation variables to understand process of implementation from the views of top-down and bottom-up structures.

Background

The policy implementation is an important field of study which plays crucial role in the policy process. The public policy process is a way of simplifying the complex context of public policy which relies on a broad network that extends beyond governmental entities to include non-profit organizations, individual citizens, community groups, and the private sector (DiGiammirano and Trudeau, 2008). Governmental authorities make decisions with policy choices and these choices are put into actions via implementation resulting policy outcomes (Peters, 2007). Accordingly, these policy choices and policy
outcomes impact citizens’ life (Dye, 2007). Public policy concerns all of these
governmental actions to examine processes, reasons, problems, solutions, influences,
and benefits of actions. This is done with a systematic analysis in several steps
(Munger, 2000). First, the problems are conceptualized and brought on agenda for
solutions. Second, possible solutions to solve problems are formulized by relevant
authorities. Third, the solutions are legitimized by proposing policies. Fourth, the
required actions are taken to implement these policies. Finally, the outcomes of the
policies are evaluated. These different steps provide a conceptual understanding of the
whole policy process which helps people to understand the compliance among existing
problems and issues, policy formulation and legitimation, policy implementation, and the
policy outcomes.

In the last three decades, research on public policy implementation has
attempted to fill the gaps that exist between policy development and policy outcomes
(Dye, 2007). These gaps occur during the process of implementation. The general
findings indicate that the implementation process influences policy outcomes directly
and effective implementation leads better policy outcomes (Hill and Hupe, 2002; Peters
and Pierre, 2006; Kraft and Furlong, 2007). In addition, research findings have
suggested various links between the policy implementation process and the outcomes
of policies by examining the compliance of policy goals and objectives with the policy
outputs (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973; Elmore, 1980; Lipsky, 1980; Mazmanian and
Sabatier, 1983; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; O’Toole, 1996; Hill and Hupe, 2002;
Anderson, 2003; Birkland, 2005; Peters and Pierre, 2006; Peters, 2007; Dye, 2007;
Kraft and Furlong, 2007). Specifically, successful implementation “leads to desired
performance and impacts” (Hill and Hupe, 2002, p.63, as cited from Ripley and Franklin, 1982).

Therefore, scholars have identified the process of implementation as a key process since implementation is what occurs between development and outcomes (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973; Lipsky, 1980; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983; Peters, 2007). In other words, it is simply the process of carrying out a program which is proposed by executive, judicial, or legislative authorities (Rushefsky, 2002). In addition, implementation constitutes one of the gaps in knowledge (Peters, 2007). The nature of implementation is reasonably related to potential policy outcomes of the policy since it affects success or failure of implementation and outcomes in some ways.

Backing up this argument, Ringquist (1993) describes implementation as “the crucial link between public policies and their associated outcomes” (p.1025). Also, according to Pressman and Wildavsky (1973), successful implementation is based on the linkages among policy actors, organizations, and departments because their actions directly affect policy outcomes. In other words, the implementation directly affects policy outcomes.

Understanding Implementation

There are three main approaches scholars have used to explain implementation which are the top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis (Matland, 1995; Ringquist, 1993). These approaches are simply different ways of understanding the processes of implementation.

The top-down approach focuses on the actions of central actors who are involved in an implementation process. The fundamental assumption that underlines the top-
down approach is that the actions of the actors at the top of organizations have more influence on implementation (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983). Top-level actors in an implementation process functions at the top of the organization and have the authority to manage and make decisions that affect policy outcomes. Their actions and decisions tend to have the most effects on policy outcomes and influence decreases as one move from top to bottom.

On the other hand, a bottom-up approach attempts to understand the process of implementation by focusing on the actors at street level rather than those at the top level. The street level actors act at the bottom level of the organization and function as front-line implementers at operational level. The underlying assumption that shapes the bottom-up approach is that the magnitude of influence on implementation is greater at bottom level because frontline managers or street level bureaucrats have discretion to make decisions and they have immediate interactions with citizens (Lipsky, 1980). They interpret policies (Rushefsky, 2002) and use discretion to make decisions (Lipsky, 1980). Their ways of interpretation and use of discretion directly influence the policy outcomes since they play key roles during the transmission of the policy goals into the action.

Therefore, they have potential influence to diverge or improve the quality of implementation or they may deviate policy objectives causing goal conflict (Sabatier, 1986). In addition, Rushesky (2002) indicates that application is one of the primary activities of the implementers who are in the front line and they might easily cause the failure of the policy implementation by changing the application towards to the different direction from actual policy objectives. Accordingly, the bottom-up approach assumes
that an implementer’s impact on policy outcomes decreases as one moves upward. Therefore, the focus should be on bottom level in order to capture the implementation process effectively. Figure 1 shows the top-down and bottom-up approaches, and links them to the policy implementation process and the policy outcomes of interest in this study.

By juxtaposing these approaches, we are introduced to a final model of implementation. The synthesis approach to implementation aims to use and combine both top-down and bottom-up approaches and view the process of implementation from both perspectives (Elmore, 1985; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; Winter, 2006). This approach assumes that both top-down and bottom-up implementers are influential during implementation and that their decisions affect policy outcomes.

A focus on only top level decisions may cause one to miss influences at the bottom, and exclusive emphasis on the bottom may miss some important parts at the top (Elmore, 1980; Sabatier, 1986). In other words, too much emphasis on top or bottom may lead to neglect the other part. Instead, a systematic focus on both parts can balance two different structures to provide an accurate way to understand implementation. So, a synthesis model will be able to capture all different trends and influences with a systematic analysis.
Figure 1. Structure of Implementation.

Although the actions of bottom-up implementers are considered in terms of their influence on implementation, neglect of the top-down implementers is not helpful. The reason for this assumption is that the bottom-up influence might not be the actual
factors to affect policy outcomes. It might affect at some level but we cannot be sure about accurate influence provided that top-down influences are captured. Therefore, the synthesis approach to implementation attempts to create a reconciliation of top-down and bottom up to understand the process of implementation better. To the extent that these various models have utility, a critical issue in implementation research is to find and apply the model that best explains the particular policy so that the factors that affect implementation process can be tracked accurately for the improvement of the implementation and policy outcomes.

Given this orientation, the top-down, bottom-up, or synthesis approaches seek to understand and explain structures that affect processes of implementation and shape policy outcomes to some degree. Each brings a different perspective to the study of implementation and implementation analysis. These three different models are the approaches to implementation which enable us to draw structure of implementation in this research. Specifically, the street level bureaucrats are referred in the phase “the bottom-up structure” and the decision makers are referred in the phase “the top-down structure.” It is a common logical reasoning of implementation research that the actors in different implementation structures affect the policy outcomes in some ways. However, the examination of the variation of these structural influences has not been subject to a comprehensive analysis so far. Therefore, this research attempts to examine the process of implementation from views of decision makers and street level bureaucrats in a particular policy implementation case.
Research Questions

In an implementation process, the actions of the decision makers shape the success or the failure of the policy implementation. In addition, the actions of the service deliverers and street level bureaucrats in a bottom-up structure also influence implementation and policy outcomes. However, the influences of each of the implementers in different implementation structures (top-down and bottom-up) differ because of the variations in their practices. In other words, the decision makers and street level bureaucrats’ practices in an implementation process may vary and there might be some trends with these variations. Therefore, it is important to capture the ways that how different implementation structures (top-down and bottom-up) practice the process of implementation. Specifically, the question of in what ways these different implementation structures practice and view implementation alike and different is crucial in today’s policy implementation research.

So, the points of how top-down and bottom-up structures practice implementation and in what ways their views differ and affect implementation and policy outcomes raise as significant in implementation research but the answer for this question has been disregarded. Hence, a comprehensive understanding of structural trends of implementation is essential in order to draw directions and guidance for implementation. So, it is a logical reasoning to study variations in the practices of top-down and bottom-up structures in terms of their influence on policy implementation and outcomes.

Accordingly, the primary purpose for this study is to explore the similarities and differentiations in the practice of implementation by decision makers and street level bureaucrats and provides answers to the following question: Do decision makers and
street level bureaucrats practice implementation in the same manner? In what ways do the top-down and bottom-up structures differ through policy implementation and outcomes?

In order to seek an answer for this question, I will use the recent police educational reforms in Turkey as case study. Specific questions to explore include:

1. **What are the structural approaches to implementation in a policy process?**
2. **What are the TNP education reforms and why were they proposed?**
3. **What is the actual output of the TNP education reforms? Has police performance in the TNP improved since the reforms? Which educational system is producing the best performances?**
4. **(Based upon the views of the participants in the study) What are the similarities and differentiations in the practices of implementation between the top-down and bottom-up actors in terms of their impacts on policy implementation and outcomes?**
5. **What are the implications of this research for scholars and practitioners?**

**Focus of the Study**

The main focus of this study is on the structure of implementation. Specifically, this dissertation attempted to understand if the people in different implementation structures (top-down and bottom-up structures) practice implementation in the same manner or not. The practice of implementation can be measured with the variables that affect implementation and policy outcomes in an implementation process. In other words, the examination of an implementation process is done with the approaches to implementation and the practices of implementers are measured by asking their
perceptions and experiences about process of implementation. To do so, the researcher attempts to measure the practices of top-down and bottom-up structures by examining an implementation process. Therefore, the variables of implementation that exist in the literature are synthesized and used to examine the process of implementation.

Hence, the emphasis through the study was on the practices and views of top-down and the bottom-up structures, not the variables of implementation. The variations in the structure of implementation could be studied in another way such as focusing on implementation variables but this research preferred to study variations by emphasizing structure of implementation. The variables of implementation were only used to learn how implementation occurred and how implementers in different structures practiced and shaped the process of implementation in order to provide relevant information for the categorization of top-down and bottom-up structures. For the measurement of the practices in different implementation structures, this study examined the process of police education reform implementation that was undertaken by the Turkish National Police (TNP) in 2001 and 2003 as its case in point.

In 2001, the Turkish government undertook a major educational reform of Turkish National Police (TNP) which included an important change in the basic education system. The original education system mandated that incoming police officers complete one year of basic police education. The reforms, undertaken in 2001 and 2003, mandated that new police officers must complete one of two new basic education approaches. The first approach increased the basic police education from one year to two years, and changed the status of the police schools to Police Vocational Schools of Higher Education (PVSHE). The second approach allowed four-year college graduates
to be police officers after just six months of basic police education. The rationale behind these reforms is based on the theory that increases in the level of education will lead to increases in the quality of job performance. The TNP reform implementation contains potentially relevant practices which would provide clear directions to find out some trends in top-down and bottom-up structures. Detailed information that explains the reform policies and their relations with this study is provided in the discussion of policy section in this study.

Key Concepts

Before proceeding this dissertation, it is essential to provide explanations for the concepts of this study in order to help readers understand this research clearly. First, the concept of “structure” in this dissertation depends upon the hierarchical positions of implementers which are categorized as top-down and bottom-up based on the positions that hold implementers in an organization. So, a top-down structure refers to a position of decision making authority while a bottom-up structure refers to a position of street level bureaucrat in an implementation process. For instance, the Head of Police Academy represents a top-down structure while a police officer in a PVSHE refers to a bottom-up structure.

Second, “approaches to implementation” consist of top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis approaches. These are important tools to understand how implementation was practiced. These approaches are also categorized as “models of implementation” in the public policy literature. Therefore, “approach to implementation” and “model of implementation” are used interchangeably in this research. So, a top-down model chooses to understand implementation from a top-down perspective, a bottom-up model
uses a bottom-up perspective, and a synthesis model provides a combined perspective through implementation. Here, the model and approach have the same meanings.

At this point, it is important not to confuse structure of implementation and approaches to implementation. Approaches to implementation refer to top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis models and help us understand the process of implementation from different angles. Structure of implementation refers to the top-down and bottom-up ways in which implementation is practiced. In fact, approaches to implementation are also theoretical basis for the structure of implementation and these two concepts are closely tightened each other. Therefore, the literature of structure of implementation was presented with the approaches to implementation.

Third, practice of implementation includes both actions and views of implementers in an implementation process. The respondents provided answers for the interview questions based on their experiences, perceptions, and practices about implementation issues. In some areas, they used their perceptions while they used their experiences and practices in other areas and this differed based on the type of the questions. For instance, respondents stated their opinions about the outcomes of the policies while they answered questions about political problems based on their experiences. So, their responds presents both their practices and views of implementation.

Finally, the variables of implementation refer to the tools to understand and implementation process. Some of the variables were presented as top-down and bottom-up in order to explain approaches to implementation but this categorization was not used in the categorization of structure of implementation. However, the variables
discussed under approaches to implementation also provide explanations for the structure of implementation. The variables which were applicable to TNP implementation case were derived from the literature with the synthesis they were used to understand implementation process for the structural analysis.

**Roadmap of the Study**

To proceed in this dissertation, the study first provides a comprehensive explanation of public policy, the policy process in general, and implementation specifically. Second, the top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis approaches to implementation which enable us to view implementation systematically are presented. Third, the study provides background information about the reform policies which are subject for this research. The reasons why TNP reforms were proposed and the underlying theory are also discussed in this section. Third, the study presents relevant methodology to answer the main research question in two supporting ways. The study first constructs a quantitative model to find out the actual success or failure of the reforms from a program evaluation perspective and then examines the process of implementation with a qualitative model. In doing so, the model uses synthesized variables of implementation in order to track the implementers’ practices and views from top-down and bottom-up structures. In the following, the findings of the study and relevant analysis and discussion are presented. Finally, the study seeks to determine the trends, if any, among the practices of street level bureaucrats and decision makers, specifically top-down and bottom-up structures, in terms of the success or failure of the reforms. In addition, the study presents some implications and limitations of this research for the scholars and practitioners of public policy.
Conclusion of the Chapter

Public policy implementation is an important field of study which necessitates close examination of the top-down and bottom-up structures. There is no doubt that actors of implementation at the top or the bottom influence the process of implementation and shape the policy outcomes to some extent. There are various different issues which are involved in implementation process and the influence of each actor on each of these issues may differ. Therefore, we need to know the differentiations and similarities of different actors who involve in implementation process. Knowing their practices of implementation is important in terms of understanding policy process accurately.

So, this study aims to provide explanation for how different implementation structures (top-down and bottom-up) practice the process of implementation. What are the similarities with their practices and views of implementation? In what ways both top-down and bottom-up actors practice the process of implementation alike? The study proposes to specify these differentiations and similarities by examining the implementation process in whole. Specifically, their practices and views on each of the implementation variables are examined to clarify top-down and bottom-up similarities and differentiations and these variables are derived with synthesis model of implementation. The study uses TNP reform implementation as cases throughout the dissertation in order to answer main research question. There are some similarities and differentiations between top-down and bottom-up structures. Top-down implementers practice implementation just like as bottom-up people in some issues. On the other hand, the practice of implementation may totally differ in different structures (top-down
and bottom-up). How top-down structure is different than bottom-up structure and how both structures are similar are primary findings of this study.
CHAPTER 2

PUBLIC POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter provides an overview of public policy including policy process and frameworks from a general standpoint. Implementation research in a depth manner in order to understand the policy process better is presented. Throughout literature review, the study also discusses implementation failures and challenges and methodological concerns about implementation research since the methodology was one of the major factors that lead to different trends and approaches in the field.

Public Policy

Providing a straightforward definition for public policy is a challenge since it has various aspects and contexts, and because many different definitions of public policy exist in the literature. Birkland (2005) states there is a need to look at different definitions of public policy since it would be fruitless to stick with a simple definition even though Dye (2007) argued that the search for different definitions of public policy would “degenerate into a word game” (p.17). However, it is noteworthy to state that policy is viewed from different angles and these different angles may not show the big picture of the public policy separately. For instance, from an economic perspective, public policy might be government actions that regulate economy. However, there are other entities that influence the economic policies besides the government such as the private companies. One cannot see the big picture of public policy unless he or she looks at policy from different perspectives.
This argument is supported by Agranoff (2008) indicating that today’s public policy process is complex and knowledge-based since private and public entities interact horizontally and vertically (as cited from Agranoff and McGuire, 2001, 2003). Therefore, we cannot limit the policy actions with only governments. Instead, we need to consider all other issues and factors that are involved in public policy besides government while defining public policy. In this way, we will be able to understand public policy precisely.

Among many definitions of the public policy that exist in the literature, I will provide some of the most influential. According to Dye (2007), policy analysis is “whatever government chooses to do or not to do” (p.1). This has been a classic definition since most scholars used it (Kraft and Furlong, 2007; Peters, 2007; Peters and Pierre, 2006; Sabatier, 1999; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1993). Similarly, Peters (2007) states that public policy is “sum of governmental activities” (p.4). These activities include all governmental actions that directly or indirectly influence individuals, groups, and organizations. Another definition which focuses on governmental actions comes from Cochran, Mayer, Carr, and Cayer (1999) indicating that public policy is “the actions of government and the intentions that determine those actions” (as cited in Birkland, 2005, p.18).

In addition, another definition by Anderson (2003) indicates that public policy is “a relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern” (p.2). Another good definition by Shafritz (2004) states that public policy is a regulation or law made by government on behalf of public. Also, Weimer and Vining (2005) state that public policy is as “client-oriented
advice relevant to public decisions and informed by social values” (p.24). In addition, Gerston’s (2004) definition of public policy indicates that it is “the combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or affect government positions of authority” (p.7). All of these definitions give some ideas about what public policy is, but there is no one absolute way to define it.

Given this fact, public policy is generally viewed with the focus of intentions, choices, alternatives, actions, and actors that play an important role in the policy process. Accordingly, this study views public policy as a field in which various intended and unintended social, political, and economic decisions and actions are considered in order to understand what responsible authorities are doing and how their decisions and actions shape those consequences.

On the whole, the early definitions of public policy just focused on the actions of the governments. However, recent definitions provide a more comprehensive understanding of public policy since the role of the governments and societies have changed over time. For instance, Agranoff (2008) denotes that today’s government has become more knowledge–based and technical than it was before, and that the work of government is shared by various entities in the society. Accordingly, public policy can also be considered as a transformation of the governments based on the needs of today’s society.

These developments in the governmental area also influenced public policy and necessitate a more comprehensive view of the field which takes into account the actions and factors in not only government, but also all other influential entities today. However, the central point of the definitions of public policy centers on the proper actions of the
government and examination of their allocation of services and benefits. This argument is well advocated by Peters (2007) with the reference to the Harold Lasswell’s early public policy question. He indicates that the question of “who gets what?” which was posed by Harold Lasswell many years ago is still central to understand public policy today (Peters, 2007, p.4).

In my view, public policy is all about people’s life and world. Sometimes, it is about education, health, environment, economy, and civil rights, etc. At other times, it is about social values, benefits, effectiveness, productivity, rationality, and equality, etc. In short, public policy is all about what we need. The reason that leads us to this conclusion comes from the comprehensive context of the term “policy.” Anderson (2003) defines policy as the behavior of sets of actors. These sets of actors may be an individual or organization. Also, Shafritz (2004) states that policy is “a standing decision by an authoritative source such as government, a corporation, or head of family” (p.221). These definitions of policy indicate that policy is a course of decisions, regulations, and guidelines that requires some actions to take throughout the life in this world. The nature of humanity mandates these decisions, regulations, and guidelines in order to create a livable environment in this world. Accordingly, policy is needed in all parts of the life and this makes the concept of “public policy” very comprehensive.

Policy Typology

There are three main types of policy that exist in the literature which are distributive, regulatory, and redistributive policies (Lowi, 1969). Distributive policies are goods and benefits which are available for a segment of the whole population or the entire society (Kraft and Furlong, 2007; Birkland, 2005; Anderson, 2003). The benefits
are available to everyone and receiving a benefit does not influence others. In other words, there is no competition to receive benefits under this type of policies. For instance, public schools are available to everybody. People are free to receive benefits from public school policies. However, Kraft and Furlong (2007) indicate that the members of Congress tend to distribute available resources for the benefits of their constituents which are called the “pork barrel” problem (p.88). In addition, Birkland (2005) demonstrates another problem with distributive policies which is termed as “logrolling” in political science literature. In this particular case, “members pledge to vote for each others funding bills” (Birkland, 2005, 143). In this way, both parties expect mutual benefits.

Redistributive policies, on the other hand, provide benefits and services to one group at the expense of others (Kraft and Furlong, 2007; Birkland, 2005; Anderson, 2003). There is a competition among individuals to receive benefits. Several people receive benefits from a specific policy while others do not. In other words, some individuals or groups gain at the expense of others. For instance, the government delivers Medicaid benefit to a certain group whose income level is lower than those of higher. People whose income levels are high have to buy their health insurance but people with low-level income are covered by government with Medicaid policies.

Finally, regulatory policies establish some limitations and restrictions the behaviors and actions of individuals and groups (Anderson, 2003). Kraft and Furlong (2007) state that regulatory policies were divided in two categories (competitive and protective regulatory policies) by Ripley and Franklin (1986). Competitive regulatory policy is defined by Birkland (2007) as the “policy that provision of goods or the
participation in a market to a select group of people or organizations” (p.144).

Regulations of computer software and communications are some of the regulatory policies (Kraft and Furlong, 2007). Protective regulatory policies were defined as “the policy that regulates some activity for the protection of the public” by Birkland 2005) (p.144). Environmental protection policies are good examples for this category.

Providing explanation for the type of the policies will help researcher understand the type of TNP education policies. Also, it will facilitate to understand implementation problems which are also related to the structure of implementation. For instance, it seems that TNP education policies are distributive since it provides benefits to everyone in the long run. Further, it is re-distributive policy since it provides benefits for people who win the competitive recruitment process. For instance, only 5,000 of 65,000 applicants are admitted to the PVSHE instructions each year. It means that 60,000 applicants cannot benefit while 5,000 get some benefits. Therefore, members of congress may influence implementers to claim some credits for the constituents, which leads to a pork barrel problem. So, providing explanations about these types of policies will help us understand what's going on in implementation better.

The creation of all of these policies takes time and occurs at specific sequence. The public policy process explains the whole process by dividing it into several phases of activity. Each of these processes explains a part of whole public policy and helps us understand what happens in these stages. In the following part, the policy process will be introduced.
The Public Policy Process

A comprehensive definition by Sabatier (1999) indicates that the policy process simply includes “the manner in which the problems get conceptualized and brought to government for solution; governmental institutions formulate the alternatives and select policy solutions; and those solutions get implemented evaluated, and revised” (p. 3). However, there is a lack of consensus on the definition of the policy process since it is viewed as complex. Some of the definitions of public policy process focus on the actions and the decision making process of the government while others look at it from a comprehensive perspective which includes social, political and economical, public and private considerations. So far, scholars have viewed this process from different angles to understand policy process better. Among them, stages heuristics framework has been the basis and the most influential to understand the policy process (Sabatier, 1999).

The stage heuristics attempts to understand the whole policy process by providing a “conceptual map” (Hupe and Hill in Peters and Pierre, 2006, p.16) to understand the entire policy process. Simply, it is a classical way of viewing policy process. Also, it provides clear explanation for the complex policy process by dividing the entire process into five stages including agenda setting, formulation, legitimation, implementation, and evaluation. This facilitates our understanding of policy making process. The reason for this was explained by DeLeon (1999) who noted that stage heuristics improves our way of thinking about public policy in concept and practice. In the following part, these stages will be introduced in brief to understand the policy process.
a) Agenda Setting

Agenda setting is defined by Birkland as “the process by which problems and alternative solutions gain or lose public and elite attention, or the activities of various actors and groups to cause issues to gain greater attention or to prevent them from gaining attention” (Birkland, 2005, p.108). In agenda setting, a problem begins the policy process. However, all problems may not come to the policy agenda. Stakeholders including individuals, agencies, and government discuss the problems within the agenda setting process. Only problems which are perceived as more important than others by policy entrepreneurs are more likely to come on the policy agenda. There are different factors and issues that shape the agenda setting process. Epstein and Segal (2000) investigate “the issue of salience,” questioning the criteria for an issue to come on the agenda. The “issue of salience” is the heart of the agenda setting process. The situations and factors that make something so important that policy makers would care about that problem underpins the “issue of salience.” Which problems should be on agenda and which problems are not? How can we measure the issue of salience? These are the major questions that need to be answered in agenda setting research.

b) Formulation

Once a problem comes on to the agenda for policy making, the formulation process starts. Peters (2007) states that formulation stage is a sort of development of mechanism to solve public policy problems. In this stage, specific alternatives are developed for the solutions by different authorities. During this process, various actors play important roles with different interactions. Peters (2007) illustrates this issue as a difficult game to play since various people are involved in and shape formulation.
However, formulation requires technical and cognitive knowledge about the problem in order to produce relevant solutions. He further backs up his argument stating that formulation is political, partisan, and expertise activity. The major players who are involved in this process are bureaucrats, think tank entities, interest groups, and members of Congress. Individuals or interest groups try to influence in formulation process in order to receive more benefits. Once the authorities decide a specific solution to solve the problem, the legitimation process starts.

c) Legitimation

This is the final phase to make the policy proposal lawful. The president, Congress, courts, federal agencies, White House staff, congressional committees, and interest groups are defined as the major players of policy making by Dye (2007). In this process, the proposed solution is legitimized by adopting a policy. However, a conflict may exist among the actors of different policy making actors. For instance, Dye (2007) states that the conflict between Congress and president, Republicans and Democrats, or conservatives and liberals may lead to alter or delay of the solution for the problems. He further explains that the decisions of the proximate policy makers are more likely to consider means rather than ends. Policy makers focus on means since they try to keep their power constantly and they do not care ends because ends may not provide any benefits due to the longer time period. Accordingly, Peters (2007) denotes that legitimation is the simplest but the most difficult part of the policy making process. This process, Peters further explains, is simple because the process involves technical forms of policy making with least complexity but it is difficult because all the actors have much power to act with well-defined agenda creating conflict among them.
c) Implementation

The implementation process is another important part of the policy process (Lipsky, 1980; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973). This process starts right after the adoption of a policy. According to Anderson (2003), implementation is concerned with the officials and organizations involved, the procedures and rules they follow, the tools and techniques they employ, and the political opposition and support they encounter. Furthermore, Matland (1995) views implementation as the actions of target group and implementing officials coincide with the desired goals from the authoritative decision.

Implementation is the process in which policies and programs are put into action. A good definition of implementation by Shafritz (2004) describes it as “the total process of translating a legal mandate, whether an executive order or an enacted statute, into appropriate program directives and structures that provide services or create goods” (p.150). In addition, Birkland (2005) describes implementation as “the process by which policies enacted by government are put into effect by the relevant agencies” (p.181). Also, from Dye’s (2007) perspective, implementation consists of various activities and actions designed to carry out the programs and policies by legislative branch. So, these definitions imply that implementation research mainly takes into account the execution of policies by looking at influential actors and actions that take place during the process. This process will be investigated in depth in the following part since the general area of concern in this research is public policy implementation.

d) Evaluation

Finally, the output and outcomes of the policy are subject evaluation in evaluation step. According to Anderson (2003), policy evaluation is a process of assessment,
estimation, or appraisal of a policy, including its content, goal attainment, implementation, and others. Anderson maintains that this process identifies the factors that influence the success or failure of a policy. Moreover, Ringquist (1993) states that most of implementation and evaluation researches include both policy implementation and policy evaluation parts since policy outcomes mostly depend on success or failure of implementation (Ringquist, 1993). In general, this research asks what the consequences of the policy implementation are. How do outcomes fit with the intended goals? How effective was the policy implemented? These are the main questions to answer during the policy evaluation process.

Public Policy Frameworks

Several frameworks have emerged in the public policy literature in order to understand the policy process better. These frameworks are viewed as alternatives since each of the frameworks attempts to understand a part of policy process from different perspective instead of looking at implementation as a whole process as stage heuristics did. Sabatier, in his edited (1999) study, juxtaposes some of the most promising alternative frameworks. In the following section, these frameworks are presented in brief.

a) Institutional Rational Choice

Institutional Rational Choice framework, developed by Ostrom (1986), Moe (1984), Miller (1992), and Shepsle (1989), explains how institutions affect and alter the individuals’ preferences and behaviors which are based on self interests. It specifically
focuses on the relationships between administrative agencies and Congress in order to explain the role of institutions and individuals during the policy process.

b) The Multiple-Streams Framework

*The Multiple-Streams Framework*, founded by Kingdon (1984), aims to solve the ambiguity of the policy process with the views of problem, policy, and politics streams. The problem stream consists of information and definitions about the nature of problems. The policy stream provides solutions to these problems. The politic stream consists of policy makers and elections. Policy makers have power to rule and allocate benefits to public. Also, public have power to demand some benefits from policy makers by the elections. So, elections are mutual compromise between public and policy makers which might cause to a policy change. Each stream operates independently but when these streams come together at the same time, which is described as “window of opportunity”, policy change occurs according to Kingdon. The window of opportunity is a short time of period when different factors come together with a greater attention to cause policy change (Birkland, 2005).

c) Punctuated-Equilibrium Framework

Baumgartner and Jones (1993) developed the *Punctuated-Equilibrium Framework*. This framework simply argues that the policy change occurs incrementally; however, there are some events and periods that policy shifts occur rapidly. For instance, there were some minor policy proposal about the FEMA and these changes used to occur incrementally. However, Katrina occurred and this event lead major paid policy changes regarding FEMA.
d) Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF)

Another alternative framework to understand the policy process is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993). The framework mainly focuses on the effect of the advocacy coalition within policy subsystem. Advocacy coalition consists of actors from different institutions who have and share similar policy interests. This alternative framework assumes that policy change occurs with events outside the sub-system and the competition within a policy subsystem.

e) Policy Diffusion Framework

In addition, the Policy Diffusion Framework, developed by Berry and Berry (1990, 1992, and 1999), Mintrom and Vergari (1998), and other scholars, explains the reasons for variation and separation of policy adoption among organizations, institutions, and governments (As cited in Sabatier, 1999). For instance, some states implement a specific policy while others do not. The reasons for these variations are explained by this framework.

All of these frameworks are alternatives to understand policy process better. Each framework provides different perspectives and explains policy process from different angles. Contrary to the stage heuristics, the policy frameworks provide explanations for some parts of the whole policy process. The focus in these frameworks does not cover the entire process. Instead, the emphasis is on specific parts of the policy process. For instance, multiple streams framework mostly explains the agenda setting part of the whole process. This framework does not answer the question of how
the policies diffuse. The diffusion of policies is explained by Berry and Berry with Policy Diffusion Framework. For this reason, we need to look further at implementation.

Public Policy Implementation

The early school of public policy examined the decision making process of politics considering the internal and external influence of policy making process. The major concerns were the influence of interest groups liberalism through policy making process (Lowi, 1969; Kaufman, 1969), and narrow approaches through policy analysis (Dror, 1967; Wildavsky, 1969). By interest group liberalism, Lowi had concerns about the actions of the politicians claiming that policy makers distribute benefits to individual groups favorably with interest group liberalism. In addition, Dror (1969) and other founding scholars complained system analysts since they disregarded broad conception of policy making and decision making indicating that they had narrow approaches to look at public policy. Later, the emphasis shifted to goal displacement during the policy implementation process with Pressman and Wildavsky’s (1973) “Implementation” works (Lipsky, 1980; Stone, 2002; Dye, 2007; and Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989). Accordingly, goal displacements caused to some gaps between policy objectives and policy outcomes. In other words, the field of public policy recognized the existence of these gaps between policy development and the achievement of the policy goals (Dye, 2007).

Seeing that, implementation scholars have placed special emphasis on the implementation process. Fitz, Haplin, and Power (1994) provide a logical explanation for why scholars should pay attention to implementation. They indicate that, among different stages of policy process, implementation stage focuses on the complex
determinants of implementation because scholars broadly interested to explore the processes and the structures “within policy objectives are put into practice” (Fitz, Halpin, and Power, 1994, p.53). Therefore, an analysis of implementation aims to view that complexity in an understandable way that policy entrepreneurs can take some actions for the effectiveness of the program.

However, it is difficult to understand the implementation process unless a systematic implementation analysis is provided. The nature of the policies may be formulated in good shape but this will not lead effective policy outcomes without a proper implementation. Therefore, a systematic analysis of implementation will provide a better understanding implementation and policy entrepreneurs will be able to see the reasons for failure or success clearly which lead them to take some actions for the improvement of the program.

Implementation Actors

From a traditional politics administration dichotomy perspective, administrative agencies are the primary entities that are in charge of implementation work. Politics deal with the policies while administrators are supposed to execute those policies according to Wilson (1887) and Goodnow (1900). However, the number of the actors who are involved in execution of policies has dramatically increased over time in accordance with the development of the society and the world.

Anderson (2003) provides a comprehensive analysis of today's implementation actors systematically. He states that many other players besides the administrative agencies are involved in the implementation process in various ways. He maintains that implementation actors consist of three main entities which are administrative
organizations, administrative politics, and administration policy making. First, administrative organizations consist of national executive branches, independent regulatory commissions, government corporations, and independent agencies. Second, administrative politics include basic law, rules and regulations, the chief executive, the congressional system of oversight, interest groups, political parties, and media. Third, administrative policy making includes all patterns of decision making such as rule making, adjudication, law enforcement, and program operations.

In addition, Anderson states that the legislative bodies, the courts, pressure groups, and community organizations are other actors that play role during the implementation. The legislative bodies control agencies with some control devices such as hearings, legislative veto, senatorial approval, specificity of legislation, budgetary issues, and caseworks. Also, the courts enforce administrative agencies via judicial actions. In addition to the interest group liberalism which influences policy making process, similar pressure groups shift their influences to the implementers with significant influences. Finally, local level organizations and entities involve in the implementation of national broad policies in their fields such as a farmer committee of a town during the implementation of a national farming policy (Anderson, 2003).

Effective Implementation of a Policy

Implementation scholars have declared various factors that influence effective implementation. No matter which factors or methodology were used, the efforts of researches were for effective implementation. Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989), in their “Implementation and Public Policy” classic, summarize the criteria of effective implementation analysis. According to them, effective implementation analysis should
address the consistency of both the policy outputs and compare the overall outcomes of
the implementation process with the desired official objectives, examine the degree of
modification of the original objectives and strategies anticipated and outlined by the
policy makers during the process of policy implementation by the policy implementers,
and identify the principal factors that affect the goal and strategy modifications, goal
attainment, and significant political impacts.

Peters (2007), in his study, provides a systematic analysis factors that affect the
effectiveness of the implementation. Some of these conceptualized factors will be
presented in the following paragraphs. The first factor that Peters raises is that the
nature of the legislation effects policy implementation. The text and content of the policy
lead implementers to make specific decisions for the relevant actions. If things are not
written and stated clearly and precisely, the interpretation of the implementers might
create gaps between policy objectives and outcomes. More importantly, the content of
the policies should not contradict any social, political, and ethical values of the society.
For instance, policy should be designed based on equal education opportunity.

The other factors that affect implementation, according to Peters, are the “policy
issues” (p.104). There are various policies that regulate the society and provide benefits
for people who need it. The type and function of the policies should be directly related to
a problem of the society. Policy makers should know underlying reasons of the
problems and propose policies that would be remedy to those problems. In other words,
they should have relevant information about a problem. Otherwise, implementation of
policy may not solve the problem.
Political setting is another factor that affects implementation according to Peters. Policies are produced by political setting and there might be a conflict among political parties. Any disagreements may affect policy implementation negatively. So, there should be a consensus of political setting for better implementation.

The other important factor is “interest group liberalism” as coined to Lowi (Peters, 2007). Interest groups have big influence on policies and they create unfair competition. Interest groups have different powers and more powerful groups may create unfairness during the implementation. Being more vocalized than others might be a reason to receive more benefits. Accordingly, interest groups also influence implementation process and this creates problems in implementation.

In addition to the examination of various actors, factors, and aspects that take place during the implementation, implementation research should also consider the magnitude of the effects of these factors in different levels such as federal, state, and local. The problems, conditions, and influences might differ at different levels. Hence, a comprehensive analysis of implementation focusing on different levels is essential. In a recent study, Slack (2005) has raised this problem indicating that most of the implementation research focused on federal level policy implementation rather than state and local level. Slack also indicates that scholars disregarded examining informal and formal decisions and agreements which are not based on public law. Moreover, Slack states that implementation research is not updated with the contemporary issues by avoiding examination of new policies in the area of information technology, welfare, urban planning, and foreign investment.
Accordingly, scholars have suggested various ways for the improvement of the field. For instance, Lester and Bowman's (1989) efforts are noteworthy in terms of drawing the map of the field by providing possible ways for advance. Their study fills the gaps and tests the theory of implementation with a comparative research. Their findings suggest that the policy problem should be assessed with a careful examination before taking any action for the solution. Further, it is necessary to update all relevant units and procedures for better implementation. Lastly, Lester and Bowman state that allocation of resources such as financial and human resources should be at reasonable level for the effective and rapid implementation.

Organizational Effects on Implementation

Implementation is mostly shaped by the characteristics of the organizations. O'Toole (1986) indicates that implementation requires multiple interactions and involvement of the organizations and individuals. Accordingly, the scholars of the implementation research have raised significant issues in multi-actor and multi-organizational implementing units. The actors of implementation act inside organizations and the nature of the organizations directly affects the effectiveness of the implementation. They play important roles to make decisions about policies and carry out the tasks that policies propose. For effective implementation, Hood (1976) suggests five issues regarding appropriate administration of the implementation in organizations as follows: (As cited in Peters, 2007, p.108).

1. “Administration would be unitary: it would be one vast army all marching to the same drummer.”
2. The norms and rules of administration would be uniform throughout the organization.

3. There would be no resistance to commands.

4. There would be perfect information and communication within the organization.


These issues indicate that organizations should have a compatible administrative structure, clear and consistent policies, and an ideal environment in which members share responsibility. Further, there should be an ideal communication environment which leads to flow relevant information among members. Finally, the time span to implement a policy should be arranged in accordance with the required time span for an effective implementation. The time when the policy is implemented and the time length of the implementation should be considered for the effective implementation. For instance, a policy should be implemented while the policy problem is still in progress. When the problem ends somehow, there is no need for the policy. Peters (2007) juxtaposes these ideal characteristics however, he indicates that these conditions are lacking in today’s organizations.

Implementation Failures

Scholars have raised various issues that lead failure of implementation. A general perspective for policy implementation was drawn by Dye (2007). Dye indicates that implementation actors may not be value-free and their interpretation on policy decisions might be subjective. The explanation for this argument of Dye comes from his other argument on the complexity of human behavior. Most policies are designed to
solve social problems of the societies and it is difficult to take the most appropriate 
actions to solve the societal problems because of the complexity of human behaviors. 
The needs and conditions are evolving constantly and accurate prediction of actual 
needs is challenging. This complexity leads implementation actors to act subjectively 
and cause to failure of the implementation.

In addition, Birkland states that the assessment of failure should be based on the 
alternatives of other policy implementations in terms of “the likelihood that other options 
would have been more or less successful” (Birkland, 2005, p.191, as cited from Ingram 
and Mann, 1980). Birkland maintains that the success of implementation may depend 
upon other policies since different policies are interrelated. The failure of a policy might 
cause to failure of another policy. Also, excessive policy expectation may also cause to 
failure of the implementation according to Birkland. If people demands are higher than 
the capacity of the policies, implementation results failure. In addition, inadequate 
thetical basis for the policy also causes to failure (Also, cited in Mazmanian and 
Sabatier, 1983). The policy should be based on sound causal theory for effective 
implementation (Birkland, 2005). Birkland also states that the use of ineffective tools to 
implementation policy is another factor that causes failure. These tools consist of any 
relevant resource, program, or models that are applicable for the implementation of the 
policies. Therefore, implementation tools should be selected based on their functionality 
on the specific policy implementation (Birkland, 2005, as cited from Ingram and Mann, 
1980).

Moreover, Peters (2007) presents some potential problems that affect 
implementation of the policies in organizations. These might create problems or failure
of implementation during implementation for individuals and organizations. First, standard operating procedures (SOP) in the organizations might create red-tape during the process of implementation or contradict with the objectives of the policies. In addition, organizational communication and inter-organizational relations might create problems in flowing adequate information among individuals and this leads lack of information to implement policies appropriately. Also, time span may be problematic if the policy is not implemented on time during the problems exist.

The other problem that Peters stresses is horseshoe-nail problems. Deriving its root from Hood (1976), a horseshoe-nail problem relates to un-planned and lack of availability resources for effective implementation. Peters specifically defines horseshoe-nail problem as “the failure to provide the nail results in the loss of the horse” (p.115, as cited from Hood, 1976). Therefore, an appropriate planning for the implementation with relevant information and resources is essential for effective implementation. Peters states that any horseshoe-nail problems might cause failure of implementation.

Additionally, inter-organizational relations affect policies. If their communications and relations positive, it will lead effective implementation. Otherwise, it will affect implementation negatively. Another factor that affects implementation in organizations is the vertical and horizontal factors. These structures may crate some gaps between policy makers and implementers. For instance, policy implementers may not exactly know what policy makers intend and this may cause to failure of implementation. This problem also relates to the top-down and bottom-up structures of the implementation which may create some gaps during implementation (Peters, 2007, p. 109-117).
Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer (2002) indicate that the most important reasons for the failure of the policy implementation comes from the inability of policy makers to structure clear and consistent policy objectives and outcomes as well as the dysfunction of the appropriate supervision of the implementation of the desired goals (Also in Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989). Accordingly, the clarity and consistency of policy objectives affect implementation and policy outcomes. More importantly, the leadership and management skills of the officials who are in charge of implementing policies are also important elements that need to be considered while analyzing success or failure of the policies.

It seems that the existence of problems during implementation process is very common in today’s society. One of the most important issues which are on today’s organizations’ agenda is to establish resistant and effective structures to minimize these problems. However, the solutions are not limited in governmental resources as it was before. Rather, as Crozier (2008) states, the solutions for today’s public policy problems are based on “less of a governmental dictum and more of an ongoing negotiation among government and non-government actors” (p.3).

Challenges in Implementation Research

Research on public policy implementation has improved in accordance with the field of public policy. However, scholars have critically questioned the field in order to know more about implementation. Lack of research has always dominated to the field since its origin (Edwards, 1980). Most scholars assert that we still have little evidence to understand the process empirically. For instance, Seatren (2005) reviews the studies on public policy with a comprehensive literature survey in the field. He indicates that “we
know surprisingly little” (p. 559) about the key aspects and cumulative research results of the field despite various researches over time. According to Seatren’s findings, the critical condition of implementation analysis is still continuing indicating a lack of empirical research in the field. For instance his findings suggest that “doctoral dissertations are the most ignored, but probably the richest, largest, and best sources of empirical research results” (Seatren, 2005, p.559). It seems that Slack’s argument needs further examination since the empirical research results of a scientific field of study should not depend on only doctoral dissertations.

Accordingly, some of scholars do not agree with this pessimist conclusion about public policy implementation analysis. In his review study, O’Toole (2000) states that implementation field might have some problems but it is still "alive and lively” (p.263). He further explains that the field continues to bear crucial issues of management and policy such as democratic orientation, network management, and intellectual development of the field.

Reviewing all different studies on policy implementation, it can be inferred that the field is difficult to study since it is complex and dynamic (Goggin, 1986). It is complex because there are lots of actors and factors that take place (Goggin, 1986). It is dynamic because it constantly changes and progresses (Goggin, 1986). However, the field of implementation, like all other fields, is improving by overcoming these challenges with new studies. Even though pessimistic approach on current implementation research seems to decelerate the development of the field, it might lead to new efforts to strengthen the field as O’Toole advised. He believes that a resurgence of attention to the field should be exorted.
In addition, O’Toole (2000) addresses crucial issues for the field of implementation research. He states that the scholars have neglected implementation research since 1990, indicating that implementation issue started to recede from the agenda since the policy agenda started to preoccupy with devolution, cutbacks, and holding lines. In other words, the field of public policy focused on budgetary and economic issues by neglecting implementation and implementation was no longer on policy agenda. He maintains that the field surged with the emergence of disappointment in the program implementations in 1960s and 1970s with the Pressman and Wildavsky’s work (O’Toole, 2000). Implementation was also viewed as “a theme posing a hegemonic threat” (p.264) to the field of public administration by traditional students of public administration (O’Toole, 2000; Also cited in Kettl, 1990 and 1993). O’Toole demonstrates his concerns indicating that even though implementation research did not provide satisfied solutions for the field, its development is disregarded. The practical world is as much in a need of updated and valid knowledge of policy implementation in today’s world as it has ever been (O’Toole, 2000).

Therefore, O’Toole argues that “there is no theory of implementation that commands general agreement” (O’Toole, 1986, p.182, also cited in O’Toole and Montjoy, 1984). The implementation researchers use diverse methodologies from different theoretical perspectives to understand the process of implementation better (O’Toole, 1986; Also cited in O’Toole and Montjoy, 1984). O’Toole indicates that “the state of the field’s empirical theory” and “normative disagreement” in the implementation research are the two main factors which are obstacle for the field’s development (O’Toole, 1986, p.181).
Methodological Concerns

In addition to conceptual and theoretical concerns of policy implementation research, some methodological problems and solutions had been suggested by students of public policy implementation. DeLeon and Martel (2006) states that “there are no easy answers” for policy questions, but the field can survive with a “more positivist approach, more participatory guideline, the application of social network analysis, and a greater use of quantitative methodology” (p. 43). In addition, Lester and Bowman (1987) state that although implementation research provided better understanding for the questions of what implementation is and how it differs (Lester, Bowman, Goggin, and O’Toole, 1987 as cited in Lester and Bowman, 1989), there are some methodological and conceptual difficulties (Lester et al., 1987 as cited in Lester and Bowman, 1989) such as relying on only a case study methodology and lack of comparative analysis (Gormley, 1986 as cited in Lester and Bowman, 1989). However, these methodological issues have tremendously shaped the development of the field.

Goggin has been one of the leading scholars that raised methodological concerns in implementation research. Goggin (1986) states that implementation study has “too many variables and too few cases” which creates obstacles for the implementation researchers (p.331). He indicates that three strategies have been employed by implementation researchers in order to overcome these problems. These strategies advocate that the number of variables should be decreased to only those that are critical, that the number of cases should be increased, and that the selection of cases should be made on the basis of comparability and similarity.
In the context of the complexity of implementation variables, Goggin identifies the “policy makers” and the “setting” as the two main critical independent variables that implementation researchers should focus on. These are individuals and institutions that are involved in the implementation process. On the other hand, “duration” and “change” are the two critical independent variables. Duration refers to the time period designated to operate and interpret the policies while change relates to the modification between the beginning and the end of implementation process. If implementation of a policy is delayed and substantially modified, the performance of the implementation is considered to be political and tends to be unsuccessful. If there is little modification and the policy is implemented promptly, it is considered administrative and tends to be successful based on the Goggin’s analysis. It seems that Goggin’s these findings directed students of public policy implementation to structure implementation variables.

Also, in my view, Goggin’s (1986) concerns relating to “too few cases/too many variables” are supported by the evidences from the O’Toole’s (1986) review. In his study, Matland (1995) also reviews O’Toole’s (1986) findings and attempts to solve the problem of “too many variables.” O’Toole reviewed over one hundred implementation studies and found over 300 key variables which are important determinants of the implementation process. With reference to O’Toole’s study, Matland (1995), in his study, states that “a literature with three hundred critical variables does not need more variables: It needs structure” (p.146). Therefore, he proposed to structure implementation to study and describe implementation in order to solve problem of “too many variables.” Specifically, he treated top-down and bottom-up models to structure
implementation. Therefore, it seems that structuring implementation would be remedy for Goggin’s “too many variables” problem.

Conclusion of the Chapter

Even though the school of public policy has provided various ways of understanding policy process such as stage heuristics and alternative frameworks, the variations in actors, organizations, and research still view the field as problematic. It can be clearly understood that the field’s problems turn around lack of empirical research results, lack of comparative analysis, lack of parsimony (Lester and Bowman, 1989), disregarding local level, overemphasis on federal level, outmoded from contemporary issues (Slack, 2005), and normative disagreement on theory (O’Toole and Monjoy, 1984; O’Toole, 1986). In other words, the field of public policy implementation has been neglected by scholars in some ways. However, the existence of these problems should not lead one to conclude pessimist situation about the field. Rather, each effort to state any problem leads to the development of the field. Therefore, more focus and research is needed for the development of the field.

From the methodological perspective, it is obvious that there are too many variables that are involved in implementation. The attempt to use all variables without any structural construction will not provide an efficient work to understand all parts of the policy implementation process. Therefore, a systematic analysis of implementation is essential by using effective structural tools that would categorize too many variables systematically. In this way, implementation research will provide systematic and relevant knowledge to understand the process better and to capture all influences of implementation on policy outcomes. Within this direction, students of the public policy
have developed different approaches to look understand and view implementation process accurately. In the following part, the primary approaches to implementation are discussed.
CHAPTER 3

STRUCTURE OF IMPLEMENTATION

In this chapter, approaches to implementation in a policy process are presented in order to answer the first minor research question. Specifically, top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis models are identified in detail. Some benefits and drawbacks are also discussed. The literature provided in this chapter indicates that both top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation have some strengths and weaknesses in understanding this process and a combination of these two approaches with a synthesis provides more comprehensive understanding of the process. The discussions about top-down and bottom-up approaches also provide explanations for the top-down and bottom-up structures.

The Top-down Approach to Implementation

A good definition for a top-down approach is authored by Birkland (2005). He indicates that it is an "approach to studying policy implementation in which one first understands the goals and motivations of the highest level initiators of policy, and then tracks the policy through its implementation at the lowest level" (Birkland, 2005, p.182). Sabatier (1986) states that top-down approach simply focuses on the decisions of central authorities and actions of the top implementers who hold high positions in organizations in order to explain the influence on policy implementation process and policy outcomes. Ringquist (1993) also identifies top-down approach stating that it "seeks to identify what affect controllable political factors (and uncontrollable ones) have
on the actions of agency officials, and thus on policy success” (p.1025). So, a top-down approach to implementation focuses on the decisions and the actions of the implementers who shaped implementation at high level by capturing main influences that affected implementation and policy outcomes through lower level.

Fitz et al. provide a similar definition indicating that top-down studies mainly focus on mapping the factors that involve in the process, and decision authorities in policy development (Fitz et al, 1994, also cited in Sabatier and Mazmanian, 1981). This definition by Fitz et al. was further clarified when they noted that the top-down implementation researchers focused on centrally developed policies when the primary concern is to “maximize the translation of the policy objectives into practice” (Fitz et al, 1994, p.54). In this condition, they neglect policy management and execution issues. In this context, a top-down structure maps the factors that influenced implementation and, then focuses on finding linkages between implementation of the policies and their outcomes. Reviewing the literature, we observe several features of the top-down approach. In the following section, the features of the top-down approach are presented.

The Features of Top-down Approach

The literature presents several characteristics of the top-down approaches. First, the top-down approach largely concerns the achievement of policy objectives. In other words, the compliance between policy objectives and policy outcomes is highly emphasized in top-down approach. In addition, as various implementation scholars stated, the achievement of the reform policies depend on successful implementation. For instance, Van Meter and Von Horn (1975) state that successful implementation is
possible when there is a high goal consensus during the policy implementation. They state that any incompatibility influences the success of the implementation negatively. To illustrate, in an implementation of health policy such as Medicaid, if the Department of Health, state health departments, and local health departments (which are major policy makers and implementers of a health policy) have high goal consensus about the policy objectives and implementation, this will lead successful implementation and achievement of health policy objectives.

Second, the main objectives of the top-down studies turned around policy decision the extent to which policy objectives are achieved after the implementation is examined rather than analysis of policy makers which Sabatier (1986) describes as “multitude of actors” (p.22). In other words, top-down analysis focuses on policy decision rather than the emphasis on the actions of the actors at operational level during the program implementation.

Third, advocates of the top-down approach have been vocal about central decision making authorities and political influences on implementation. For instance, in his study, Sabatier (1986) states that the variables that Mazmanian and Sabatier conceptualized basically identify the conditions of the primary policy decision and following economic and political interaction in the implementation process. Sabatier (1986) further goes on to list the essential questions which top-down models ask. For example:

1. “To what extent were the actions of implementing officials and target groups consistent with (the objectives and procedures outlined in) that policy decision?
2. To what extent were the objectives attained over time, i.e. to what extent were the impacts consistent with the objectives?

3. What were the principal factors affecting policy outputs and impacts, both those relevant to the official policy as well as other politically significant ones?

4. How was the policy reformulated over time on the basis of experience?” (Sabatier, 1986, p. 22).

These questions briefly summarize the main point of the top-down approach. To put it briefly, top down approach mainly focuses on central actors and factors which play an important role. Further, it emphasizes in policy objectives and goals since these goals and objectives are shaped by the capacity and the nature of policies (Birkland, 2005). Furthermore, the capacity of central implementers is also concerned in this approach because it affects policy outputs and outcomes.

In regard to successful implementation, from a top-down perspective, the scholars have mostly focused on major actors who involved in implementation. Ringquist (1993) states that top-down models aim to examine the effects of the political factors on actions of the implementers which lead to success or failure of the policy objectives (Ringquist, 1993). With reference to Ringquist, it can be assumed that any influential actions of implementers directly or indirectly impacts success or failure of implementation.

Another point of successful implementation was presented by Hogwood and Gunn (1984) from a top-down perspective (As cited in Powell, 1999). Hogwood and Gun indicates that availability of the resources is an important element which influences
policy implementation and outcomes. Hence, it is important to track the availability of resources such as finance and personnel that were needed for the proper implementation in order to understand the influences better by using top-down model.

Also, Hogwood and Gunn’s additional explanations about a top-down approach indicate that a single administrative structure tends to lead more successful implementation and outcomes than multiple structures. They explain the underlying reason for this argument indicating that multiple implementing authorities tend to experience more problems than the single ones. Accordingly, the more problem exist during the implementation the less successful will occur in implementation.

Further, Mazmanian and Sabatier’s (1983) work has been shown as representative for a top-down approach by Sabatier (1986), Ringquist (1993), Fitz et al., (1994), and Matland (1995). This framework was first developed in the early 1980s and then it was further modified in their 1989 study. It presents a systematic explanation for the crucial variables that affect the policy implementation process. Specifically, the framework conceptualizes various different political, legal, and tractability variables that affect the implementation process.

These all variables were used as important tools to understand the process of implementation from a top-down perspective in the past since the authors believed that providing and accurate information about implementation was possible by applying these variables to only top-down implementers. However, this does not draw accurate information about structure of implementation for this research since structure of implementation in this research is not based on implementation variables. Rather, structure of implementation in this research is based on the positions that top-down and
bottom-up implementers hold in an implementation process. The variables of implementation are synthesized and used as tools to understand implementation. The structure of implementation was clarified by dividing all implementers in two groups as top-down and bottom-up. Then, each of the groups was asked questions about implementation and these questions were derived from previous top-down and bottom-up researches with a synthesis.

In the following paragraphs, a clear identification of these variables that affect the achievement of the desired legal objectives throughout the policy implementation process will be provided as shown in Figure 2 (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989, p.22). Mazmanian and Sabatier divide all variables into three main categories which are “tractability of the problems,” “the ability of the statute to structure implementation,” and non-statutory variables affecting implementation” (p.21). The authors believed that these all variables were applicable in the top-down structures but later on they also accepted that it would be possible to use these variables in both top-down and bottom-up structures with a synthesis.

First, tractability factors relate to the capability of the problems being addressed. This includes the manageability of the problems too. For instance, there are some social problems that are easy to handle while others are difficult. Mazmanian and Sabatier state that tractability factors mainly describe social problems that might be influential in a policy implementation. Tractability factors consist of technical difficulties, diversity of target group behavior, target group as percentage of the population, and the extent of behavioral change required. Technical difficulties aim to explain influences related to the lack of technical requisites during a program implementation.
Figure 2. Mazmanian and Sabatier’s framework (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989, p.22).

In addition, Mazmanian and Sabatier state that the diversity of the behaviors being mandated for target group matters and the more diverse behaviors required leads
to more difficulty in implementation. In addition, the population of the target group for the policy implementation also play important role. The authors state that the smaller groups of target group lead successful implementation. Also, the magnitude of required behavioral change is important during implementation since the higher degree of change require more efforts to make change (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983).

Second, Mazmanian and Sabatier construct statutory variables which focus on the nature and the capability of the policies. These factors are “clarity and consistency of objectives”, “incorporation of adequate causal theory”, “initial allocation of resources”, “hierarchical integration”, “decision rules of agencies”, “recruitment of implementing officials,” and “formal access by outsiders” (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983, p 25-29).

These variables were further defined by the authors in their study. According to Mazmanian and Sabatier, it is important that the policy objectives be specified and defined clearly and consistently. In addition, the policy should be compatible with sound theory and there should be a causal linkage between the required actions of the policy and relevant theoretical basis. Also, the availability and allocation of relevant resources for implementation is important for the effective implementation. Mazmanian and Sabatier indicate that lack of resources leads failure of implementation. The hierarchical communication of implementing institutions as well as their decision making qualities are other factors that affect implementation. Moreover, the authors indicate that the policy objectives should require and employ implementing officials who are capable of achieving policy goals and the nature of the policy should allow participation of outside supporters (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989).
Finally, Mazmanian and Sabatier state that non-statutory variables explain non-legal variables that influence policy implementation and outcomes. These variables include “socioeconomic conditions and technology”, “public support”, “attitudes and resources of constituency groups”, “support from sovereigns,” and “leadership skills of implementing agencies” (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989, p. 30-34). Mazmanian and Sabatier indicate that any social, economic, and technological issues that has significant mean regarding to the policy to be implemented are important factors that affects implementation and outcomes. In addition, citizens’ attitudes and perceptions toward the policy and their support are other significant factors that affect implementation. Their positive perceptions and higher degree of support lead higher quality of implementation and outcomes. In addition to citizens, sovereigns’ support is also important since they have power to allocate financial resources, use discretion, and make revisions in policies. Additionally, the leadership skills of the implementers and their commitment to achieve policy goals are other important factors. Lack of leadership and unwillingness of the implementers affect implementation negatively (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989).

In addition to these potential effects which are considered as independent variables (X), Mazmanian and Sabatier’s framework also provides subsequent stages, which can be considered as dependent variables (Y) in the implementation process. These variables are related outputs and outcomes of the implementation and consist of “policy outputs of implementing agencies,” “compliance with policy outputs by target groups,” “actual impacts of policy outputs,” “perceived impacts of policy outputs,” and “major revision in statute” (p.35).
Mazmanian and Sabatier state that implementing agencies should take specific actions and produce relevant instruments which are proposed with policy objectives. For instance, some rules, regulations, and decisions, etc. should be established and implemented if a policy requires. In addition, the transformation of policy objectives into practice can be observed with the compliance between target groups and policy outputs. Any non-compliance action results the failure of the implementation.

In addition, the authors state that the ultimate achievement of policy objectives leads to actual outputs when there is compliance between policy objectives and implementing outputs, the target groups conforms those outputs, and there is no conflict with the theory and the implementation. Also, actual impacts of the policy may be perceived differently. Therefore, perceived policy outputs are other important issues in terms of policy success. Finally, implementation of a specific policy may require revising, reformulating, or changing policy and this issue was shown as another indicator to determine policy success (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989).

In an overview article, Sabatier (1986) critically reviewed Mazmanian and Sabatier’s implementation framework. In his study, Sabatier basically examined 20 different studies which utilized Mazmanian and Sabatier’s top-down framework to study implementation. He states that the majority of reviewed studies were selected among the US local and state level in ten different policy areas such as education, land use control, and environmental protection. Sabatier indicates that Mazmanian and Sabatier’s top down model had a wide range of use presenting its validity and the applicability in the policy area.
Another attempt to test the top-down model comes from Ringquist (1993). He provides a comprehensive categorization of the factors that affect implementation and policy outcomes some of which were borrowed from Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989). Although Ringquist did not drive a clear top-down direction in his research, he states that general trend of his research represents a top-down work. According to his analysis, there are four main factors that shape and affect implementation.

The first factor is “internal statutory factors” (Ringquist, 1993, p.1025). Internal statutory factors consist of clear statute with consistent goals, technical resources, policy tools, and strong causal theory. Ringquist states that the nature of the policy is the main tools of implementers to act and achieve specific goals. Therefore, as Mazmanian and Sabatier emphasized, it is important to provide clear statute with strong theory and relevant tools. The content of the policy should provide relevant actions for implementers to achieve policy goals.

The second factor that affects implementation is “internal political factors” (Ringquist, 1993, p.1026). The internal political factors relate to the support and bureaucratic capacity. The author states that internal political influences are based on resources and characteristics of bureaucratic capacity. It is necessary to provide relevant technical, managerial, and financial resources for the success of the implementation. Failure to support bureaucratic capacity in any way will affect policy outcomes negatively (Ringquist, 1993).

The third factor that Ringquist raised is administrative outputs. The administrative outputs relate to the adequate bureaucratic activity such as adequate inspection and well-targeted enforcement. The success of the implementation also depends on the
compliance between the actions taken by the agencies and implementers and the policy regulations. Agencies and implementers should provide sufficient and appropriate actions to achieve policy goals. In doing so, the actions should be arranged strategically for the effectiveness of the implementation.

The other factor that affects policy implementation and outcomes is “external environmental factors” according to the Ringquist. External factors consist of any influences besides the administrative outputs, statutory, factors, and political factors such as socioeconomic conditions, population, education etc. Also, it is important to determine relevant external factors in a policy implementation case. The external factors should somehow relate and affect implementation and outcomes of the policies in order to be considered as significant.

Strengths

Given an overview of the top-down model, it is doubtless that there are some benefits to use this approach. For instance, Ringquist (1993) presents some of them (as cited in Sabatier, 1986). First, Ringquist indicates that the top-down approach is most applicable when the goal is the assessment of the effects of the previously implemented policies for the effective implementation. At this point, the utility of top-down model is more appropriate for effective implementation. Second, Ringquist assert that top-down models are more applicable in the field of social regulatory policies as he cites from Ripley and Franklin (1986). He further states that conditions of the effective implementation vary according to the policy types. Finally, top-down models are more useful in terms of accessibility to the strong state regulatory agencies which are dominant to the implementation process (Ringquist, 1993).
Sabatier presents some additional benefits of top-down model in his review study of Mazmanian and Sabatier’s top-down model. First, the legal structure of the implementation process has emerged as an important element in determining the success or failure of policy in the top-down model. “The evidence suggests that, while fairly coherent structuring is difficult, it occurs more frequently than critics realize, and when present, proves to be very important” (Sabatier, 1986, p.27). Second, the six criteria for effective implementation allow policy entrepreneurs and researchers to understand the variation in the program implementation performance over time. These criteria are consist of a sound theory identifying causal linkages and principal factors, clarity and consistency of the objectives, maximizing the performance of implementing officials, substantial managerial skills of implementers, support by constituency groups, and relevant socio-economic conditions. Finally, the “legally-mandated objectives” of the framework encouraged researchers to focus on the evaluation of governmental performance more optimistically rather than the pessimistic evaluation of the first generation scholars. Legally-mandated objectives are required actions that the nature of the policy proposes to achieve.

Weaknesses

While the top-down approach had a wide range of use and benefits in implementation research (Winter, 2006; Hill and Hupe, 2002; Matland, 1994: Ringquist, 1993; Sabatier, 1986), some limitations and problems exist. Several studies have pointed out similar drawbacks and problems about top-down approaches. An overview of these problems will reveal all critical issues when one uses top-down approach.
Some of the problematic issues are addressed by Winter (2006). He states that the ultimate goal of public policies is to benefit citizens and this benefit occurs with the delivery of policies by front-line staff; however, central authorities, which top-down focuses on, do not have strong control over these front-line workers. For instance, a health officer in a local health office has discretion to implement a health policy in his or her area as a front-line staff, but the Head of State Health Department cannot control all actions of him or her. Health officer will use his or her discretion, ability, and knowledge to implement a particular components and this will shape implementation and outcomes. There might be some control mechanisms inside he organization; however, this might not be sufficient to control front-line staff constantly according to opponents of top-down approach.

Furthermore, Winter (2006) develops his argument claiming that top-down approach overemphasizes “the ability of policy proponents to structure implementation” by neglecting “the ability of policy opponents” to interfere the structure of implementation (p.153). Sabatier (1986) and Hilland Hupe (2002) also agree with Winter’s argument. As a result, it can be assured that implementation researchers should balance the emphasis throughout the process of implementation.

In addition, Powell (1999) criticizes top-down approach as being dependent on “technocratic assumptions” which pertain to government based knowledge and administration (p.10). He further explains his argument indicating that top-down approach assumes that successful implementation is depend on appropriate organizational structures and procedures by neglecting the actions of different actors.
Seeing that there are various factors that influence implementation, an implementation analysis should not only depend on technocratic assumptions.

Another important criticism was about political control of the bureaucracy. Elmore (1980) posits that the notion that policy makers can control the political, organizational, and technological processes is unrealistic since authority is controlled and delegated by appointed and elected policy makers (p. 603). In addition, Elmore states that the top-down approach treats only a narrow range of possible explanations for the implementation failures" (p.604). These arguments for the limitations of the top-down approach are well supported throughout his work and he suggests forward mapping to provide better explanations for the implementation.

Some other research sheds additional light on limitations of top-down approach. For instance, Sabatier (1986), known as one of the founder of top-down approach, critically evaluates his previous top-down work conducted with Mazmanian in review article and presents some criticisms. One of the top-down criticisms that Sabatier relays in his study is about time frame. He states that even though top-down model includes longer policy orientations to study implementation, it does not drive a conceptual explanation for the policy reformations which take long time period since the top-down models arises from the time frame to look at the policy changes which occur in the period of a decade or more. In the long run, Sabatier states, the framework does not consider the influence of the other strategies such as political stability or socioeconomic developments that might be a cornerstone for a better dynamic model (Sabatier, 1986).

Another criticism that Sabatier raises is that top-down model has wide use in the areas where a major policy dominates to the field; however, it does not provide an
appropriate use in the policy areas in which there is no dominant policy, such as during the implementation of social service policies. He provides additional explanation from the Mazmanian and Sabatier’s top-down framework indicating that hierarchical integration and inadequacy of the causal theory were considered to ensure the social variables; however, they cannot provide relevant explanations in the complex situations (Sabatier, 1986).

The other major criticism relies on the distinction between policy implementation and formulation according to Sabatier. He maintains that top-down models advocate this distinction. Sabatier further states that the opponents of the top-down models indicate that this distinction is useless and misleading since most of the organizations are involved in both formulation and implementation process at the same time and a clear distinction is not possible in all cases. Hence, the attempt to create any distinction between formulation and implementation stages simply disregarded the administrators, legislators, and other policy entrepreneurs (Sabatier, 1986).

Sabatier (1986) concludes that even though the first two criticisms presented above were reasonably persuasive, the third one had not been taken so seriously by the scholars in the discussion of top-down and bottom-up implementation. He states that While Mazmanian and Sabatier recognize the arguments of Lipsky, Elmore, and Hjern regarding the usefulness of the top-down approach; however, they disagree with their pessimistic conclusion which indicates that target groups and street level bureaucrats have a dominant influence on policy implementation, reflecting their own preferences throughout the implementation.
Sabatier responds to this criticism stating that the actions of target groups and street level bureaucrats are limited and their individual preferences in both initial policy decision and over time tend to be influenced by political and legal mechanisms. Sabatier continues his argument indicating that Mazmanian and Sabatier justify their arguments with the supportive tools of the political control of the bureaucracy. According to Sabatier, policy makers have power to select the implementing officials, provide sanctions and incentives, and balance constituency support.

Further, Sabatier states, the actions and the behaviors of the target groups and street level bureaucrats can be controlled by the policy makers provided that the following six conditions were met:

1. “Clear and consistent objectives
2. Adequate causal theory
3. Implementation process legally structured to enhance compliance by implementing officials and target groups
4. Committed and skillful implementing officials
5. Support of interest groups and sovereigns
6. Changes in socio-economic conditions which do not substantially undermine political support or causal theory” (Sabatier, 1986, p. 25).

Although Sabatier treats the problem of top-down with the political control of the bureaucracy, this treatment does not seem to be a remedy in all cases. For instance, the influence of street level bureaucrats on policy process may differ based on the type of the policy and the structure of organization. There are some policies that street level bureaucrats have dominant influence over and there are other policies that central
bureaucrats have more influence over. For instance, street level bureaucrats are more influential during the implementation of a policy regarding to human right attitudes of the governmental officials, while high level bureaucrats are more influential during the policy implementation in terms of financial aid or allocation. Street level bureaucrats act at frontline and their actions should not violate individual rights which were guaranteed by the principles of human rights.

Hence, drawing an absolute conclusion about the influence of top-down might be misleading researchers. So, the actual influence should be examined by considering all different issues. To illustrate, it is clear that both high level bureaucrats and front-line staff can influence the implementation in various ways. Disregarding one part seems to mislead researcher. There are absolutely top-down and other influences occurred during the implementation. The issue here should be to include all influences with a combination in order to find out the influences that different implementation structures involved.

On the whole, the main problem with the top-down model is that it focuses on the central decision makers’ perspectives by neglecting other actors who take very significant roles throughout the implementation (Winter, 2006; Powell, 1999; Matland, 1995; Ringquist, 1993; Sabatier, 1986; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Hull and Hjern, 1982; Hanf, 1982; Barret and Fudge, 1981; Elmore, 1980). Since the top-down perspective tries to capture the actions and the decisions of the actors from the central authority, it tends to disregard the strategic initiatives coming from street level actors, the private sector and others key implementing officials. In this way, the top-down researchers disregard and underestimate the dynamic influence of the target groups and street level
bureaucrats on the policy implementation. Hence, it is essential that an implementation analysis capture all dynamic influences during the implementation process. This brings up the need to study implementation from a different standpoint.

The Bottom-up Approach to Implementation

The bottom-up approach is another way of understanding the implementation process. Birkland (2005) states that bottom-up approach is a way of studying implementation “in which one begins by understanding the goals, motivations, and capabilities of the lowest level implementers and then follows the policy design upward to the highest level initiators of policy” (p.185). As a leading scholar of bottom-up approach, Elmore (1980) defines the bottom-up approach as the opposite of top-down approach. Rather than beginning at the top of the implementation, bottom-up approach begins at the last point of implementation “at which administrative actions intersect private choices” (Elmore, 1980, p.604). Elmore further backs up his definition stating that policy makers or policies are not the problems solvers; instead, people with “immediate proximity” solve the problems (p.612). However, in my view, it should be noted that individuals with “immediate proximity” can solve the problems provided that policy makers or policies give authority to individuals for the specific problem. So, there is a responsibility and authority sharing mechanism to solve the policy problems. Therefore, it can be assumed that Elmore’s argument seems to underestimate the whole policy process.

Another definition of the bottom-up approach provides additional clarification. According to Sabatier (1986), it is a model that analyzes the process of implementation by focusing on the actions of the actors involved in service delivery at local level. The
evidence from bottom-up research shows that the fundamental assumption that underlies bottom-up approach is that the influence on implementation process and policy outcomes decreases from bottom level though top level. Bottom people are the most influential actors in a policy process. In his work, Sabatier states that, unlike the top-down model, the bottom-up model pays attention on the implementation strategies used by agencies in order to achieve the policy objectives (Lipsky, 1980; Berman and McLaughbin, 1976; Elmore, 1980; Hull and Hjern, 1982; as cited in Sabatier, 1986). Sabatier further develops his argument by indicating that the advocates of the bottom-up model have always had concerns with the actions of the implementers because of the possibility to deviate policy objectives or cause goal conflict.

The bottom-up approach has emerged as a reaction to the top-down approach. Scholars who used top-down approach to view implementation are referred as top-downers, while others who used bottom-up approach are referred as bottom-uppers in this particular research. The primary concern that bottom-uppers had about the top-down approach was its methodological rigor. Bottom-uppers claimed that top-down approach was limited to understand the implementation process because of the methodological problems. Their major concerns are based on the unit of analysis of the researchers. The units of analysis covered central actors disregarding front-line actors. In addition, they indicate that most of the variables that top-downers used are applicable to bottom-uppers but there are some crucial variables that top-down neglects such as leadership skills of the front line managers. A typical top-down research just focuses on leadership skills of central authorities.
This issue was further explained by Hjern, Hanf, and Porter's (1978) leading bottom-up classic. As founders of the bottom-up approach, Hjern et al. (1978) developed the bottom-up model with a careful examination of the methodology in the implementation research. Hjern et al.'s concerns were aimed at establishing an "inter-subjectively reliable methodology" to study implementation by incorporating the different policy areas into bottom-up research because of their claim of the lack of methodological rigor with the top-down model (Sabatier, 1986, p.32). Unlike the top-down model, the bottom-up research aims to structure a policy network in which various actors are involved in service delivery, states Sabatier. From my point of view, considering Hjern et al.'s major methodological concerns, it can be assumed that bottom-up research has emerged because of the reactions to poorly designed top-down research.

The Features of Bottom-up Approach

Several characteristics exist with the bottom-up approach. One major feature is that bottom-up approach basically considers the actions, behaviors, goals, and the contacts of these actors at local, regional, and state levels. These contacts are used as tools to develop the policy network that identify the key actors throughout the policy implementation process (Sabatier, 1986). According to bottom-uppers, this starts from the “bottom” (street level bureaucrats) and moves “up” (to the formal policy makers) (Hjern et al., 1978; Hjern and Porter, 1981; Hull and Hjern, 1982, as cited in Sabatier, 1986). So, the magnitude of influence starts at the bottom level and it decreases through the top implementers.
In addition, the emphasis is on street level actors rather than top-levels. The importance of bottom-up approach was reiterated by Lipsky’s (1980) “street level bureaucrats” classic. He defines street level bureaucrats as “teachers, police officers and other law enforcement personnel, social workers, judges, public lawyers, health workers, and many other public employees who can access to government programs and provide services with them” (Lipsky, p.414). He states that street level bureaucrats have dominance on political controversies because they have considerable effects on citizen’s life and “debates about the proper scope and focus of governmental services are essentially debates over the scope and function of these public employees” (Lipsky, 1980, p.414). This argument is further backed up by Lipsky noting that street level bureaucrats “hold the key to a dimension of citizenship” (p.415).

Further, Lipsky presents several reasons for why the focus should be on street level bureaucrats. First, street level bureaucrats must be dealt with when policy is subject to change. They tend to have more information than the central actors since they are closer to the origin of the problems. In other words, street level bureaucrats functions as expertise and transmitter of the policy problems through the top levels. Their ways of view of the problem are very essential in terms of proposing a policy change. Second, they have immediate interaction and impact on citizens’ lives. They are the authorities who interact and deliver services to the citizens. Most of time this interaction occurs face to face and the influence increase in these cases. For instance, a police officer directly interacts with citizens to enforce some rules. However, the Head of the State Department of Safety does not have a direct interaction with citizens. Third, their decisions are allocative and redistributive. Further, they make decisions about
people which may influence their life dramatically. Another reason stated by Lipsky is that street level bureaucrats are involved in personal reactions to their decisions; however, they cope with their implications” (p.417). Finally, Lipsky states that street level bureaucrats have discretion which might open favorably for people. Most policies are not written in detail. Implementers transform policy objectives into action by interpreting and using their discretions. Thus, they may or may not use their discretion appropriately. They may want to use their discretion favorably for people they have already known or they may be equal and objective while using their discretion.

Throughout his work, Lipsky indicates that the routines of the street level bureaucrats and their decisions as front-line manager when a policy is implemented directly influences the outcome and the outputs of the public policies. Their decisions and actions during any kind of service delivery directly shape the quality of the service that citizens receive since they have a direct interaction with citizens. Their knowledge, ability, and skills play important role during service delivery process and this directly influence policy outcomes. Also, the devices and tools that they use in many cases influence the policies that they carry out. These devices and tools include any technical and managerial instrument that implementers uses while implementing policies such as team work. If they use effective tools and devices, policy implementation will be more effective. The street level bureaucrats, Lipsky asserts, make the choices about the use of public resources under pressure; however, they always try to make the best choices (Lipsky, 1980). Furthermore, Carino’s (2008) argument sheds additional lights on Lipsky’s argument stating that public officials should make required public choices
responsibly and accountably based on the needs and demands of the people (Carino, 2008. As cited from De Dios and Hutchcroft, 2003).

In my view, it seems that Lipsky’s idea that street level bureaucrats always try to make best choices creates some contradictions with rational choice theories. The underlying assumptions of rational choice theory are that people are self-interested and they pursue goals that consider self-interests. According to RCT, people rank order their preferences and they try to maximize their utilities (Elster, 1994). This theory just focuses on individual behaviors. The notion that individuals tend to maximize their utilities with their self interests indicates the possibility to pursue street level bureaucrats their self-interests. For instance, Mulgan (2008) indicates that front line public officials are heavily under scrutinized for the process and procedures they are supposed to achieve, but not adequately for their activities. Therefore, insufficient scrutiny might lead deviations with their activities. This assumption might also valid for the central actors in organizations. Thus, drawing an absolute direction that street level bureaucrats always try to do their best might be problematic. They are individuals and they might pursue their self interests instead of public interests. That’s why, some principal agent problems exist in political arena.

Most of the explanations of bottom-up approach are based on principal-agent and rational choice theories. According to principle agent theory, the principle assigns agent specific policy objectives to implement and agent is supposed to achieve those policy objectives. However, there might be goal displacement between policy objectives and policy outcomes because of agent’s incompatible actions with policy objectives. Therefore, public policy is perceived as the most important issue of the governance
since it deals with the appropriate policy making and implementation in order to satisfy the intended outcomes of the policy makers and citizens, considering principal agent relationship (Stone, 2002).

However, the agent’s actions and decisions are based on guiding principals of rational choice theory for human behaviors, in which individuals seek to maximize their utilities (Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002). Both theories are motivated by individual interests; therefore, there is always a possibility for failure of the principal’s desired policy outcomes during the implementation process. In the context of public policy implementation, principles are the authorities who proposed and legitimated the nature of the policies, politics or agency’s goals, whereas the agents are policy implementers who are assigned to execute the policies, bureaucrats or implementing agencies. A bottom-up approach also examines these principle-agent actions that takes during implementation and ensured whether there is compliance between policy objectives and its outcomes.

In another study, Peters (2007) points out some contemporary issues about bottom-up approach. He argues that most implementation scholars have been seeking the implementation problems from a top-down perspective in American government. Instead, in his study, Peter states that a special emphasis is needed to examine problems at bottom level since the underlying reasons for the problems are hidden at the bottom-level of the organizations. He further develops his argument indicating that policy makers should take into account the ease of implementation during at during the development phase. Moreover, he maintains that policy design should consider the values and desires of clients and interests of the lower level bureaucrats. Despite of his
arguments that advocate bottom-up approach, Peters offers a moderate implementation strategy in which different authorities share the responsibility.

Strengths

Examining the bottom-up approach in detail, it is clear that bottom-up approach has some benefits in implementation research. For instance Powell (1999) states that the bottom-up approach helps to recognize how individuals can influence the implementation and policy outcomes during the implementation process. Particularly, in a policy implementation case, there are institutions, individuals and other factors that influence the process. Among these influences, it is difficult to capture individual influences in an implementation research. However, using a bottom-up approach will clarify individual influences.

Although Powell mentioned various benefits of the bottom-up approach, more systematic analysis of benefits were introduced by Sabatier (1986). First, the model provides a replicable and explicit methodology in order to identify the implementation structure. To put it differently, the bottom-up model has developed the policy networks which provides better explanation for the implementation research. For instance, in Hjern et al.’s small firms study, key officials in each randomly selected small firm were interviewed to find out their implementation problems, the techniques that they used to cope with those problems and their contacts to manage these techniques by using a networking analysis technique. This network analysis drew the implementation structure of the small firms in terms of financial or other related problems. Second, the bottom-up model is able to access different programs from both public and private organizations since it does not start with an emphasis on the governmental program. Third, it is more
likely to provide better explanations for the unintended consequences since the model
does not focus on the attainment of the policy objectives. Fourth, this model can also
deal with the policy problems in different areas ranging from public to private. Finally,
bottom-up researchers can act more specialize with strategic interaction over time since
the model covers a wide range of variables and actors (Sabatier, 1986).

Weaknesses

In spite of these benefits, scholars have also pointed out some drawbacks about
the bottom-up approach. In his recent study, Peters (2007) argues that political leaders
have responsibility to reach their political goals (Cited from Risen and Lichtblau, 2005)
in order to fulfill their promises to the citizens. Therefore, they tend to control and
intervene implementation street level bureaucrats in the policies which may lead more
credit claim for the policy makers. Accordingly, the influences of central authorities tend
to be higher in these kinds of policy implementation cases and this contradicts with
bottom-up approach.

Moreover, Powell (1999) criticizes the bottom-up approach claiming that there is
too much emphasis on street level bureaucrats. The point here is too much emphasis.
There should be emphasis on street level bureaucrats, but it should not be excessive.
Too much emphasize on street level actors leads little emphasis on central authorities.
Therefore, implementation researcher should be able to balance the emphasis by
considering taking into account various issues raised in this research.

In addition to these critics, Sabatier (1986) presents another systematic analysis
of bottom-up debate: First, while top-downers overemphasized the central actors, the
bottom-uppers have neglected the central actors. Second, the bottom-up model
considers present participant’s demands and it ignores the previous efforts that took place to structure implementation. Third, the bottom-up approach does not “start from an explicit theory of the factors affecting its subject of interests” (Sabatier, 1986, p. 35). Finally, the bottom-uppers are not principally worried about the implementation of the policy, but rather with the analyzing and understanding of the interactions among the policy actors (Sabatier, 1986). In a nutshell, the literature on bottom-up models indicates that a policy should be viewed from the perspective of the service deliverers and target population in order to provide better understanding of implementation (Matland, 1995).

The Synthesis Approach to Implementation

The synthesis approach is a combination of the benefits of top-down and bottom-up approaches into one model that can address the process of implementation from top and bottom (Birkland, 2005). The literature on synthesis approach had been built on top-down and bottom-up studies. The reason for this is that these studies attempted to use some parts of each approach which are applicable to policy that is being studied and these parts were referred to top-down or bottom-up approaches. From a general perspective, a synthesis model is a way of studying implementation process by using relevant elements from top-down and bottom-up with a combination.

Need for Synthesis

Given that both bottom-up and top-down perspectives have important and problematic parts, we understand that top-down and bottom-up models view the process from different focus for the effective and successful implementation. Accordingly, this differentiation caused to emerge a debate in implementation research.
As explained in above literature, the advocates of the top-down approach assert that implementation can be viewed the best from the top-down perspective while advocates of the bottom-up approach stated that bottom-up perspective is better to understand implementation. However, scholars have noted that the debate of top-down and bottom-up has tremendously contributed to the development of the implementation research (Hill and Hupe, 2002). According to, Ringquist (1993), both top-down and bottom-up models are useful with an appropriate application through the process. In addition, Matland (1995) states that both top-down and bottom-up researches paint similar pictures of the previous studies suggesting similar ways for the future studies indicating for a need of reconciliation of bottom-up and top-town theoretical models of the implementation for not painting the same pictures.

Hence, it can be asserted that the existence of this dichotomy has enriched the research quality of the implementation research since it encourages researchers to find out new ways to study implementation. Looking at the advantages and disadvantages of each model, the implementation researchers might focus on to view implementation process by using both top-down and bottom-up approaches.

Thus, we understand that using only bottom-up approach will cause researcher to miss important parts of the top-down approach. Similarly, sticking to only top-down approach will also lead some limitations by missing some important parts of the top-down approach. Both approaches have good parts and they are applicable to the policy implementation process with a careful examination. Within this context, it seems that the ideal action would be taking the most appropriate parts of those approaches with a synthesis to view the process accurately.
It can therefore be argued both models allow understanding policy implementation process from different perspectives. This does not mean that one is helpful and the other is not. There are absolutely some important parts of both approaches. Both models seek better ways of implementation even though they are using different perspectives. No matter what kind of policy is it, implementation has some aspects of both top-down and bottom-up approaches. Therefore, in today’s complex policy networks, implementation process should be viewed from different perspectives since the influence of actors in both top and bottom are significant. A synthesis of both approaches with careful examination tends lead reliable research findings for effective implementation. Therefore, a combination of two approaches might be more applicable for enhancing the effectiveness of today’s policy implementation practices.

Synthesis Studies

Several scholars have attempted to use synthesis model to study implementation. One study comes from an early bottom-upper. Elmore (1985) attempted to combine the bottom-up and top-down models by developing his earlier backward mapping (bottom-up) research with his new “forward mapping” (top-down) perspective (p.603-604). His backward study used to consider the actions at bottom level and later, in his analysis of “Youth Employment Policy” (YEP), he found that there were multi-actors from top and down which had significant influence to shape the implementation. On the one hand, federal policy makers formulated policy in order to solve youth employment problems and allocated some resources. On the others hand, there are individuals who are in the service delivery process and have closest proximity
Elmore points out is that the significant effect on implementation and outcomes of policy is inevitable in both federal level and service delivery (Elmore, 1982).

Elmore states that top-down and bottom-up approaches have valuable insights to study implementation. As Sabatier (1986) states, Elmore’s analysis is based on the argument that “policy-makers need to consider both the policy instruments and other resources at their disposal (forward mapping) and the incentive structure of ultimate target groups (backward mapping) because program success is contingent on meshing the two” (Sabatier, 1986, p.37. also cited in Winter, 2006). In short, Elmore with this study proposed to use multiple perspectives to implement and design the policies.

The other synthesis study was proposed by two early bottom-upper. Hull and Hjern (1987) synthesized both approaches in their small firm studies. They developed an inductive approach to examine implementation process which also explains the compliance between policy objectives and policy outcomes. To do so, they conducted comprehensive interviews of relevant implementers from bottom to top (also cited in Winter, 2006). Their main assumption to propose this study was that implementation process should be viewed with a focus on the actions of all factors from top to down systematically.

Another synthesis study was conducted by Sabatier who is a key actor in the establishment of the top-down approach to implementation. Sabatier (1986) attempted to combine the top-downers’ concerns with bottom-uppers’ concerns by developing an Advocacy Coalition Framework in Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) study. This framework basically attempts to develop a policy process model in a longer time frame.
by using the relevant features of both models. The framework mainly focuses on the
interactions of the advocacy coalitions within policy subsystem. These coalitions consist
of from different institutions and organizations with a common share of policy beliefs.
According to framework, any policy change is a product of competition and events
within and outside the policy subsystem. Focusing on a variety of public and private
actors involved in policy process as well as major actors for the analysis of
implementation, the study synthesized both top-down and bottom-up models by
including the legal instruments and socio-economic issues. With this synthesis, policy
change was analyzed over time (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993).

Considering Elmore (1985), Hull and Hjern (1987), and Sabatier and Jenkins-
Smith’s (1993) studies, it seems clear that a combination of the two approaches is
necessary for capturing all influences on implementation and policy outcomes. A
rationale for this argument might be the background of these scholars. Elmore and Hull
and Hjern are known as the leading scholars of bottom-up with while Sabatier is one of
the founders of top-down model with his study with Mazmanian (1981). Later, Elmore
and Hull and Hjern recognized the need for a synthesis and developed their bottom-up
notions with a combination of top-down. Similarly, Sabatier also noticed that he was
missing some important parts of the bottom-up approach and he proposed to synthesize
his top-down model with bottom-up. Hence, it can be clearly understood that the actions
of these founding scholars indicate for a need to synthesize both top-down and bottom-
up models in order to provide accurate descriptions about implementation.

The other synthesis study was presented by Winter (1990; 1994; 2006). His
synthesis study was later reviewed in his 2006 study. Winter developed an Integrated
Implementation Model that aimed to integrate various fruitful elements of implementation research. In his study, he lists a set of factors which focuses on how implementation affects the outcomes. One factor is that “implementation is characterized by organizational and inter-organizational behaviors representing different degrees of commitment and coordination” (Winter, 2006, p.156). Another factor that Winter suggests is that implementation depends on the “type of resource-dependency among participating organizations” (p.156). Winter maintains that the behaviors of street level bureaucrats are crucial in most policy implementation cases as an influential factor through policy outcomes. Another factor that Winter further presents is that target groups of public policies play also important roles and they also affect the behaviors of street level bureaucrats. The last factor that Winter states in his study is that socio-economic contexts form important conditions for implementation and these conditions directly influence implementation and outcomes.

It seems that Winter selected best parts of different implementation researches and developed a synthesis model. For instance, he picked up the idea of street level bureaucrats from bottom-up model while he borrowed the socio-economic factors from top-down model. In these way, he was able to study implementation effectively since he could capture most parts of the influences occurred during implementation.

Moreover, Matland (1995), in his “Synthesizing implementation literature” study, proposes to structure “too many variables” of implementation research in a conceptual structure. He asserts that policy implementation research needs to minimize many variables rather than finding more variables in order to develop the field. He states that the use of top-down and bottom-up approaches with a synthesis provides a conceptual
structure of too many variables to study implementation. In other words, he treated synthesis model as a remedy for the “too many variables” problem in implementation research.

In his study, Matland identifies four crucial paradigms in implementation research categorizing them as administrative implementation, political implementation, symbolic implementation, and experimental implementation which are based on the magnitude of the conflict and ambiguity. In the following paragraphs, these paradigms will be identified.

According to Matland, outcomes of implementation are determined by resources in administrative implementation. If the sufficient resources are provided, desired outcomes of the policy makers will be achieved. There is low conflict-low ambiguity during this phase. Furthermore, political implementation assumes that “implementation outcomes are decided by power” (p.163). Some actors may have more power and others may not. Or, individual actors may combine their power to force their desires. The condition is high conflict-low ambiguity in political implementation. In experimental implementation, “contextual conditions dominate the process” (p.165). These conditions vary based on the environment, problems, actors, and policy and situation in this phase is low conflict-high ambiguity. Finally, the central point of the symbolic implementation is that “local level coalitional strength determines outcomes” (p.168). In symbolic implementation, local level actors control the resources and shape the policy outcomes according to Matland. There is a high conflict-high ambiguity in symbolic implementation.
Matland further explains that policy conflict exists when more than one implementing organizations view policy directly relevant to their interests and when they have incompatible views. What is more, Matland maintains that policy ambiguity exists from the goals and means ambiguities and goal ambiguity leads uncertainty and misunderstanding which cause to implementation failure.

Later, Matland’s findings were structured by Winter (2006) stating that the early top-down models are applicable when conflict is low and the policy is clear. Further, newer top-down models provide more accurate results when ambiguity is low and conflict is high. On contrary, bottom-up approaches present more accurate description of implementation when conflict is low and policy is ambiguous. However, when both ambiguity and conflict is present, both top-down and bottom-up models have relevance to understand implementation process.

Knowing more about Structure of Implementation

Implementation is mostly done by bureaucrats and public servants. No matter at what level of the policy implementation process they are in, they influence the policy implementation process and the policy outcomes. Specifically, their way of handling implementation shapes the outcome of the policies because the style and interpretation of the policies by both top-down and bottom-up implementers plays crucial role in terms of reaching intended outcomes. In addition, various other political, social, and environmental factors also influence implementation and policy outcomes. At this point, the structure of implementation plays important role in understanding the actual nature of implementation which might differ based on the circumstances. So, we need to know
more about structure of implementation in order to understand differentiations and alike in different implementation structures.

In addition, the literature has already provided relevant evidences for a need to use synthesis approach to study implementation. However, there is limited number of synthesis studies and these studies just focused on most relevant parts of top-down and bottom-up approaches to understand implementation process. They do not provide clear explanations on how a top-down or bottom-up structure in a synthesis model influence implementation process and policy outcomes. They just focus on explanations for the program or policy outcomes by disregarding structural analysis of top-down and bottom-up effects. The literature, however, indicates that both top-down and bottom-up approaches draw different influences on policy outcomes and we need to know more about these influences and trends, if any. Specifically, there are some ways that top-down and bottom-up actors impact implementation processes and policy outcomes in a policy process but we still need to know more about the magnitude or trends of these influences with a comprehensive analysis of implementation process.

The ways and trends of influence on implementation can be measured by examining the practices and views of top-down and bottom-up actors about their experiences and perceptions about implementation. In other words, their practices and views can specify the magnitude and extent of effects on implementation and policy outcomes as well. So, this study asks following research question in order to answer the issues raised above: Do decision makers and street level bureaucrats practice implementation in the same manner? In what ways do the top-down and bottom-up structures differ through policy implementation and outcomes?
Gaps in the Literature

This study aims to fill four important gaps in the literature. The first gap is that there is a limited quantity of literature on top-down, bottom-up and synthesis approaches, and we still have little empirical evidence on how the different implementation structures impact policy implementation and outcomes. The literature draws only specific conclusions about structural effects on policy outcomes focusing on approaches separately. The studies mostly focused on the effectiveness of the implementation by neglecting potential trends that top-down and bottom-up structures draw in an implementation process. In addition, most findings are case-specific and they do not draw general conclusions in order to make substantive arguments on the actual influences. Therefore, there is a need to look at implementation process by focusing on both bottom-up and top-down structural influences on policy implementation and outcomes with a comprehensive analysis of the process of implementation by using synthesis variables. So, the central purpose of this study is to clarify top-down and bottom-up structural trends, not the variables of implementation. The variables of implementation are synthesized and used to understand structural trends. In this way, the findings of the research will draw clear paths and ways on the actual impacts of the actors in different implementation structures on policy outcomes.

The second gap that exists in the literature is that the implementation researchers do not provide clear evidence on how different implementation structures affect implementation and policy outcomes considering the hierarchical structure of organizations. Organizations have different structures and the structure of implementation is influenced based on these organizational characteristics. Considering
that TNP has a hierarchical structure, this study draws essential implications on how those involved in the different implementation structures practice the variables of implementation in hierarchical organizations.

The third gap is that most literature focused on federal, state, or, local levels separately to understand implementation and literature lacks comparative analysis of the process in terms of structural affects on outcomes of the policies. The TNP reform implementation has both state and local aspects to be studied. Therefore, this study aims to provide some conclusions on the variations in the practice of implementation focusing on both state and local aspects.

The final gap is that implementation literature is lacking to empirical findings pertaining police education policies. Most literature focused on environmental, health, economy, and public education policies. However, the implementation of police education policies necessitates a close examination for the empirical research findings. Therefore, this study will fill this gap by examining basic police education policies.

Conclusion of the Chapter

In this literature review, we understand that public policy is an important field of study. Public policy looks at the policy process systematically. Among different components of the policy process, implementation is a major sub-component of this literature. In that literature, there are three approaches that are discussed which are top-down, bottom-up and synthesis. The discussion of approaches demonstrates that the process of implementation is drawn by these approaches. We know that various issues and points that are provided in this section indicate potential impacts of the top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis approaches of implementation on policy outcomes.
Basically, three different approaches to implementation exist in the literature of public policy implementation. These are top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis approaches. The origin of top-down and bottom-up approaches goes back to the rise of the field while the synthesis approach has emerged later. Each of these approaches provided different perspectives to understand the implementation process more accurately. However, given an overview of the synthesis literature, we understand that there are ambiguous issues and conditions that affect implementation and using only top-down or bottom-up models are no longer sufficient to explain policy process accurately. Instead, the literature necessitates the synthesis of both models with the careful analysis of issues and conditions occurred during the implementation. In other words, understanding policy process in today’s world is possible if the approaches to implementation are capable to tell the truths about what is going on in implementation. So, it is essential to combine the best applicable parts of both top-down and bottom-up approaches in order to provide accurate explanations for the implementation process.

Overall, the literature shows that the success or failure of implementation and policy outcomes depends upon the actions of street level bureaucrats and decision makers and the top-down and bottom-up structures specify the influences which take place during an implementation process. Also, it is demonstrated in the literature that top-down and bottom-up structures are reasonably related to potential outcomes of the policies and we would like to know in what ways their practice of implementation differ through policy implementation and outcomes.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION OF THE POLICY

The first minor research question has already been answered in the previous section by providing a comprehensive literature examination which is related to this study. The TNP education reform changed the basic police education system for the purpose of increasing the performance of the police officers by increasing their levels of the education. The policy makers proposed this change by assuming that higher education would lead higher performance of the police officers. So, the reform actions directly relate to the theoretical basis of the basic police education in terms of its efficiency. In this section, the second minor research question will be answered by examining underlying theories of the TNP education reforms and the reasons this policy change. In the following, a discussion of underlying theory for the reform is presented.

Discussion of Police Education and Performance

The TNP reform policies were proposed with the theoretical basis of higher level of education lead higher job performance. However, the theoretical basis of the basic police education does not provide consistent evidence for this common assumption. Therefore, it is noteworthy to provide a brief summary of the discussions in order to understand the underlying reasons for and against more basic police education.

Overall, the results from empirical studies have been mixed in regards to the effect of higher education on police performance. On the one hand, some scholars have suggested that greater levels of traditional higher education lead to greater
professionalism and thus greater performance (see for example Carter and Sapp, 1990). On the other hand, others criticize this idea of greater higher education, suggesting that police officers perform better when their professionalism is achieved through hands on activity (see for example Sherman 1978). In the section to follow, I briefly discuss these two schools of thought.

Advocates of Higher Level of Education

Those scholars that have advocated greater traditional education assert that college educated police officers are more aware of problems in the society, they are less authoritarian and more flexible, they have stronger professional attitudes (Miller and Fry, 1978; Weiner, 1976) and higher education makes police officers more effective (Bittner, 1990; Breci, 1997; Sherman, 1978; Sparling, 1975; Vogel and Adams, 1983; Shernock, 1992).

The advocates of this school pay attention to the various functions of policing indicating that not only does policing consist of crime fighting function, but it also requires dealing with the various kinds of problems in the community by community policing method that requires citizens’ satisfaction. That is, college educated police officers are more likely to have ability in handling democratic policing (Brown, 1974; Goldstein, 1977; Lynch, 1976; Saunders, 1970).

In a recent study, Wimshurst, Marchetti, and Allard (2004) examined whether higher education influence student perceptions or not in the Australian criminal justice system. With the establishment of new criminal justice education among the Australian colleges, the study investigates the undergraduate students’ beliefs on race and diversity over time. The study finds that police majors have more negative beliefs than
criminal justice students and there tends to be little change in students’ perceptions ever time.

Some of the research viewed the discussion of police education from the point of citizen’s satisfaction and complaints. Among them, Peterson (2001) tested the relationship between police officer’s educational attainment and their job performance. She hypothesized that police officers with higher level of educational attainment will have fewer citizens’ complaints and lower level of job satisfaction. According to her findings, level of education does not have any significant relationship with the number of incidents of excessive force used in arrest situations, the number of citizens’ complaint a police officer receives, and the number of arrests that a police officer facilitates when he or she confronts with a potential suspect. However, she found significant relationship between the differences among educational attainment and departmental job satisfaction. Also, the author found significant correlations among police officers’ age and force use, number of arrests, and job satisfaction with current department and police career. Moreover, her analysis found that there was a significant relationship between police officers’ age and a linear combination of force use, number of arrests, citizens’ complaints, and job satisfaction with police department and police career.

Moreover, Truxillo, Bennett, and Collins (1998) conducted a research on the relationship between measures of college education and work performance among police officers by observing 84 police officers for 10 years. They use “education”, “written test,” and “job performance” as measures. They found that there is a statistically significant effect between college education variables and promotions and supervisory ratings of job knowledge; however, they found inconsistent relationship with the
disciplinary action. The study concludes that college education is relevant to many fields of policing, but we cannot generalize that it affects all areas of performance.

In a nutshell, the advocates of the higher level of police education assert that police officers need higher education because the abilities that higher education builds on police officers lead higher performance of the police officers. According to them, the higher level of education makes police officers more efficient to achieve their tasks. It is assumed that more education leads the higher performance of the police officers. Considering the adequacy of the causal theory that underlies the TNP education reform, the assumptions of the positive school of the police education directly fit into the implementation of the education reform.

Opponents of Higher Level of Education

On the other hand, the other school of thought of police education does not suggest the need for the higher level of education for the better performance of the police officers. Worden (1990) states that even though college educated police officers may be better writers and more reliable, there is no significant effect between their attitudes and performance and their college education. He also notes that college educated police officers are assumed to be more flexible than others. It is an expectation from the college education to give insights to consider human side behavior. Accordingly, college educated officers are more likely to use their insights to solve the problems rather than using the law. That is, they are more likely to solve the problems by developing extralegal solution.

Similarly, some other researches denote that college educated police officers are more likely to be dissatisfied and frustrated with their jobs (Levy, 1967; Stoddard, 1973;
Swanson, 1977; Weirman, 1978). Worden (1990) found that college educated officers are more likely to be dissatisfied with their supervisors besides their job. Also, Hudzick (1978) found that police officers with higher education tend to pay less attention to the value of obedience to supervisors. Therefore, they are less satisfied with their careers and they are more likely to be dissatisfied with their job. Additionally, higher level of education with higher credentials leads greater job dissatisfaction and turnover in the organizations.

Having a higher level of diploma is perceived as a positive indicator in society. However, this school of thought disagrees with the idea that police officers need higher level of education in order to be more professional in their duties (Baro and Burlingame, 1999). They assert that police officers do not need more than a high school diploma. Similarly, Sherman and McLeod (1979) indicate that higher education does not necessarily contribute police officers performance since they receive similar and better education in the basic training of the police academies.

In addition, Kakar (1998) found that there was no significant relationship between the level of education and police officers’ job attitudes. He claims that police work does not relate to the college education; therefore, higher education may decrease the quality of police work. In his study, Kakar used two main theories. The first theory indicates that the ability of police is connected to higher education affecting their performance positively. The second theory indicates that police work does not provide the kind of stimulation that a college graduated police officers needs and officers with higher education are more likely to be frustrated and dissatisfied with their jobs and leave for a better profession. He denotes a gap in the literature explaining that it is not clear
whether similar significant relationships hold when experience on the job is controlled. He mainly focuses on re-examining whether police officers’ level of education significantly associated with their perceptions of the quality of their performance.

Kakar (1998) concluded that the officers with higher education rated themselves significantly higher on several performance categories. No significant differences were discerned in the officers’ involvement in community projects or voluntary work. Education level did not have any significant effect on officer’s attitudes towards their job, office and department. However, officers with the higher level of education significantly differed from the officers with lower education on performance measures that were found to be different when means of the groups were compared on each measure without controlling for the years experienced.

In summary, this school of thought views the function of the basic education differently, indicating that higher level of education does not have a significant effect on police officers’ performance. The performance of the police officers is based on the issues which are not related to the higher education. Therefore, adequacy of the causal theory that underlies the TNP education reform contradicts the assumptions of this school of thought of the police education. So, the question of who is correct still does not have a straight answer and it is still debatable. However, the findings of this research provide some evidences which advocate the theory that higher level of education lead higher job performance. Given the theoretical discussion of basic police education which provides theoretical basis for the reform, the TNP reform is discussed in the following section.
Description of TNP Reforms

Serving the whole nation with over 200,000 members, the Turkish National Police (TNP) was the main target of programmatic reform in 1999. Many observers questioned the manner of policing within Turkey and there were complaints about the quality of police performance from government officials and the public. The media, too, was a major critic of police behaviors and was very influential in shaping the public perception of the police. Government officials as well as EU controllers and UN human right observers raised various problems with the police behaviors in the country. The identified problems included police misconduct, human rights violations, and overall citizen dissatisfaction (Rumford, 2001). For instance, citizens were complaining of miscommunication of police officers during policing. Their expectation was to be respected during all policing activities (Durmaz, 2007), but police misbehavior was still occurring in the police stations or patrols. As a result of this negative exposure, many policies were implemented with the clear objective of solving these problems, but there was very little success due to a lack of a clear goal definition (Duner and Deverell, 2001). In the end, most attributed the problems in the TNP with the quality of police education (Guloglu, 2003). In fact, the existing police education system was considered to be the main reason that many of the issues were raised by critics of the TNP (Sonmez, 2003). In response, the Turkish government set out to reform its police education system by adopting the Turkish Police Higher Education Law (2001). The goal of this policy is to increase the job performance of the police by changing the level and type of education that a police officer receives.
The new legislation required that duration of formal education of a police officer be extended from one year to two years (Turkish Police Higher Education Law, 2001). In a follow up policy adopted in 2003, four year college graduates were allowed to become police officers with an additional six months of basic education. The idea behind these standards was that these new systems would create a more modern police force of high standards that would be able to implement policies effectively and efficiently, to adhere to human rights principles, and hopefully to improve citizen satisfaction with the higher job performance of the police officers in Turkey (Murat & Uygun, 2003). Specifically, it was believed that the higher level of education would lead to higher police performance. In a nutshell, the government proposed to increase the performance of the police officers by increasing their level of education. The major reform changes in the TNP occurred in the pre-profession training system, specifically basic police education for new recruits.

Pre-profession training, also called basic training, is organized under the umbrella of the Turkish National Police Academy. The Turkish National Police Academy offers two years of undergraduate education in 25 Police Vocational Schools of Higher Education (PVSHE). However, the basic police education before this reform required only one year basic education.

Each PVSHE has its own structure located in 20 cities of the country. There is a standardized curriculum that all PVSHE administrations have to obey. PVSHE educates new recruits for two years. The curriculum of PVSHE aims to educate police officers in different areas such as criminal law, policing, behavioral sciences, democratic policing, and human rights. Each candidate has to meet basic requirements in order to
be police officer. After graduation, they are employed as police officers but do not have any opportunity to promote to a higher position such as lieutenant unless a special promotional exam is offered by the TNP.

In addition to the two year undergraduate education reform, another reform action allowed four-year college graduates to be a police officer with an additional six months of police education. The admission requirements for new recruits are same as PVSHEs except age and educational backgrounds. The candidates have to graduate from a 4 year bachelors program. There is no restriction on the academic area of the candidates. All social science majors as well as the technical and hard sciences majors can be police officers if they meet recruitment qualifications. However, TNP does not guarantee candidates to employ the police officers according to their undergraduate major. The education for potential officers graduating from a four-year bachelor program is provided by TNP Education Department in five Police Education Centers located in Istanbul, Cankiri, Samsun, Siirt, and Bursa cities and the education process takes only six months. These two reform actions are the major changes that reshaped the TNP basic education system and the results of these changes are subjects for this research.

As can be seen in Table 4.1, police officers currently employed in the TNP completed one of three forms of education. Despite the variation, as officers, they complete and do the same tasks. Category 1 police officers are officers who began their service before the 2001 reform and received one-year education from pre-reform type police schools. Category 2 police officers receive a two-year education from the new Police Vocational Schools of Higher Education, and Category 3 police officers receive four-year college degree and 6 months of police education.
Table 4.1

*The Educational Backgrounds of Police Officers in Turkey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY 1</th>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Police Schools</td>
<td>1 Year Before reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY 2</th>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Police Vocational Schools (PVSHE)</td>
<td>2 Years After reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY 3</th>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Years College</td>
<td>6 Months Basic Education</td>
<td>After reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reform of 2001 also changed the curriculum of the basic police education by adding new courses such as police ethics and behavioral sciences on policing. This curriculum modification and change in education levels in police education was proposed to lead to better performances by the police officers in their duties. With better performance, the policy makers' expectations range from improvements in
communications such as effective public relations, behavioral skills such as integrity and respect to human right issues, and professional skills such as scientific policing.

Discussion of Structure of Implementation in TNP Reform Implementation

Structural approaches to implementation provide more comprehensive and systematic analysis to study implementation. In other words, using top-down, bottom-up, or synthesis models in implementation research seems to be remedy for the problems and concerns that scholars raised in the field. Accordingly, a structural examination of TNP reform implementation provides comprehensive and systematic findings about the influences of different implementation structures on reform outcomes.

Research on implementation sheds light on understanding the structure of TNP reform implementation in several ways. For instance, Lester and Bowman’s (1989) findings on implementation theory provide an excellent guidance for the TNP reform implementation. First, it is essential to examine the compliance between the underlying reasons of the problems and the actions that have been taken for the solutions while implementing the reforms. For instance, the reforms extended the years of basic police education but how about instructors who were supposed to educate them? Were they also furnished based on the new expectations? Did they have ability and skills to solve the educational problems of the police officers? Did the implementers take proper actions to solve the problem of TNP education system by employing appropriate instructors? These answers for these questions will provide a comprehensive explanation for the TNP reform implementation.

Moreover, the condition of infrastructure of TNP education system should be examined for better understanding of the reform implementation. There were other units
and procedures that might be related with the new reform policies. Were they updated? For instance, the foundation law of TNP has been using since 1937 and there might be some contradictory issues and structures between new reform policies and previous traditions. A comprehensive examination of these issues is essentials for the effective implementation.

Also, an examination of the availability of resources (such as human and fiscal) in TNP reform implementation is essential. Were there enough people to implement the policies? How about financial resources? Did the proper allocation of the resources occur during the implementation? What were the problems and challenges? Lester and Bowman’s suggestion leads this study to include these concerns.

Furthermore, some scholars have complained about too much emphasis on federal level with the neglect of state and local level policy implementation such as Slack (1995). Since the TNP reforms were implemented at federal and local levels, the examination of reform implementation in both state and local levels satisfies the concerns of Slack and other scholars.

From several perspectives, TNP reform implementation mostly fits into top-down structure. First, the TNP reform implementation best fits to top-down approach since the expectation of the policy makers and constituents was producing higher quality police officers by achieving reform objectives focusing on achievement of the policy objectives. The root of this top-down structure was drawn by Pressman and Wildavsky in their implementation classics many years ago.

Second, as Van Meter and Von Horn (1975) back up, the Police Academy, TNP Department of Education, and PVSHEs (which are major implementers of the TNP
reforms) had high goal consensus about the implementation of the reforms, and this plays important role for successful implementation and achievement of those reform objectives. Further, Van Meter and Von Horn’s analysis showed that the implementation process tends to be more successful when policy objectives require small marginal changes. However, the TNP reforms required big changes. These changes were consisted of institutional reorganizations and behavioral changes of police officers. For that reason, this might influence the achievement of the reform objectives negatively. However, other factors might be effective to overcome this negative condition. Especially, being a member of European Union (EU) has been a symbolic issue for the country and target groups and implementers might be motivated to achieve big changes in respect of being a member of EU.

Third, with reference to Matland and Ringquist, actions of TNP reform implementers and political factors that influenced the actions of these implementers are directly related to success or failure of reform implementation. These include all decisions that were made and any actions that were taken regarding to reform implementation. In addition, target groups, in this particular reform implementation, are TNP police officers and citizens. A top-down approach requires examining the actions of these groups in terms of compliance with desired goals of the reform.

Fourth, considering top-down questions that Sabatier (1986) raised, several issues are associated with the TNP reform implementation from a top-down perspective. First, as Matland and Ringquist pointed out above, the actions of the TNP reform implementers are crucial indicators to clarify the factors that influenced reform implementation and reform outcomes. Second, it is also essential to consider time span
of reform implementation and the consistency of outcomes with reform objectives over
time. Third, there are principal factors that shaped the TNP reform outcomes and it is
essential to find the factors which are relevant with to the TNP reforms. Finally, any
reformulation of reform policies since 2001 should also be considered throughout the
TNP reform implementation. Overall, an examination of these issues helps to find out
how the top-down structure impacted reform implementation and outcomes in some
ways.

It seems that using a top-down approach in TNP reform implementation would
provide some benefits. First of all, legal structure of reform implementation is an
important indicator to clarify success or the failure of the reform implementation. The
legal structure of implementation draws the primary rules, regulations, rights, and
directions to run the reform policies. This includes all mandated actions and conditions
which are mostly structured by the nature of the policies. Therefore, an emphasis on
legal structure of implementation will help researcher to clarify the success or the failure
of the reform implementation. In addition, using the implementation tools that
Mazmanian and Sabatier suggested to track the influences from a top-down perspective
will help researcher to capture all major factors that played role during reform
implementation. Finally, the reform objectives were clearly stated in reform policies and
all actions that are required to achieve these objectives are structured legally.
Therefore, legally-mandated reform objectives lead achievement of policy objectives.

In addition, the arguments of top-down approach are mainly based on the US
policy setting. It seems that the TNP reform implementation is not applicable with some
part of the findings from the literature such as Ringquist’s finding on regulatory
agencies. This is not applicable since there is no regulatory agency action during TNP reform implementation process. However, it should be noted that using a top-down approach in TNP reform implementation would be effective since this research attempts to assess the reform policies which were implemented in 2001 and 2003.

Considering the relation of this discussion to the study, it seems that top-down approach can easily capture the actions and the influence of the TNP bureaucrats and politics on the implementation process of TNP education reforms. Since the TNP has a hierarchical structure, top-down influences are more likely to emerge during most policy implementation cases in TNP. The top-down model captures and considers hierarchical flow and conditions while bottom-up approach disregards it (Sabatier, 1986). Therefore, a top-down approach would provide better explanation for the implementation of the education reforms. Furthermore, central actors have played the major roles in the implementation of education reforms. However, the bottom-up approach neglects the actions of the central actors. The major influence on this particular policy implementation emerges from the central actors whose actions can be captured by top-down approach more effectively.

Specifically, the conditions and expectations from the TNP reforms lead this research to use best parts of top-down model. Since TNP education reforms were dominant programs in which the major considerations were the achievement and effectiveness of the program, top-down model is more applicable in this particular area, as Sabatier (1986) and Ringquist (1993) suggest. Especially, the achievement was vial for the EU integration for the politicians and the nation. Also, the increased democratic
values and public awareness on individual rights in the country resulted higher expectations from the police officers service in the country.

To put it briefly, the advocates of the top-down model assert that it is more useful in the policy areas in which the major consideration is the effectiveness and achievement of the program. In addition, top-down models consider various factors that may affect the effectiveness of the policy implementation. The factors that Mazmanian and Sabatier conceptualized are tractability of the problem, statutory, and non-statutory factors. Also, some of other factors that Ringquist proposed include internal statutory factors, internal political factors, administrative outputs, and external environmental factors (Ringquist, 1993, pgs. 1025-1027, 1030-132). Most of these factors are applicable to the TNP reform implementation and the most relevant factors are considered to be subject for this research. The detailed explanations about these factors will be introduced in the methodology section of this research.

In short, top-down structure tracks the ways of influence focusing on top level implementers of the TNP. However, the implementation of the educational reforms has also required lots of significant actions at bottom level besides top level. The points that top level TNP implementers state in terms of success or the failure of the implementation might differ than that of bottom level implementers. Therefore, a need to look at the reform implementation of TNP from bottom-up perspective is also essential in order to capture all important parts of both top-down and bottom-up.

A bottom-up perspective in TNP reform implementation should focus on the police officers and bureau managers as street level bureaucrats in three implementing institutions since the magnitude of influence in TNP reform implementation starts at the
bottom level and it decreases through the top implementers. The skills, actions, and ways of looking at implementation of implementers and various issues shaped the implementation of reforms should be considered in within this context. These issues had been the most influential for the success or failure of the reforms. Moreover, a bottom-up perspective should examine the compliance of their actions with policy objectives in order to find out deviations.

From the point of Lipsky, the street level bureaucrats in TNP reform implementation are police officers and bureau managers who played crucial roles at operational level of the reforms at the bottom. The argument of Lipsky is well supported in TNP reform implementation since these front line managers had discretion to make some changes, they had authority to allocate benefits, and they were influential to the candidates of police officer.

Moreover, bottom-up literature draws some challenges that an implementer from the bottom level of TNP may face. First, even though administrative structure of TNP reform implementation did not include political actors directly, there was a political pressure on TNP organization to solve the problems. The top TNP bureaucrats were indirectly acting on the behalf of the political actors since the success of the reform implementation would be a credit claiming issue for ruling party. Therefore, there was a top-down influence in TNP reform implementation from the point of Peter's perspective and a bottom-up approach is limited to capture this picture. Second, the problem which was proposed to be solved by the reforms had been on agenda for years but it could not be solved by previous political settings. The credit claiming issue in these particular reforms was considerable since these reforms were the major efforts that have been
taken to solve the problems. Therefore, the politicians might have paid special interest on the implementation of these reforms and this supports Peters’ argument.

Lastly, combining top-down and bottom-up models, synthesis studies could suggest several trends of the structure of implementation. First, the coordination among Police Academy, TNP Education Department, and PVHSEs, the commitment of actors in these institutions, the number of actors, and various different issues joint together, creating complexity, and these all issues affect success of implementation and reform outcomes in the direction as Winter draw before. Second, the implementing institutions of TNP reforms have reciprocal relations in which three institutions are depend on each other. Therefore, institutions have incentives to cooperate and this might lead to successful reform implementation and outcomes. Third, the front-line managers such as police officers and bureau managers in three implementing institutions of TNP, made some important discretionary decisions which influenced implementation significantly. Especially, the work conditions and situations such as limited resources and various demands in which these front-line managers were in might compel to take these influential actions. Fourth, as this issue was raised with Matland’s (1995) argument previously, in this particular reform implementation, both citizens and police officers are target groups. Police officers are expected to improve their performances by the implementation of the reforms and, accordingly, citizens will satisfy with police officers behaviors. Hence, the actions of both groups are important to capture the influences on policy implementation and outcomes. Finally, some socio-economic conditions of Turkey might have influenced implementation and outcomes and these should be taken into account during the implementation process. For instance, the economic conditions
of Turkey during the reform implementation or social status of police officers matter and affect implementation. The examination of these issues is also essential in order to provide accurate description about TNP reform implementation process.

Relation to the Study

The TNP reform implementation relate to this study in several ways. First of all, examination of structural trends in an implementation process requires using a previously implemented policy as a case. The TNP reforms had occurred with the implementation of two similar educational policies. The implementation of these policies provides a relevant examination of different views on the process of implementation and policy outcomes. Top-down, bottom-up, and synthesis models can easily be adapted to the TNP reform implementation in order to capture the actual influences that occurred during the implementation.

Second, the primary reform objective was to increase the performance of the police officers and it is possible to measure the outcomes with quantitative indicators in TNP reform implementation case. The actual outcomes the reform policies are indicators for success or failure of the reforms. This provides more accurate conclusions about the impact of different implementation structures.

Third, since the TNP is a uniformed and standardized organization, the structure of the educational reforms implemented did not differ among the implementing institutions. It is also possible to obtain relevant data from a large sample. There are 25 different PVSHEs each of which has same organizational design and curriculum. This uniformity of design allows for capture of both top-down and bottom up influences.
Fourth, the TNP is a federal organization which has large population and consists of both local and central entities, and the education policy reforms were handled at both local and central levels of the organization. This leads the researcher to examine both top-down and bottom-up influences effectively by comparing different findings at top or bottom level and federal or local level.

Finally, each implementing institutions uses a hierarchical structure and top-down and bottom-up policy actors are easy to identify and capture the influences. Especially, in this particular reform implementation, hierarchy flows from top to bottom and disregarding top influence creates problems in understanding the actual affect of actors on implementation and policy outcomes. Therefore, it is essential that a comprehensive synthesis approach be used in order to find out actual impact of top-down and bottom-up structures on implementation and policy outcomes. Also, examining the structure of implementation in these hierarchical institutions leads to draw some important policy implications in terms of policy implementation questions in hierarchical organizations. In the following part, a discussion of police education and performance which explains the underlying theory to propose TNP reforms will be introduced.

Conclusion of the Chapter

The primary objective of TNP reform implementation was to increase the level of education to higher level in order to obtain higher performance from police officers. The police officers after the reform were expected to perform better than police officers before the reform. In other words, receiving higher level of education was expected to be primary factor to solve police misbehaviors and other performance related problems. However, there are two different theoretical bases about the effect of level of education
on police officers' performance. One theory assumes that higher level of education leads higher performance of police officers while other theory indicates that higher level of education does not play significant role in increasing or decreasing the police officers' performance. So, the underlying theory of TNP reform implementation directly relates to the discussion provided in this chapter.

Given this discussion, the purpose is not testing the theory whether higher level of education leads higher police performance or not. Rather, the study presents a potential theoretical situation in order to understand the underlying reasons of the reforms better. Also, the presentation of this theoretical debate leads researcher to capture some theoretical factors that might potentially influence implementation and policy outcomes.
METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study is to examine how decision makers and street level bureaucrats in different implementation structures practice implementation in terms of their effects on implementation and policy outcomes. So, the primary research question is “Do decision makers and street level bureaucrats practice implementation in the same manner? In what ways do the top-down and bottom-up structures differ through policy implementation and outcomes?” The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the methods used in order to answer this question.

This research proposes to answer the research question with a mixed-method research design with both quantitative and qualitative ways. The qualitative method is used as primary tool in this research while quantitative way is used to measure a part of the whole body and to shed lights on the qualitative findings. To put it differently, the qualitative method is used to measure the practices and views of implementation while the quantitative method is used to evaluate the TNP education reforms. Samples, data, and the variables used in each of the methods are presented separately. In the following, the quantitative methodology is introduced first, and then the qualitative methodology is presented next.

Quantitative Research Design

The TNP reform implementation is used as cases for this research and the third minor research question necessitates the examination of actual policy outputs since it is
essential that the outcomes of the reform implementation be clarified for the examination of the top-down and bottom-up structures. Therefore, the study constructs a quantitative model to evaluate the success or failure of the reforms from a program evaluation perspective. In doing so, the study uses individual data from a sample of police officers from various parts of the country. One way ANOVA analysis, Post Hoc Test, and Multiple Regression statistical methods will be used to analyze the quantitative data in this chapter.

So far, no official and empirical program evaluation of TNP education reforms had been issued by authorities and scholars. However, it is essential to know the success or the failure of the program in order to make consistent judgments while discussing the effects of the top-down or bottom-up actors on implementation and policy outcomes in the qualitative part to answer the main research question of this study. Specifically, this model clarifies if the police performance in the TNP has improved since the reforms and the findings of program evaluation flashes on major findings of this research in qualitative part.

This model aims to answer the third minor question of this research. Specifically, the actual outputs of TNP education reforms and whether police performance in the TNP improved since the reforms are examined in this part. Also, among three different type of education categories, which category is producing the best performance are clarified as a result of program evaluation.

One of the purposes of the study is to understand why there was success or failures in policing outcomes. Therefore, the study attempts to find out whether these successes or failures are related to the implementation process that used. So, the
researcher focuses on quality outcomes or performance outcomes in the TNP. The study reports those findings and the researcher makes sense those findings using interviews which tell about implementation process that was used (top-down, bottom-up, or synthesis). In the following, the researcher makes a linkage that says that these are the actual outcomes of that policy and here is why people think it was a success or failure. It might be because of top-down policies were in place or it might depend on the bottom-up people who do what they supposed to do. The researcher makes these kinds of linkages by using both qualitative and quantitative findings. The model is presented in the following section.

Model of the Evaluation of the TNP Reform Outcomes

This model attempts to test whether policy objectives of TNP education reforms have been achieved through the policy outcomes or not, building on Mazmanian and Sabatier’s (1989) Implementation Model and Ringquist’s (1993) Policy Outcome Evaluation Model. In addition, which of the educational systems produce the best performances and whether police performance in the TNP has improved since the reforms will be examined. The model is constructed by using quantitative measures since TNP has already established some measurement criteria inside the organization that would capture the actual impacts of the policy outputs with several performance indicators.

The TNP education reform aims higher performance of the police officers which has been discussed in earlier chapters. The effects of the reform actions can be evaluated over time since the implementation process took a long time and the policy objectives required various individual and organizational changes. A considerable time
has passed to provide reliable explanations about the outcome of the reforms since the implementation of the reforms.

This research studies the extent of change in police officers performance with the implementation of the reforms. In doing so, different factors that shape and affect the performance of the police officers in the organization are used to measure the extent of change in police officers' performance. The reform has brought changes and shaped police officers by the implementation of the education reforms (see Figure 3).

Dependent Variables

Police officers are the ultimate guarantor of the security that enriches life in the communities. Hence, it is important to establish and assess quality performance standards for police officers since they function as primary public servants interacting with citizen frequently.

Accordingly, police officers' performance was the main underlying reason to propose education reform in TNP. In general, police officers' performance can be measured in several ways as discussed in the earlier chapters. The level of the performance of the police officers may differ in different fields such as conflict management, public relations, report writing, etc. However, TNP had gathered all performance indicators with an organizational evaluation system based on TNP’s goals and objectives.
Figure 3. Model of The Evaluation of the Police education Reform Outcomes
Five different main performance indicators exist in the system which all of them have standardized and reliable basis. These are personnel evaluation grades, rewards, appreciations, sanctions, and criminal involvement. These five performance indicators are considered as the main indicators that specify police officers’ performance. Therefore, these variables are used as dependent variables of the quantitative model in order to capture the effects of the reform implementation on the reform outcomes.

_Police Officers’ Personnel Evaluation Grades_

The TNP has a personnel evaluation system which proposes to track the performance of the police officers. The Turkish Government requires all governmental organizations to use personnel evaluation forms to evaluate the performance of the government officials. These standardized forms are updated based on the needs and developments in the job area. Organizations can add new performance indicators to the evaluation forms based on their function, organizational objectives, and needs. TNP revises the personnel evaluation forms each year with careful examination of the general performance indicators of the policing. These evaluation forms are filled out once a year by the police officer’s 1st, 2nd and 3rd supervisors. Standardized performance evaluation forms are sent to the each unit of the TNP at the end of each year and the forms and each supervisor grades the police officers’ performance on general attitudes and behaviors, job requirements, and management abilities in 100 point scale. The average performance grade is calculated by dividing the total number of points for each category into the total number of questions. There should not be a 30 point difference between 1st, 2nd, and 3rd supervisors’ average grade.
In general, police officers are considered as unsuccessful when their average score is below 60 and they are considered as successful when their score is above 90. These forms are filled confidentially and gathered in the TNP Personnel of Personnel to record on officers’ database. The officers are not allowed to learn their scores according to a governmental rule. If a police officer, however, scores under 60, he or she will be notified about the situation. On the other hand, when a police officer scores above 90 in preceding 6 years, he or she will receive an extra one year tenure benefit which allows employees deserve retirement one year earlier. In these two circumstances, police officers have some opinion about their performance. Otherwise, they do not have any idea about their performance average grade.

In the performance evaluation form, there are four main parts which measure of the performance of police officers. These are characteristics of police officers, basic job performance, management skills, and behaviors during abroad duty. The characteristics of police officer are measured by qualitative measure and this is not directly related to the performance of the police officers. Also, police officers working abroad are an extraordinary case for the police officers. Therefore, character evaluation and behaviors in foreign countries part will be excluded to determine police officers’ job performance. The study will consider only basic performance and management skills parts to determine police officers.

In the performance evaluation form, the following performance indicators are used to determine police officers’ job performance:

*Basic job performance:*
1- Responsibility? (Working without supervision and ability to give feedback about the tasks that are done)

2- Loyalty and enthusiasm for duty?

3- Professional knowledge, written and oral expression ability, and self-development?

4- Orderliness and attentiveness?

5- Success in cooperation and adaptation to different circumstances and duties?

6- Impartiality? (While performing his/her duty; Objectivity in language, race, gender, political ideas, philosophical beliefs, religion, etc.)

7- His /her manner and behavior toward his/her supervisors or colleagues?

8- Respect to human rights? (Showing respect to people's personality and rights, restraining from treatments that are contrary to human dignity)

9- Compliance to discipline?

10- Efficiency, ability, and diligence in performing the job?

11- Ability to represent the department's professional capacity and language knowledge in international duties.

12- Maintenance and protection of tools equipment and weapons and the ability of using them when it is necessary.

13- Tendency to interpose others (politics or other powerful authorities) for self-benefit?

Managerial performance:

1. Ability of making timely and correct decisions?

2. Planning, organization, and coordination ability?
3. Representation and negotiation ability?
4. Control inspect and being exemplary ability?
5. Adapting to new legislation and technological developments?
6. Level of success to deploy and develop subordinates efficiently?
7. Work knowledge and self confidence?
8. Social and personal relations? (Derived from TNP personnel Evaluation Form)

The supervisors grade police officers on a point 100 scale based on these measures which are considered as the major performance indicators of police officers in Turkey. The higher performance grade indicates the higher performance of the police officers while the lower performance grades indicate the lower performance of the police officers. Accordingly, higher performance of the police officers indicates the success of the policy reforms while lower performance leads failure of the reform. This variable is main indicator that specifies the actual impact and outputs of the education reform on police officers’ performance.

*Police Officers’ Organizational Sanctions*

The TNP established a code of behavior for all employees in the organizations. Each employee has to act based on the rules and regulations stated in the code of behavior. The standards that are stated with code of ethics were clarified based on democratic and human right values stated in EU Human Right Standards and Copenhagen criteria. Also, some notions from the EU Code of Police Ethics standards were also included in the TNP code of ethics. In addition, TNP has also some standing orders and rules to maintenance the internal discipline of the organization. These orders and regulations require police officers to be in good standing on their duties. Any
violation of these rules, regulations, code of ethics requires organizational sanctions which are stated in TNP Organizational Sanctions Regulations. The more a police officer involves in any violation, the lower performance he or she will have. Therefore, this variable is included as an indicator of the police officers’ performance in TNP.

*Police Officers’ Criminal Involvement*

One of the major reasons for the existence of the police officers is to prevent criminal activities in the place where they work. However, some problems related to police brutality and police integrity may lead some police officers to be involved in criminal activities such as corruption, human right violations, and maltreatment of the citizens. Involvement in any kind of criminal activities is also an indicator that specifies the performance of the police officers. Therefore, police officers’ criminal involvements are considered as a factor is related their performance.

*Rewards*

In addition, rewards are important indicators that specify police officers' job performance. When police officers achieve outstanding duty, they are rewarded by TNP. Money incentives and the official certification by the General Directorate are the main two outcomes of the rewards. The amount of money differs based on the magnitude of the achievement. Also, the rewards are considered as one of the indicators to make promotion decisions of the police officers for higher level positions. The more rewards a police officer has, the better performance he or she will have. Therefore, this study uses rewards as a performance indicator of the police officers.

*Appreciations*
Appreciations are the official certification of the police officers at local level when they achieve an outstanding duty. It does not include any monetary incentives. The only benefit of the appreciation is that it a positive indicator while promoting. This award system is considered as a lower level of the award. If police officers have more appreciation certificate, he or she will be considered more successful. For that reason, this variable was included as the independent variable of the study.

Independent Variables

The Turkish government proposed to increase police officers’ performance by increasing the level of the education with TNP education reform. With the reform, police officers’ education levels are shaped as shown in Table 4.1. Currently, there are three different categories of police officers. These categories are determined according the type of the education police officers received. In other words, the reform policies have brought two new and one old education systems in TNP. Therefore, type of the education is considered as the major effect that shaped the policy outcomes. In addition, the effects of other factors such as internal and external on policy outcomes are considered in this research to determine actual policy outcomes.

Education

The nature of the policy developed and enhanced the standards to be a police officer in the nation. With the implementation of the reform policies, three different police officers’ categories exist in the organization. The first category is the product of the pre-reform police education system while the second and the third categories are the product of the post-reform education system.
Pre-reform police education system used to be a 1 year basic training program after the high school. According to his system, police officers used to become a police officer in one year and TNP used to appoint to any position in the organization. The candidates had to complete military duties previously in order to qualify to attend the police schools. Currently, there is no different treatment or implementation among the police officers from pre-reform or post-reform. However, all police officers are supposed to do the same policing tasks in the same organizations. Being police officers from the pre-reform education is a factor that might affect the performance of the police officers. They may act better or worse than the police officers from post-reform police officers. This variable will be a basis to compare the performance variation of the police officers among different categories. This leads the researcher to capture the actual performance variation among all categories by looking at their level of effects on the performance variables.

The level of basic police education has increased to 2 years with some curriculum modification. The status of the basic police education was also changed into 2 years associate bachelors’ degree by changing the police schools name as Police Vocational Schools of Higher Education (PVSHE). The qualifications to enter PVSHE have also changed with this reform. The candidates did not have to complete their military duty to be eligible for the PVHE. Therefore, the younger candidates were allowed to be police officers based on the reform policies. The post-reform has brought totally different police officer profiles than the pre-reform system. The expectation from the new police officers was higher since several changes occurred. This variable will
allow researcher to track the performance variation of 2 year college graduates on actual reform outcomes.

Another reform action that was discussed in the previous chapter allowed four year college graduates to be police officers after 6 month basic education. The policy did not have any limitation regarding the major of the 4 years graduates. No matter what the major of the college graduates is, they are allowed to be police officers. It is expected that the college graduates have higher level of education and they do not need two years basic police education. Instead, six months basic education would be enough to be police officer. One of the underlying reasons of this change was the expectation of higher performance from the four-year college graduates in policing as theoretical basis were discussed in the earlier chapters. How the police officers in this category perform will be an indicator to compare the effect of the policy on police officers’ performance. Consequently, this variable is included in this model to capture the performance variation of the college graduates. This variable will be recoded as CATEGORY 1 = 1, CATEGORY 2 = 2, and CATEGORY 3 = 3. It is hypothesized that police officers who received higher level of education (Category 2 and Category 3) will have higher job performance than those who received lower education (Category 1). Among Category 2 and 3, it is also assumed that Category 3 performs better that Category 2.

Internal Factors

The quantitative model also seeks the effects of the internal variables on police officers performance. Among various different internal factors, only six most relevant
variables were chosen for the model. The model looks at how these variables affected the police officers’ performance.

A great deal of research in police education indicates that the seniority of the police officer is directly related with their performance. It is assumed that experience provides police officers better skills which are needed for quality policing (Kakar, 1998). To measure seniority or experience, a variable that indicates the number of years a police officer has been employed by the TNP. It is expected that police officers with more experience will have higher performance ratings.

A second indicator is the gender of the officer. Five percent of all TNP officers are women. This proportion is similar in law enforcement organizations all over the world. Research indicates that gender might be a significant factor in policing while practicing their duties (Kakar, 2002). Accordingly, gender in policing is an important issue while examining the relationship between police officer’s performance and their education level. Kakar (2002) examines male and female officers’ perceptions about their job performance on 40 job performance categories to determine if there are any statistically significant gender differences in law enforcement officers’ perceptions in their job performance skills. These differences are tested in job performance in street-level work and supervisory and administrative tasks. The findings of the study show that men and women have very similar means on 75% of the 40 performance categories. Men and women’s scores did not differ significantly on their knowledge of departmental rules and knowledge of state and federal laws. They have identical mean scores on their ability to deal with extra work, criticism, and work without supervision. The study concludes that male and female officers perceive themselves equally qualified to carry
out tasks required in law enforcement, including administration and supervision functions. Male and female police officers work equally well on their jobs and there are no significant differences in their job performance, capabilities, and administration skills even when level of education and years of experience are controlled. The variable will be recoded as MALE=1 and FEMALE = 0. The case in TNP seems also similar and it is expected that gender does not matter in terms of their job performance in TNP.

Another indicator that affects the police officers’ performance is in-service trainings. The TNP offers its employees in-service training programs in various areas. Some in-service training programs are mandatory for all police officers, while some of them are offers to the volunteers. The main purposes of these programs are to specialize in police officers in a specific area, improve their knowledge and skills, and inform about the innovations and changes in the environment they are in. After each in-service training program, official certificates are delivered to the participants and they are recorded on each police officers file in the TNP Department of Personnel. It is expected that the more in-service programs a police officer participates in, the better performance he or she will have. Therefore, this model takes into account the in-service training in terms of its effect on police officers’ performance.

Finally, individual degrees that police officers earn individually are another indicator of the internal factors. Besides each of different categories that exist with the education reform, police officers are able to attend different 2 years and 4 years college distance education programs during their duties from Open University. Open University is a distance education program which functions under Eskisehir University. In the program, each course has a textbook and students are supposed to read and take
exams from the textbooks. There is no classroom and instructor to teach the students. There are exam centers all over the country and student stake exams in these centers. It has been a tradition to finish Open University to have a higher level of education in order to have higher social benefits in the governmental organizations in Turkey. However, the quality of Open University in Turkey is not as good as normal universities. There is considerable number of police officers who had some kinds of college degree individually in this organization and the level and the content of the degrees are almost based on the same format which is not equivalent with an ordinary college degree. These individual degrees are classified into four categories as police officers without any individual degree, police officers with an open university degree, police officers with a normal university degree, and police officers with master degree. Therefore, it is hypothesized that open university degrees do not have any effect on police officer’s job performance.

External Community Factors

Statutory and internal factors are not the only influences upon education reforms; some external factors also affect the reform outcomes as well. Any change in the external environment affects the reform implementation and relative importance of the reform objectives. For instance, any economic condition in the country directly affects the implementation since economy is an important indicator in implementation. Better economic conditions will lead to more financial allocation for the implementation. It is noteworthy that the research must control these external factors in order to determine how these factors influenced the reform outcomes.
Crime rate is one of the most important indicators to have an idea about the conditions and the environment of the area. Due to several reasons, crime rates differ among cities. For instance, crime rates tend to be higher in the metropolitan cities. Also, the cities with higher migration rates tend to have higher crime rates. Crime rate directly affects the police officers’ work load and their mood as well. That is, the model will determine whether crime rates affect the officers’ performance or not. It is hypothesized that the higher crime rate in a city leads lower job performance of the police officers working in the city.

In addition to crime rates, the population being served by police officers is also a factor that affects the policy outcomes. The more population police officers serve the greater effort they will exert which will play important role to determine their performance. Therefore, this variable will serve to capture the effect of the population on police officers’ performance. Accordingly, it is estimated that the higher population police officers serve, the greater performance they will have.

Another external community factor is social and economic condition. Social and economic conditions in the area where police officers serve influence police officers’ work. Variations in economic and social status of the citizens shape their behaviors and these influence the type of the behaviors during the interaction with police officers that may influence officers’ performance. Consequently, the model attempts to determine their actual affect on the police officers’ performance. It is assumed that the better social, income, and economic conditions of the area where police officers serve lead higher job performance of them.
Also, *education level of citizens* in the cities is another external community factor. The education levels of the cities tremendously differ throughout the nation. The research evidence indicates that education level of the population is significantly related with crime rates. As stated above, crime rate also affects the police officers. Also, police officers’ interaction with higher or lower educated citizens would be a factor that affects their performance. Hence, this variable was included in this model to examine the effects of education level of the citizens on reform outcomes. It is hypothesized that the higher levels of education in the cities where police officers serve lead greater police job performance.

Finally, the *geographic conditions* also play very important role in achieving the duties. The east part of the country consists of mountainous areas and the weather conditions are severe in the area. Accordingly, economic and life conditions in the east part of the country are not as good as they are in the west part since a great number of people migrated to the west part of the country. Therefore, the east part of the country is not an area where most of the police officers would be willing to work. To solve this problem, TNP has divided the whole country as east and west and established a mandatory appointing system. Each police officer has to serve in the east part of the country after serving the western part several years. The time range to serve in the eastern cities varies based on the conditions of the cities. The TNP specified the years to serve in the cities. For instance, mandatory serving time of City of Hakkari which is on the border of the Iraqi is two years while it is four years in the City of Erzurum which is a major city in east central Anatolia. The model takes into account these variations and look at its effect on the policy outcomes. The variable will be recoded as EAST = 0 and
WEST = 1. It is estimated that police officers working in Western area of the country have higher job performance than those of working in the Eastern part.

Quantitative Data Procedures

For the quantitative section, the data will come from two different sources. First, information on the individual police officers will be governmental records which come from the TNP Department of Personnel which is the major data source for this model. This institution has a database that includes all demographic and performance related data of the sworn police officers.

From this database, the police officers’ performance related data, statutory factors, and internal factors data will be derived with careful examination. Specifically, personnel evaluation grades come in 100 point scale with the average of the all grades. For the organizational sanctions, criminal involvements, rewards, and appreciations data, the total number of the occurrence during their career are calculated and will be used for the research. These all performance related measures will be interval ratio.

However, the statutory factor measures will be nominal since the study will categorize the police based on police officer’s education levels. There will be three nominal groups that will be compared. These are police officers with one year basic education, 2 years of college education, four-year of college education with six month basic education, and individual degrees which are stated in Table 4.1 as Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3.

To measure the internal variables, both nominal and interval ratio measures will be used. For the experience, the number of years spent in the organization will be calculated to measure police officers’ experiences. The in-service training variable will
be measured with the total number of the in-service training that a police officer 
received in his career. These two variables will be interval ratio data. Further, police 
officer’s gender, major, and department data will be categorized to measure nominally. 
Additionally, the geographical condition of the cities, which is external factor, will be 
derived from this database. There will be two categories which are East and West and 
the measure for this variable will be nominal too.

The other data source for the quantitative model is the Bureau of Statistics of 
Turkey. This is a federal institution which handles all statistical issues in the country. All 
kinds of data are derived with careful examination in this institution. This institution 
conducts an official research to collect the relevant data regarding the development of 
the cities in terms of socio-economic conditions once in 5 years. This database includes 
all kinds of demographic data at local and state level (Dincer, Ozaslan, Kavasoglu, 
2003). Also, the findings of this research are published and it is for sale by the 
department. This study uses the updated version of this publication (Publication No: 
DPT 2671). All external factor variables’ data, except geographical conditions, come 
from this institution. The external factor variables in the model relate to the environment 
in which police officers are in, specifically cities. The study will derive the cities’ crime 
rates, population, socio-economic status, and education level data from this database. 
These rates are specified as percentage in 100 scales by taking into account various 
related issues and indicators by the Bureau of the Statistics. These all measures will 
also be interval ratio.

As noted above, for the second empirical section, the sworn police officers 
working in the TNP will be subject for the analysis of the policy outputs since the reform
objectives directly focused on the police officers of the TNP. TNP has a centralized organizational structure to serve the whole population of the Turkey. Police officers are not ranked personnel and remain as police officers during their career. This study excludes ranked officers in the organization since their educational process is completely different than the basic police education system. There are 81 City Police Departments and each department has similar tasks. By 2008, the TNP has 186,250 sworn police officers, of which roughly 10,000 of the officers are women. Because of the large number of potential subjects, a stratified random sampling method will be used to gain a sample of the whole population of the police officers in 81 cities. The stratified sampling guarantees the desired representation of relevant large subgroups within the sample (Gay and Airasian, 2003). The general population of the police officers in TNP will be represented in the sample in the same proportion that exists in the population. The cities will be divided in two groups as East and West.

The sampling procedure first clarified 20 cities with stratified sample and then the sample of the police officers in selected cities will be subject to another stratified randomly sampling procedure. Among 81 cities, 20 cities from East and West parts of the country were selected randomly. As stated before, the TNP has divided the cities in two categories as East and West based on geographic and economic conditions. The population of the police officers in city police departments and the geographic conditions of the cities are two main criteria to clarify the sampling cities.

The samples were derived from these 20 cities by stratified randomly sampling. From these areas a total sample of 4,006 used. The police officers working in the General Directorate Departments in Ankara and police officers working in Police
Academy were excluded from this study since their duties are not typical police work. Police officers in these departments mainly deal with the bureaucratic works rather than the typical police work like police officers working in the city departments. A comparison of the performance values of police officers working in the city police departments with those who work in the general directorate may not be reliable. Therefore, this population was excluded from the general population. The total population of the excluded police officers is around 5 % of the general population.

Finally, this study uses One-way ANOVA Analysis, Post Hoc Test, and OLS Multiple Regression statistical models in order to find the relevant results from the analysis of the data. Therefore, linearity, normality, and multi-colliennarity tests were applied to the dataset that were used for OLS regression analysis. According to the results of this application, the data were combined or transformed for an appropriate analysis.

Qualitative Research Design

This study used in-depth qualitative interviews to find out how top-down or bottom up structures are involved in the process of implementation. Specifically, how street level bureaucrats and decision makers practiced the process of TNP reform implementation was examined. To do so, people at various levels from top and bottom levels were interviewed and the practices of implementation by top-down and bottom-up structures were examined.

What caused the successes and failures of the TNP reforms and how top-down and bottom-up structures practiced the process of implementation were examined in this section with in-depth qualitative interviews. The systematic analysis of the success
or the failure of the program is possible by understanding the process of implementation via implementation variables. So, the study preferred to use synthesized implementation variables in order to investigate differentiations and similarities in the top-down and bottom-up structures (structure of implementation). In this way, how the top-down and bottom-up actors have affected the success or the failure of the TNP reforms and how their practices of implementation differed were examined.

The study proposed to find some ways to link interview findings to either a top-down structure or bottom-up structure. There are implementers at the top level that identify the top-down category and people from bottom level that come into the bottom-up category who were both actually at play. The researcher sought some patterns in the data which suggested certain paths that could be characterized as top-down or bottom-up structure. The links in this context is suggestive rather than definitive. However, this condition leads for more research that draws that link definitively.

The implementers at various levels were asked questions about the implementation process of TNP reforms. These questions (see Appendix 3) examined the issues that caused success or failure during the implementation. The questions were constructed in a way that respondents could clearly state their opinion and experiences about TNP reform implementation. These questions were selected from different implementation research that examined the process of implementation qualitatively. All questions were applicable to both top-down and bottom-up approaches. In other words, all implementers were asked the same basic questions and top-down and bottom-up structures were examined by interviewees’ levels. For instance, if the interviewee was a head of department in TNP, the responds of the interviewee drew a
top-down structure. Similarly, if the interviewee was a police officer working in a PVSHE, the responds of him or her drew a bottom-up structure.

Regarding the construction of the questions, the variables that affected and shaped implementation process were taken into account and these variables were derived from the literature. These variables enable us to examine the practices of implementation by street level bureaucrats and decision makers. In the following section, some theoretical bases are presented in order to justify these variables which are used to examine implementation process.

Theoretical Basis for the Qualitative Model

The most relevant variables that implementation research suggests in particular implementation case were included with a synthesis. In implementation research, it is stated that various sorts of factors such as tractability, statutory and non-statutory variables shape the process of implementation (Elmore, 1980; Lipsky, 1980, Sabatier, 1986; Goggin, 1986; O'Toole, 1986, 2000; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Matland; 1995; Anderson, 2003: Birkland, 2005; Dye, 2007). These scholars have suggested that there are sets of variables and factors that lead us the understanding of how implementation occurred. These variables help us to understand the process of implementation and this enables researcher to track structural trends, if any, in the implementation. Specifically, these variables clarify us how the process of implementation took place, what were the successes and failures, and what were the issues which were influential etc. Then, the researcher looks at structural trends in the practices of top-down and bottom-up implementers and tries to find variations in the implementation by examining how top-down and bottom-up practices and views differ.
So, these variables are related to understanding the process of implementation (not directly to structure of implementation) which enables us to draw structural trends in implementation. This can be considered as the first step. In the second step, the structure of implementation is categorized based on the implementers’ positions as top-down and bottom-up and draw conclusions based on what happened in the process of implementation.

Some of the major factors that most emphasized in the literature and applicable to the TNP reform implementation are as followings:

- Technical problems (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Peters, 2007; Agranoff, 2008)
- Political problems (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Anderson, 2003; Peters, 2007)
- The extent of behavioral change (Hjern, Hanf, and Porter, 1978; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989)
- Clarity and consistency of policies (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002; Birkland, 2005; Dye, 2007)
- Availability and allocation of financial resources (Hjern, Hanf, and Porter, 1978; Lester and Bowman, 1989; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993) and availability of the resources (Lester and Bowman, 1989; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Winter, 2006)
- Cooperation among institutions (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Birkland, 2005; Winter, 2006; Peters, 2007)
• Use of discretion and the guidance of the implementers (Hjern et al., 1978; Lipsky, 1980; Mazmanian and Sabatier; 1989; Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002)

• Social, economical, political, and technological conditions (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Powell, 1999; Birkland, 2005; Winter, 2006; Peters, 2007)

• Public support (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989)

• Commitment and leadership skills of the reform implementers (Elmore, 1980; Lipsky, 1980; O’Toole, 1986; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; Anderson, 2003; Birkland, 2005; Peters, 2007)

• Information flow inside and outside the organizations (Hood, 1976; Peters, 2007)

• Time span (Hood, 1976; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Peters, 2007).

There are different variables mentioned in the literature but these are the most relevant and applicable determinants to examine the TNP education reform implementation. So, only these variables were used to understand the TNP policy process in this study and all of them were derived from the literature with a synthesis. Even though the early literature of top-down and bottom-up differentiated these variables as top-down and bottom-up variables, the synthesis model later suggested the combination of these variables. This research gathered all variables in the literature and used the most relevant variables in TNP reform implementation.
So, the methodology of this dissertation does not categorize the variables as top-down or bottom-up since the contemporary literature does not suggest doing in that way. The literature suggests the synthesis of these variables since they can be related to both to some extent. The categorization as top-down and bottom-up variables were only shown in a part of the literature review in order to present historical development of top-down and bottom-up approaches and provide explanation about what top-down and bottom-up were. Therefore, it seems that it is impossible to draw a category as the top-down or bottom-up variable today if we are using a synthesis model since the synthesis model covers all variables which are relevant. The variables were only categorized in the literature review part and the synthesis model at the end of literature review suggested the combination of both top-down and bottom-up responses for the methodology of this research.

What we are categorizing is the responses of top-down and bottom-up in order to differentiate top-down and bottom-up structures. So, the researcher asks the same questions (synthesized variables) to 30 top-down people and 30 bottom-up people in order to examine how top-down and bottom-up actors practiced and viewed implementation process and policy outcomes. In the following section, the conceptualization of implementation process is presented.

Model of the Implementation of the TNP Reform Implementation

The main research question of this study seeks answer for the ways of differentiations and similarities in the top-down and bottom-up implementation structures. This necessitates examining the process of implementation from top-down and bottom-up perspectives in terms of their influence on policy implementation and
outcomes of the TNP reforms. Accordingly, interview questions sought relevant answers from the TNP reform implementers in order to answer the research question. In doing so, the researcher uses some variables (Technical problems, financial resources etc.) that affect implementation and policy outcomes in order to find out the magnitude of effects of each variable from top-down and bottom-up perspective. All of these variables were derived from the implementation literature with a synthesis.

Technical Problems

Technical difficulties mostly relate to the issues that are based on technical actions (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Anderson, 2003; Peters, 2007; Agranoff, 2008). The definition of “technical problems” relates to development or the availability of specific technologies, and inability to develop relatively inexpensive and effective program indicators to solve principal problems (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989). So, any problem about lack of technology or lack of program development relates to the technical problem since these kinds of problems affect implementation negatively. For instance, broken network system is a technical problem since it’s related to the lack of technology. People cannot communicate each other if network is problematic, so this hinders implementation. Also, TNP reform objectives required the development of ideal curriculums for new education system. The inability to develop new curriculum can also be considered as technical problem since relevant program development did not exist for the effective implementation. Therefore, respondents were asked their opinions about technical issues during the implementation and any reasons for why implementation had been problematic were captured.
Political Problems

Political problems relate to the political conditions that reform implementation was influenced. Political conditions have considerable influence on policy implementation since political settings shapes the main structure of implementation (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Anderson, 2003; Peters, 2007). As Mahyew (2004) stated, politicians may shirk and intervene for some reasons during the policy process. They may be ideological shirkers which mean that they may want to act with their ideological preferences of their constituents to pursue their ideological agendas. Also, they may want to respond to only rent seekers to whom politicians deliver the benefits of the policies at the expense of public at large. In addition, politicians may pursue credit claiming which relates to the actions that considers desirable particularized benefits. Finally, a logrolling problem may exit with the politics since politicians and other individuals or groups may have expectations of mutual benefits from the program implementation (Mahyew, 2004).

The influence of politics exists in several ways. First, politicians have power to select implementers for the policy implementation. Especially, politics focus on the appointment of top-level implementers in order to dominate and intervene in implementation process easily. Second, politicians pressure implementers to pursue some benefits. This benefit may be for individually or public. Finally, top level implementers tend to be very sensitive for political demands in order to maintain their power and positions.

The TNP is a uniformed and hierarchical organization which functions under Interior Ministry. The TNP bureaucrats are appointed, not elected. Therefore, it seems
that, in theory, TNP is a political-free organization; however, in practice, it is not. The Interior Minister is a politician and he or she can easily influence the TNP organization. Therefore, political conditions and problems were very important in terms of effective program implementation. In some political conditions, implementation occurred effectively while some political conditions caused to some problems.

The Extent of Behavioral Change

Implementation of a policy requires some behavioral change to achieve policy objectives. The behavioral change consists of the amount of modification required actions and functions for implementers and target groups which policy objectives propose (Hjern, Hanf, and Porter, 1978; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989). For instance, TNP policy objectives were required the establishment of new PVSHE institutions. This requires various new actions and functions to take for implementers.

Police officers’ behaviors were perceived as problematic by the policy makers and they proposed to change police officers’ behaviors with this reform. The expectations from the police officers were extremely high with the implementation of the reforms. The more behavioral modification is required, the more difficulty the implementers face. Therefore, the extent of the behavioral modification is an important indicator that affects the implementation and respondents were questioned about the extent of required behavioral change.

So, the magnitude to this change is high. In general, the TNP reform implementation required a considerable amount of behavioral modifications in order to achieve the reform objectives. These changes were clear and recognizable by
everybody. The greater change required in a policy implementation process, the more problematic will be the implementation according to Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989).

Clarity and Consistency of Policies

The clarity and the consistency of the policies relate to the perceptions of the top-down and bottom-up implementers on the content and meanings of the policies. The easiness and simplicity of to understand what the policies propose and mean is the most important criterion for the clarity and consistency of the policies. So, it is noteworthy that the nature and the structure of the policies substantively affect the policy implementation and outcomes.

The literature indicates that clear and consistent objectives help implementers in achieving successful implementation. In addition, the questions on how consistent and clear were the reform objectives provide relevant explanation to understand implementation to some extent. If the reform objectives were not clear, then implementation would be problematic. If everything is clear and consistent, then it is assumed that implementation is efficient.

So, the clarity and consistency of the reform objectives play crucial role in shaping the implementation (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002; Birkland, 2005; Dye, 2007). The statute of the TNP reform policies is the primary factor that structured the implementation with legal objectives. Therefore, both top-down and bottom-up respondents were asked their perceptions about the statute of the TNP policies.
Availability of Financial Resources

The availability of financial resources is vital in order to implement policies and achieve reform objectives effectively for both top-down and bottom-up implementers. So, financial resources are the primary factors to run the projects and programs (Hjern, Hanf, and Porter, 1978; Lester and Bowman, 1989; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Winter, 2006). The TNP reforms required allocation of financial resources in several areas such as technology, staff, and capacity. So, relevant funding was critical in order to achieve reform objectives. For instance, new PVSHEs were established, previous police schools were modernized, and new staffs were recruited under this reform. Most of the actions that implementers intended to take required relevant funding directly or indirectly. If relevant funding is available, then the implementation takes place. However, it is noteworthy to state that using these resources effectively and efficiently shapes the success or the failure of the implementation. Therefore, the respondents were asked to express their feelings, opinions, and experiences about the allocation of the financial resources during the TNP reform implementation.

Cooperation among Institutions

It is important that implementing institutions cooperate to achieve policy objectives. For the effective cooperation, institutions should be committed to achievement of the policy objectives and responsible for the assigned duties (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Birkland, 2005; Winter, 2006; Peters, 2007). Also, they should act collectively to achieve objectives. There were three main implementing institutions during TNP reform implementation. These are the Police Academy, TNP Department of Education, and PVSHEs. It is estimated that the smooth cooperation
among these institutions leads the better implementation of the reforms. These institutions were in contact with each other and each of them had different responsibilities for the implementation. Moreover, each of these institutions was also in contact with some outside institutions such as different universities, Higher Education Council, and Interior Ministry. The respondents were asked their perceptions about the level of cooperation among these institutions. Their evaluation on level of cooperation was based on institutional actions and behaviors that they experienced.

Use of Discretion

It is important that implementers be given enough and relevant discretion to implement the policies effectively (Hjern et al., 1978; Lipsky, 1980; Mazmanian and Sabatier; 1989; Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002). The opportunity to use enough and relevant discretion also affected the effectiveness of the TNP reform implementation. With the use of discretion, implementers’ authority to make free choices on implementation was examined with interview questions. Specifically, the respondents were asked their experiences and opinions about to what extent they could use discretion during the TNP reform implementation. It is estimated that the more discretion and guidance to the implementers lead, the more effective implementation takes place.

Their free choices were shaped and affected by their ability, experiences, and knowledge about the content of the implementation. For instance, the TNP reform policies proposed to establish a police education system with the marriage of theoretical and practical knowledge and the policies did not specifically drive a path to carry out implementation. Instead, policies provided discretion for the implementers. However,
the answer for the question of how this marriage should be differs from person to another person.

Commitment and Leadership Skills of Implementers

Commitment and leadership skill of the implementers is one of the most important factors that affect implementation (Elmore, 1980; Lipsky, 1980; O'Toole, 1986; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Ringquist, 1993; Matland, 1995; Anderson, 2003; Birkland, 2005; Peters, 2007). Implementers are responsible to take actions to achieve policy objectives. So, their leadership skills and their commitment to the nature of implementation play important role to realize what the actual policy objectives are and how to formulize actions to achieve those objectives. If an implementer has high leadership skills and is highly committed to the implementation of the policies, his or her performance in achieving policy objectives tend to be higher. The reason for this is that his actions and manners to transform policy objectives into action directly affect the effectiveness of the implementation. Any actions or manner that contradicts with the policy objectives creates some deviations in the achievement of the policy objectives.

On contrary, the actions and manners which happen in compliance with the policy objectives create successful policy outcomes. Leadership notions lead implementers to use various tactics and strategies to meet the policy objectives. These will create good relationships with others and effective managerial skills which would be motivation factors for the effective implementation. So, it is imperative that implementers have high leadership skills in order to understand and implement policy objectives effectively in today's world. Therefore, respondents were asked their perceptions about the leadership practices of the implementers to whom they interacted with and
experienced during the implementation of the TNP reforms. It is estimated that the better leadership and higher commitment leads to the success of the implementation and these issues were examined via interview questions.

Time Span

It is important that actions be taken on time during the implementation for the success of the implementation (Hood, 1976; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Peters, 2007). Any problem related to time span might cause to deviation of policy objectives. Sometimes, delaying implementation might contribute to the success of the failure while hurrying might cause to stay behind the need as Peters (2007) states. So, each implementation actions require a time management for the effective implementation.

Which actions should be taken first and immediate? What should be the order of the implementation? Each of these kinds of questions requires comprehensive time management ability for the implementers. A good time management brings success while a problematic time management leads failures during implementation. Therefore, the respondents were asked their experiences and opinions about time related problems and issues. Specifically, the questions examined the time issue of TNP reform implementation in order to capture required actions were taken on time or not. This also includes appropriate schedule of time to allocate relevant resources on time.

Improvement in Police Performance

Improvement in police performance is one of the primary objectives and major outcomes of the TNP reform implementation which is the dependent variable of this
research. The quantitative section of this research examined the effectiveness of the program with quantitative indicators. In addition to quantitative findings, the researcher also attempted to capture qualitative findings about the improvement in police performance from a program effectiveness perspective. The respondents were asked questions if there is any improvement with the police performance in general. The respondents were asked to compare before and after the reform in order to track any development in police performance. The criteria for the improvement with police performance were described as any improvement with police behaviors, police-public relations, and crime reduction.

So, the outcome related questions regarding police officers performance improvement aimed to develop and boost up what the quantitative analysis suggest about the actual outcomes of the policy implementation. This provided a comparison of qualitative and quantitative findings on reform achievement. In this way, the qualitative data allowed us to flash out what the numbers were telling us in the quantitative part.

Control Variables

In addition to the above factors that shape implementation and affect policy outcomes, the literature also presents some extraneous factors that may play role during the implementation as control variable. Social and economical conditions, public support, and information flow inside and the outside the organization are control variables which are applicable to the TNP reform implementation. In the following part, these factors will be presented.

*Social and Economical Conditions*
Social and economical conditions are important factors that need to be considered as control variable since it might influence implementation somehow. Variations social and economic conditions directly affect implementation of the policies (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Powell, 1999; Birkland, 2005; Winter, 2006; Peters, 2007). Poor economic and social conditions hinder implementation, while better conditions make implementation successful. For instance, poor social conditions increases the crime rate in the society and policing in this society may be difficult. Also, citizens with poor social conditions tend to create more problems for the police officers.

On contrary, good social and economic conditions create enriched environment for people to perform better and, accordingly, implementers can act in this environment more confident. These all conditions may or may not affect implementers and implementation. So, it is noteworthy to look at the effect of social and economic conditions in TNP reform implementation. Both top-down and bottom-up respondents were asked their perceptions and experiences on how economic and social conditions of the environment that they were in affected implementation.

Public Support

Public support is another factor that can be considered as control variable. Public support makes implementation successful (Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1989). The border of public support was drawn as public’s positive or negative behaviors and actions about the reform. For instance, did the public like these changes? How did they like or dislike? Did they take any action which is against? These are some of the questions that inquired respondents' opinion and experiences. Any resistance or negative actions
against reforms create difficulty for the implementers. On contrary, compliance with the reforms assists and motivates implementers because they are supposed to do something which public agree and support. So, both top-down and bottom-up respondents were asked their experiences and opinion about to what extent public supported TNP reforms.

Information Flow Inside and Outside the Organization

Information flow is critical in any organization. Information should flow on time and accurately with smooth communication channels for a successful implementation (Hood, 1976; Peters, 2007). The TNP had already established some communication system inside and outside the organization. POLNET (Police Network) is the main online network system that TNP uses. All kinds of information flow and communication among members of the organization occur in secure environment. In addition, formal written documents and internal and external communication devices are other tools to communicate and share the information. An effective communication environment lead secure, accurate, and fast information flow inside the organization and this lead to the success of the implementation. Any problems in communication channels and information flow network hinder implementation and lead to the failure of the implementation. Therefore, the respondents were asked to convey their thoughts and experiences about the information flow and communication channels during the TNP reform implementation. Given the presentation of relevant model to view implementation, the following section provides explanation for the data procedures.
Qualitative Data Procedures

The study develops a qualitative model of policy implementation that attempts to capture the top-down and bottom-up actions as well as the factors that affected the implementation process and the policy outcomes of the education reforms in order to address the fourth minor research question. For this model, the data was derived via interview method. The unit of analysis for the qualitative model is the implementers of TNP education reform between 2001 and 2004 in Turkey. These implementers range from top to bottom level officials in the organization. The interviewees were selected among actors who played the most important role during the implementation of TNP education reforms.

Specifically, sixty major players during the implementation of the TNP education reform were asked various in-depth implementation questions (see Appendix C). The interview questions asked respondents to explain their experiences and opinions in various implementation related issues. Accordingly, the findings of the study depend on the perceptions of the participants.

The interviewees were selected from different implementing institutions. The reform was adopted by Turkish Congress and TNP was assigned to implement the reform. Since it is a centralized organization, TNP has a large organization structure which delivers and operates different duties and tasks. For the implementation of this particular policy reform, three institutions played an important role. These institutions are the Police Academy (PA), the TNP Department of Education (TNPDE), and 25 PVSHE institutions. The heads of departments, heads of divisions and bureau
managers from 27 implementing institutions were interviewed in order to provide relevant data for the research.

Heads of departments, head of divisions, and bureau managers in the TNP who all are the major stakeholders involved in the implementation process are the appropriate subjects to obtain relevant data for this research. TNP Department of Education and Police Academy function under the TNP and Interior Ministry. Heads of departments are the primary responsible authorities for the implementation of the reforms among implementing institutions. Heads of divisions are also subsequent responsible authority at top level. Furthermore, bureau managers are the major implementers that managed the implementation process of the reforms at bottom level. These all major players are the actors who have played significance role during the implementation of education reforms since 2001.

Among all interviewees, heads of departments, and heads of divisions are considered as top level implementers while bureau managers and officials are considered as bottom level implementers. Specifically, 1 head of department and 4 heads of divisions, 5 bureau managers from the PA were interviewed. Moreover, 1 head of department, 4 heads of divisions, and 5 bureau managers were interviewed in TNPDE. Finally, 2 heads of the divisions and 2 bureau managers from each selected 10 PVSHE were subject for the interview. The researcher used telephone, email, and face to face interview methods to obtain the data.

Conclusion of the Chapter

This study uses two different methods to answer research questions. First, a quantitative model was constructed in order to evaluate the TNP reform outcomes.
Basically, model examined if there was any significant improvement with the police performance since the reforms or not. This part of the measurement aimed to shed light on qualitative findings regarding to the outcomes of the reforms. The data derived from the governmental resources. To analyze this data, ANOVA analysis, post hoc test, and multiple regression analysis statistical methods were used.

Second, the study created a qualitative model to measure the implementation process considering the top-down and bottom-up structures. This method used in-depth interviews to provide relevant data for the analysis. The interview questions aimed to examine both implementation and the outcomes of the TNP reform policies. The respondents were top-down and bottom-up implementers who played major roles during the implementation of the TNP reform which was undertaken in 2001 and 2003. Basically, 30 top-down and 30 bottom-up respondents were subject for this research. The top-down respondents’ responses were compared to those at the bottom-up. This part of the measurement had been the primary methodology to answer the main research question of this study.

The synthesized variables of implementation were used to determine structural variations in implementation. The variables to understand TNP implementation process were derived from the literature with the synthesis approach and applied in TNP implementation case to understand the process of implementation. The variables used were technical problems, political conditions and problems, the extent of behavioral change, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, social and economical conditions, public support, commitment and leadership skills of implementers, information flow
inside and outside the organization, time span, and improvement in police performance. Among these variables, improvement in police performance was related to the outcome of the implementation while the rest of them were the major determinants that shaped the implementation and affected policy outcomes. These all variables were used as tools to understand implementation before determining structural trends in implementation.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of this research in two parts. First, the study presents quantitative findings which are related to the outcome of the implementation. Then, the study displays the qualitative findings of the study which relates and examines the process of implementation and outcomes.

Quantitative Findings

This part of the study presents the quantitative findings of the analysis. First, three different categories were compared with one-way ANOVA analysis. Second, a post hoc test was applied in order to find the associations between each of the category and five performance indicators. Finally, the study applies multivariate regression analysis in order to examine the associations between dependent and independent variables. In the following, these findings are presented.

One-way ANOVA Analysis

The study used one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) in order to compare 3 different type of education (Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3) by looking at their relationships with dependent variables. Specifically, this analysis determined whether the relationship between three categories and each separate performance indicator was significant or not. Table 6.1 presents the findings of this relationship. Table 6.1 presents the results of ANOVA F tests which compare the three different groups in terms of their
relationship with personnel evaluation, rewards, appreciations, criminal involvement, 
and sanctions. The formula for the F test is as follows: (Agresti and Finlay (1999)

\[
F = \frac{\text{BSS} / (g - 1)}{\text{WSS} / (N - g)} 
\]

BSS: Between Sum Squares
WSS: Within Sum Squares

\( g \): Number of groups
\( N \): Sample size

In ANOVA analysis, the mean squares are derived by dividing the sums of the 
squares by their degrees of freedom. The between groups and within groups estimates 
of the population variance \( \sigma^2 \) consist of the two mean squares (Agresti and Finlay, 
1999). For instance, in “Between Groups” row of the personnel evaluation variable in 
Table 6.1, BSS (Between Sum of Squares) divided by \( df_1 \) is 2215.931 (BBS / \( df_1 = 
4430.783 / 2 = 2215.931 \)). Similarly, WSS (Within Sum of Squares) is 14.901 (WSS / 
\( df_2 = 59927.438 / 4003 = 14.901 \)). Then, the F test statistic is calculated by the ratio of 
these two mean squares. For instance, in personnel evaluation variable the F value is 
148.478 and it was derived with the ratio of two mean squares of between and within 
groups \([F = \text{BMS} (\text{Between Mean Square}) / \text{WMS} (\text{Within Mean Square})]; F = 2215.931 
/ 14.901 = 148.478\).
### Table 6.1

*ANOVA Table for Results of F Test for Type of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4430.783</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2215.391</td>
<td>148.478</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59727.438</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>14.921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64158.221</td>
<td>4005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REWARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.476</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.238</td>
<td>111.925</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>187.330</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197.805</td>
<td>4005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPRECIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>251.452</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125.726</td>
<td>28.780</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>17487.278</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17738.730</td>
<td>4005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>4005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANCTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36.532</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.626</td>
<td>4005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ANOVA F test show that there is a significant mean difference in all performance indicators (personnel evaluation, rewards, appreciations, criminal involvement, sanctions) when comparing three different educational categories of the TNP education system (Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3) \((p < 0.001, p > 0.05)\).

In “personnel evaluation” category, the results show that there is a significant mean difference between Category 1, 2 and 3 \((F = 148.478, p < 0.001)\). This means that police officers’ personnel evaluation grades significantly differ based on their education level. Similarly, the results show that the received rewards significantly differ according to the police officers educational background \((F = 111.925, p < 0.001)\). Also, the type of education significantly affect the received appreciations \((F = 28.780, p < 0.001)\). Also, the number of criminal involvement significantly differs based on their educational background of the police officers in TNP \((F = 4.536, p < 0.05)\). Finally, the sanctions that TNP police officers received is also significantly associated with their educational levels \((F = 5.132, p < 0.05)\).

Post Hoc Test

The results of one-way ANOVA analysis displayed the explanations if there is a significant relationship between type of education and each performance indicator. However, we still did not have detailed evidences on how each these different three educational categories are associated with five performance indicators. Post hoc test was used to capture these separate associations by making possible all comparisons among groups (Warner, 2007). Therefore, we needed to follow up one-way ANOVA F test with Tukey’s HSD post hoc test since we had five independent variables that measured police officers’ performance. This test enabled us to capture interactions
between each educational category (Category 1, 2, and 3) and each police officers’ performance indicators (Personnel evaluation, rewards, appreciations, criminal involvement, and sanctions). One category was compared with the other two categories in post hoc test. The mean differences (MD) between groups specify the level of interaction at $\alpha = .005$ level in this analysis. The mean value of one category is subscripted with the sum value of other two categories. If the result is negative, one group (I) performs lower than other two groups. Also, the higher level of mean difference (I-J) leads to higher performance of the group.

Table 6.2 demonstrates the results of Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis which provides detailed explanations about the relationship between each educational category and police officers five different performance indicators. In personnel evaluation, the results show that both Category 2 and 3 perform better than Category 1. The mean difference is – 2.8661 with the comparison of Category 1 and Category 2 and this means that Category 2 significantly perform better than Category 1 (MD = -2.8661*, $p < .001$). Similarly, The mean difference between Category 1 and Category 3 is -3.0816 and this means that Category 3 significantly performs better than Category 1 (MD = -3.0816*, $p < .001$). Therefore, the results demonstrate that Category 2 and Category 3 police officers significantly perform better than Category 1 police officers in terms of their personnel evaluation grades.

Considering that Category 1 represents pre-reform while Category 2 and 3 represent post-reform educational system, the empirical evidences show that post-reform system is more successful than pre-reform system in terms of their personnel evaluation grades. The results also show that there is no significant difference between
Category 2 and Category 3. However, the mean difference of Category 3 is higher than the mean difference of Category 2, which means that Category 3 have higher performance evaluation grades than Category 2 when we compare them with Category 1 ($+ - 3.0816 > + - 2.8661, p < .001$).

Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis of “rewards” and “appreciations” also support our findings with “personnel evaluations.” In “rewards,” the mean difference between Category 1 and Category 2 is -.14347, which means Category 2 significantly have higher rewards than Category 1 (MD = -.14347*, $p < .001$). However, there is no significant difference between Category 1 and Category 3 in terms of rewards. Similarly, in “appreciations,” the mean difference is -.06882, which means Category 2 have higher level appreciations comparing to Category 1 (MD = -.06882*, $p < .001$). However, there is no significant difference between Category 1 and Category 3 in terms of appreciations.
Table 6.2

Tukey’s HSD Post Hoc Test- Multiple Comparisons of the Educational Categories and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>(I) TYPE OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>(J) TYPE OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL EVALUATION</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-2.8661*</td>
<td>.17152</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-3.2683</td>
<td>-2.4640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>-3.0816*</td>
<td>.63014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-4.5591</td>
<td>-1.6042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>2.8661*</td>
<td>.17152</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.4640</td>
<td>3.2683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>-0.2155</td>
<td>.64625</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>-1.7307</td>
<td>1.2997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>3.0816*</td>
<td>.63014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.6042</td>
<td>4.5591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.2155</td>
<td>.64625</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>-1.2997</td>
<td>1.7307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REWARDS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.14347*</td>
<td>.009606</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.16600</td>
<td>-.12095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.00909</td>
<td>.035290</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>-.07365</td>
<td>.09183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.14347*</td>
<td>.009606</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.12095</td>
<td>.16600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.15256*</td>
<td>.036192</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.06771</td>
<td>.23742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>-.00909</td>
<td>.035290</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>-.09183</td>
<td>.07365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.15256*</td>
<td>.036192</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.23742</td>
<td>-.06771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey 1 YEAR</td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.68823*</td>
<td>.092808</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.90582</td>
<td>-.47063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRECIATIONS</td>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>-.64960</td>
<td>.340966</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-1.44902</td>
<td>.14982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.68823*</td>
<td>.092808</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.47063</td>
<td>.90582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.03863</td>
<td>.349684</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>-.78123</td>
<td>.85849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.64960</td>
<td>.340966</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-1.44902</td>
<td>.14982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.68823*</td>
<td>.092808</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.47063</td>
<td>.90582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.03863</td>
<td>.349684</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>-.85849</td>
<td>.78123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.03863</td>
<td>.349684</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>-.85849</td>
<td>.78123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>Tukey HSD</td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.01291*</td>
<td>.004242</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.02268</td>
<td>-.00297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCTIONS</td>
<td>Tukey HSD</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.01362</td>
<td>.015584</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.02292</td>
<td>.05016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.01362</td>
<td>.015584</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.02292</td>
<td>.05016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>.01362*</td>
<td>.004242</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.00297</td>
<td>.02286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>.01362*</td>
<td>.004242</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.00297</td>
<td>.02286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS COLLEGE + 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>.02653</td>
<td>.015983</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>-.01094</td>
<td>.06400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>-.01362</td>
<td>.015584</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.05016</td>
<td>.02292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YEARS</td>
<td>-.02653</td>
<td>.015983</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>-.06400</td>
<td>.01094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
Our findings on “criminal involvement” also demonstrate that post-reform system was more successful than the previous system. The mean difference between Category 1 and Category 2 is significant and positive which means the level of criminal involvement in Category 1 is higher that Category 2 (MD = .00, \( p < .001 \)). On contrary, the findings on “sanctions” do not support our previous findings. The mean difference between Category 1 and Category 2 is significant and positive which means that Category 2 has higher sanctions when comparing with Category 1 (MD = -0.129, \( p < .05 \)). However, in both “sanctions” and “criminal involvement” there is no significant difference between Category 1 and Category 3.

Multivariate Regression

This study applied multiple regression analysis to find out the relationships between dependent and independent variables. It is necessary to examine the distribution of all variables before examining the correlations between dependent and independent variables. A normality test was issued to all variables that will be used in regression analysis. According to the preliminary data analysis, only “personnel evaluation” data set was normally distributed and all other variables were considerably positively skewed. However, the skewness values of the distributions should be between + - 1, while kurtosis values should be around + - 2 (Warner, 2008). In this case, Agresti and Finlay (1999) suggest that the distributions of the variables should be transformed into normally distribution by using some transformation techniques such as square roots, logs, and inverse (As cited in Basibuyuk, 2008). Therefore, “rewards,” “appreciations,” “sanctions,” and “criminal involvement” variables were transformed into normally distributed variables by using square roots method. Moreover, some
dependent variables that are in the same category were combined in order to reduce the number of the models in the analysis. Rewards and appreciations have similar data set and the mean of the data is suitable to combine; thus, rewards and appreciations were combined for the analysis. Also, sanctions and criminal involvement variables have similar means and values and they were combined into one variable as well. Applying these transformations and combinations, the researcher constructed three different models for each independent variable and nine different models were applied for the analysis.

OLS Regression Analysis of Personnel Evaluation

Table 6.3 shows the three different models of OLS Regression Analysis of Frequency of Personnel Evaluation. Model 1 focuses on the impact of basic education on frequency of personnel evaluation. Basic education, alone, explains 6.3 % of variation on the frequency of personnel evaluation (R²=.063). Model 2 includes some more variables in addition to basic education like years of experience, gender, individual degrees, and in-service trainings. With these additions, variables in model 2 explain 12.5 % of variation on the frequency of personnel evaluation (R²=.125). Finally model 3 covers all variables; basic education, years of experience, gender, individual degrees, in-service trainings, crime rate, population, socioeconomic status, education and geography. This holistic model explains 13.4 % of variation on the frequency of personnel evaluation (R²=.134). These results show that using additional variables to explain the relationship between level of education and personnel evaluation improves the percentages of explanation since R² change significantly increases in Model 2 and 3.
The relationship between basic education and personnel evaluation is positively statistically significant in all three models ($B_1 = 2.529$, $B_2 = 0.936$, $B_3 = 0.786$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, basic education is a good predictor to predict personnel evaluation. Frequency of personnel evaluation increases .768 units with every one-unit increase in the basic education based on statistics in model 3 ($B_{ae} = .768$). In other words, every one more level of education for police officers increases their frequency of personnel evaluation. The higher level of education police officers achieve, the higher evaluation grades they receive.

In Model 2, all other variables are also statistically significant to predict the frequency of personnel evaluation. Years of experience, individual degrees and in-service trainings are statistically significant at 99% level ($p < 0.001$) while gender is statistically significant at 90% level ($p < 0.10$). This weak relationship between gender and personnel evaluation completely disappears in Model 3. In Model 2, years of experience ($B = -0.178$, $p < 0.001$) and gender ($B = -0.466$, $p < 0.10$) are negatively significant, while individual degrees ($B = 0.968$, $p < 0.001$), and in-service training ($B = 0.175$, $p < 0.001$) are positively significant. For instance, the frequency of personnel evaluation decreases .178 units with every one unit increase in years of experience ($B_{ae} = .178$). This means that the police officers with higher years of experience tend to have lower personnel evaluation grades and male police officers tend to have lower personnel evaluation grades. Put differently, female police officers tend to have .466 unit less frequency of personnel evaluation grades than their male counterparts ($B_{ae} = .466$). However, police officers having higher level of individual degrees and more in-
service trainings tend to have higher personnel evaluation grades based on the analysis.

Model 3 covers all independent variables. In this model no statistically significant relationship is found between personnel evaluation and crime rate, population, socioeconomic status and gender. However, other variables in this model; basic education, years of experience, individual degrees, in-service trainings, education, and geography are statistically significant predictors of the dependent variable (frequency of personnel evaluation). There are statistically significant positive associations between personnel evaluation and basic education (B= 0.768, p<0.001), individual degrees (B= 0.716, p<0.001), in-service training (B=0.185, p<0.001), and education (B=0.463, p<0.001).

These results indicate that police officers with higher level of education, individual degrees, and in-service trainings tend to have higher personnel evaluation grades as also predicted in Model 2. The results of the Model 3 also show that police officers tend to have higher performance evaluation grades in the cities with higher educational index. Also, police officers working in the west part of the country tend to have lower performance grades (B=-1.568, p<0.001). However, there is no significant relationship between personnel evaluation and gender, crime rate, population, and socioeconomic status of the cities where police officers work.
Table 6.3

OLS Regression Analysis of Frequency of Personnel Evaluation (SQRT) (N=3878)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B^a (SE)</td>
<td>β^b</td>
<td>VIF^c</td>
<td>B^a (SE)</td>
<td>β^b</td>
<td>VIF^c</td>
<td>B^a (SE)</td>
<td>β^b</td>
<td>VIF^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education (Level of Education)</td>
<td>2.529*** (0.156)</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.936*** (0.196)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.768*** (0.204)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.178*** (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.172*** (0.14)</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.466* (0.261)</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.424 (0.260)</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Degrees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.698*** (0.087)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.716*** (0.087)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Trainings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.175*** (0.48)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.185*** (0.049)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.378 (0.004)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.375 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-5.86 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.463*** (0.106)</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.568*** (0.286)</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>2.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>261.8***</td>
<td>68.8***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01 (One tailed test),  a Unstandardized regression coefficient, b Standardized regression coefficient, c Variance Inflation Factor
OLS Regression Analysis of Rewards and Appreciations

Table 6.4 examines three different models of OLS Regression Analysis of Frequency of rewards and appreciations. These models basically examine the relationships of rewards and appreciations with all other independent variables that were presented in the previous models. Model 1 shows the effect of police officers’ level of education on rewards and appreciations. In this model, basic education itself explains 3% of variation on the frequency of rewards and appreciations (R²=0.029). Model 2 adds more variables such as years of experience, gender, individual degrees, and in-service trainings and examines their impact on rewards and appreciations. Five percent of the variations on the frequency of rewards and appreciations were explained by all independent variables in this model (R²=0.046). Finally, Model 3 covers all independent variables and looks at their effect on rewards and appreciations. All independent variables in this models explains the variations on the frequency of awards and appreciations (R²=0.087).

The results of Table 6.4 demonstrates that relationship between basic education rewards and appreciations is positively statistically significant in Model 1, 2, and 3 (B₁=0.299, B₂=0.143, p<0.001, B₃=6.387, p<0.10). Frequency of the rewards and appreciations increases 0.299 units with every one unit increase in basic education in Model 1 (0.143 unit increase in Model 2 and 6.387 unit increase in Model 3). These results indicate that police officers with higher level of education tend to have more rewards and appreciations.

In addition, years of experience is negatively associated with the rewards and appreciations and this finding is statistically significant in Model 2 and 3 (B₂=-1.76, B₃=...
Each one unit increase in years of experience leads 1.76 unit decrease in rewards and appreciations in Model 2 (1.37 decrease in Model 3). These results suggest that police officers with higher years of experience tend to receive less rewards and appreciations.

Gender does not have any significant relationship with rewards and appreciations in all models in this analysis. This means that gender does not matter when receiving rewards and appreciations. Also, individual degrees do not have any significant relationship with rewards and appreciations in Model 2. However, it is positively statistically significant at 95% level in Model 3 ($B_3=3.099$, $p<0.05$). Each one unit increase in individual level leads 3.099 unit increase in rewards and appreciations according to findings of Model 3 in Table 6.4. This leads a conclusion that police officers with higher level of individual degrees tend to receive more rewards and appreciations.

In-service training have positive and statistically significant relationship with rewards and appreciations in Model 2 and 3 at 99% level ($B_2=2.303$, $B_3=3.157$, $p<0.001$). Frequency of rewards and appreciations increases 2.303 units with each one unit increase in in-service trainings (3.157 unit increase in Model 3). These results indicate that police officers who receive more in-service trainings tend to receive more rewards and appreciations.
### Table 6.4

**OLS Regression Analysis of Frequency of Rewards and Appreciations (SQRT) (N=3878)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 Rewards and Appreciations</th>
<th>Model 2 Rewards and Appreciations</th>
<th>Model 3 Rewards and Appreciations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education (Level of Education)</td>
<td>0.299*** (0.028)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Degrees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Trainings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>116.2***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01 (One tailed test),  
  a Unstandardized regression coefficient,  
  b Standardized regression coefficient,  
  c Variance Inflation Factor
In Model 3, crime rate, socioeconomic status, and education do not have any significant association with rewards and appreciations. In other words, crime rate, education index, and socioeconomic status of the cities where police officers work do not matter in terms of being recipient of awards and appreciations. However, population of the cities is positively associated with rewards and appreciations and this associations is statistically significant at 99 % level in both Model 3 (B₃=3.372, p<0.001). The frequency of rewards and appreciations increases 3.372 units with every one unit increase in the population of the cities. This result implies that police officers who work in the cities with higher population tends to receive more rewards and appreciations.

Finally, the findings of the Model 3 in Table 6.4 show significant association between geography and rewards and appreciations at 99 % level (B₃=-0.408, p< 0.001). According to the results, police officers who work in the Eastern part of the country tend to receive more rewards and appreciations comparing the police officers who work in the Western part of the country.

OLS Regression Analysis of Sanctions and Criminal Involvements

Table 6.5 presents the results of the OLS regression analysis of sanctions and criminal involvements in three different models. As it is case in Table 6.3 and 6.4, Model 1 of Table 6.5 examines the relationship between basic education and sanctions and criminal involvements. This model explains 1 % of the variation of the frequency of sanctions and appreciations (R²=0.005). Model 2 adds years of experience, gender, individual degrees, and in-service trainings and examines their relationships with
sanctions and criminal involvements. With these additions, variables in Model 2 explain 2% of the variation on the frequency of sanctions and criminal involvements ($R^2=0.019$). Finally, Model 3 covers all independent variables by adding crime rate, population, socioeconomic status, education, and geography variables and looks at their associations with sanctions and criminal involvements. This complete model explains 2.4% of the variations on the frequency of sanctions and criminal involvements ($R^2=0.024$).

According to the results, the relationship between basic education and sanctions and criminal involvements is negatively statistically significant at 99% level in all three models ($B_1=-3.15$, $B_2=-4.88$, $p<0.001$, $B_3=-5.39$, $p<0.001$). Frequency of sanctions and rewards decreases 3.15 units with every one unit increase in basic education in Model 1 (4.88 units decrease in Model 2 and 5.39 decrease in Model 3). Put differently, police officers with higher level of education tend to have fewer sanctions and less involve in criminal activities.

Years of experience is also negatively associated with sanctions and criminal involvements and the associations is statistically significant at 90% level in Model 2 and 99% level in Model 3 ($B_2=-1.71$, $p<0.10$, $B_3=-1.99$, $p<0.01$). Each one unit increase in sanctions and criminal activities leads 1.71 units increase in years of experience based on the statistics in Model 2 (1.99 increase in Model 3). Put differently, police officers with higher years of experience tend to have fewer sanctions and less involve in criminal activities.
Table 6.5

**OLS Regression Analysis of Frequency of Sanctions and Criminal Involvements (SQRT) (N=3878)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanctions and Criminal Involvement</td>
<td>Sanctions and Criminal Involvement</td>
<td>Sanctions and Criminal Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B^a (SE) β^b VIF^c</td>
<td>B^a (SE) β^b VIF^c</td>
<td>B^a (SE) β^b VIF^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education <em>(Level of Education)</em></td>
<td>-3.15*** (0.007) - 0.070 1.00</td>
<td>-4.88*** (0.009) - 0.109 1.69</td>
<td>-5.39*** (0.010) - 0.120 1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-1.71* (0.001) - 0.057 1.72</td>
<td>-1.99*** (0.001) - 0.066 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>2.927** (0.012) - 0.038 1.02</td>
<td>2.989** (0.012) 0.039 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Degrees</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-2.61*** (0.004) 0.101 1.01</td>
<td>-2.54*** (0.004) - 0.098 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Trainings</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-4.37* (0.002) - 0.031 1.04</td>
<td>-3.62 (0.002) - 0.026 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>4.684** (0.000) 0.066 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-9.83 (0.000) - 0.020 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>1.795*** (0.000) 0.079 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-1.86*** (0.106) - 0.123 4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>1.844 (0.014) 0.037 2.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>19.16***</td>
<td>14.38***</td>
<td>3.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R^2</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01 (One tailed test), a Unstandardized regression coefficient, b Standardized regression coefficient, c Variance Inflation Factor
Unlike previous findings, the results of the Table 6.5 show that there is a statistically significant relationship at 95% level between gender and sanctions and criminal involvements in Model 2 and 3 (B2 = 2.927, B3 = 2.989, p < 0.05). These results indicate that male police officers tend to involve in the sanctions and criminal activities more comparing with female police officers.

Similar to years of experience, individual degrees is also negatively significantly associated with sanctions and criminal involvements at 99% level in both Model 2 and 3 (B2 = -2.61, B3 = -2.54, p < 0.01). The frequency of sanctions and criminal involvements decreases 2.61 units with every unit increase in individual degrees. This means that police officers with higher individual degrees tend to have fewer sanctions and less involve in criminal activities based on the findings.

However, in-service trainings variable does not have significant relationship with sanctions and criminal activities in all Models of Table 6.5. There is a negatively statistically significant association at 90% level (B2 = -2.927, p < 0.05) in Model 2 while this relationship disappears in Model 3 when adding more independent variables. Based on Model 2, the results imply that police officers with more in-service trainings tend to have fewer sanctions and less involve in criminal activities.

Crime rate and socioeconomic status are positively significantly associated with sanctions and criminal activities while population and geography do not have any association in Model 3 (B3a = 4.684, p<0.05, B3b = 1.795, p<0.001). Frequency of sanctions and criminal activities increases 4.684 units with every unit increase in crime rate. This indicates that the higher crime rate of the cities where police officers work
lead higher sanctions and criminal involvements. Similarly, the frequency of sanctions and criminal involvements increases 1.795 units with each unit increase in socioeconomic status. This means that the higher level of socioeconomic status of the cities where police officers work lead higher sanctions and criminal involvements.

Conversely, there is a negatively statistically significant relationship at 99 % level between education index and sanctions and criminal involvement in Model 3 (B₁ = -1.86, \( p<0.001 \)). The frequency of sanctions and criminal involvements decreases 1.86 units with every one unit increase in education index. This implies that the higher degree of educational index in the cities where police officers work leads lower sanctions and criminal involvement of police officers.

Qualitative Findings

This part of the study provides answer for the fourth minor question of this research. The rough data derived from the interviews were securely recorded. Then, each interview was transcribed into text. Top-down and bottom-up responses were classified in two different groups. Then the main concepts which were raised in the interviews were identified. Then, the concepts in each sample were classified into variables that would fit into each of the categories that were previously constructed.

The researcher preferred to present all of these findings by going over each of the variables instead of categorizing all of the findings under top-down structure and bottom-up structure in this section. The reason for this was to maintain the general understanding of the implementation process. The categorization of top-down and bottom-up structures was presented in the analysis part of this research. In most cases, the responds are the practices and the experiences of the implementers. However,
there are some areas where the practice or the experience of the implementers do not exists such as in outcome related variables and social and economic conditions. In these variables, the respondents presented their perceptions and opinions about implementation. So, the findings of this research include both respondents' practices, experiences, and perceptions.

Technical Problems

Both top-down and bottom-up interviewees specified a wide range of technical problems during the TNP education reform implementation. Even though the researcher has provided some explanations for what might include technical problems, the respondents perceived the concept of “technical problems” from a wide perspective. For this reason, the responses on technical problems drew different points which created difficulty to track some top-down and bottom-up trends.

The first technical problem that specified by top-down respondents is poorly designed curriculum. Over 95 % of the top-down respondents viewed curriculum as significant problem. This problem relates to the development of the relatively effective program indicators to solve police officers' problematic behaviors as Mazmanian and Sabatier indicated.

The development of the effective curriculum in PVSHEs was one of the primary solutions according the reform objectives. The Department of Education has conducted some academic research with the collaboration of universities in Turkey. The goal of this research was to develop an ideal curriculum for PVSHEs in order to improve police officers’ performance. The research teams conducted different surveys among citizens, students, public and private officials in order to specify their needs and demands in
terms of security. Then, bureaucrats from the TNP Department of Education and academicians form different universities designed an ideal curriculum and this curriculum was sent to Police Academy for the implementation. The ideal curriculum was based on theoretical and practical applications with strategic actions and democratic values.

Unfortunately, the Police Academy which was the responsible institution to run the new curriculum, had disregarded this ideal curriculum that was developed by Department of Education. The Police Academy has decided to adapt previous curriculum according to the new reform requirements. Therefore, the curriculum was only adapted to new system with slight changes and it did not offer a drastic change which could create a reform in police education. For instance, the theory courses dominated to the education by lacking practical learning.

Similarly, 95 % of the bottom-up respondents have indicated the same curriculum problem. The new curriculum with reform was the primary concern for the implementers since its effectiveness directly relates to the police officers performance. In other words, there was an important expectation from the new curriculum and reform objectives required drastic changes in the curriculum for the effectiveness. However, the curriculum that was proposed with police education reform was not implemented. Instead, a slight adaptation process in curriculum has applied by Police Academy.

Another technical problem that was indicated by top-down respondents was that the primary implementing institution, the police academy, did not have experience in basic police education. This was viewed as problematic by 85 % of the top-down respondents. In the past, the basic police education was handled by the TNP
Department of Education. The Police Academy was only offering a bachelor program which produced ranked personnel for the organization. However, with the reform, police schools had been transferred from the TNP Department of Education to the Police Academy and the name of the police school was converted to PVSHE. The Police Academy was responsible for basic, bachelor, and graduate education after the reform.

The top-down respondents indicated that bachelor and basic education programs were totally different and each education style required experience. What police academy did was that it tried to adapt bachelor system to the basic education system and this created problem. People in the Police Academy had approached to the problems of the PVSHEs' from bachelor school system perspective and this created problem in solving them effectively. For instance, the Police Academy attempted to use curriculum materials and systems of the bachelor but most parts of the adaptation process were incompatible. So, this leads us to a problem of inexperience. If the Police Academy had experienced in basic police education system, it would have been more efficient during the adaptation process.

In addition, the absence of requisite technology for successful implementation of the reform was another technical problem. Almost 90% of the top-down respondents indicated that they observed and experienced this problem. As Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989) stated, the absence of technology to carry out program effectively causes to some difficulties in the achievement of the program objectives. From this point of view, the availability of technological devices for carrying out the TNP reforms was vital for the successful implementation. However, there were certain problems in some PVSHEs which located in the east and rural area of the country. The reason for
this is that the economical and life conditions of the east part of the country are lower than the west part because of the unequal distribution of resources among institutions. For instance, the police academy campus was very comfortable and had lots of computer labs while the conditions in Bayburt PVSHE were very poor.

The other problem that emerged from top-down respondents is lack of quality educators in PVSHEs. Nearly 75% of the top-down respondents viewed this issue as problematic. This problem was identified from three perspectives. First, most educators working in the PVSHEs were nor eager to teach. They were not appointed to PVSHE voluntarily. Working in a PVSHE is perceived as non-activity service behind the front for most educators. Second, the TNP appoints high level police chiefs to PVSHEs as educators when there is no available position during high level policing appointees. Most police chiefs preferred to be appointed as educator police chief to the PVSHE since they could promote to a higher rank in the organizations. This situation also created the problem of lack of education since they were not educated to be a quality educator in PVSHEs. Finally, most PVSHE personnel have administrative and teaching position at the same time because of lack of personnel in the organization. People were teaching and following the routine office duties in PVSHEs and this makes them very busy which might reduce their quality in teaching.

The problems that were stated above were also stated by the bottom-up responders. Over 90 of the bottom-up respondents stated the same technical problems as top-down respondents did. However, there were some certain technical problems which were specified by only bottom-uppers. The most cited technical problems that were stated by 90% of bottom-up people are long working hours, overloading, and
hierarchical structure of the organization. All these problems relate to the development of the effective indicators for the reform implementation. However, the findings show that these indicators were not effective because of the reasons stated above according to the bottom-up people.

There were too many things to do for bottom-uppers since the reform policies have brought drastic changes. Especially, during the early years of the reform implementation, the required work was so intensive that standard working hours were extended one or two hours. Top-down people required bottom-up people to stay longer at work in order to finish the assigned work.

Similarly, there were too many things to do because of the reforms but the numbers of the bottom-up people were not sufficient in most institutions. Therefore, bottom-up people were supposed to undertake everything by overloading the work. For instance, the number of students in PVSHEs was increased with the reforms; however, the number of the personnel was responsible for the student’s records, awards and sanctions remained the same. This made bottom-up people so busy that they could not concentrate on their duties.

In addition, TNP had a strict hierarchical structure and this dominated to a formal relationship among the members of the organization. There was a strict command chain between top-down people and bottom-up people in implementing institutions. The bottom-up people had to obey the commands and they are not supposed to comment top-down people’s commands. Therefore, this situation did not allow practicing flexibility for the bottom-up people.
Political Conditions and Problems

Political conditions had positive and negative influence during the implementation according to the top-down people. The ruling party was supporting EU integration of Turkey and was eager to make some changes in TNP education. The reason for this was that they believed that better education would bring better performance of the police officers and better performed police officers were able to meet the EU standards which would be a positive credit for the integration. Therefore, there was a clear political support for the implementation of the reform. Politicians agreed with all kinds of proposals that TNP bureaucrats proposed. Also, relevant financial resources were provided by politicians for the implementation.

However, some problems existed because of the political influences. First, politicians intervened in the process of establishing new PVSHEs. Almost 95 % of the top-down respondents stated this problem. Each Interior Minister of powerful politicians desired to establish PVSHEs in their home town since PVSHE was supposed to bring some economical benefits for their constituents. Therefore, politicians pressured TNP bureaucrats to open new PVSHEs even though the physical and geographical conditions were not suitable to establish a new PVSHE. Kastamonu and Bayburt PVSHEs are the best known samples of the PVSHE that were established with political pressure.

The other political problem that was stated by top-down respondents is that politicians were influential in recruiting new candidates for the PVSHE. Over 85 % of the top-down actors observed and experienced this problem. There were specific requirements and exams for the admission to the PVSHEs. However, some politicians
captured the recruitment process and they wanted TNP bureaucrats to recruit their supporters for the credit claiming. During the early years of the reforms these problems were very common. Later on, the significance of the problem was recognized by the government and some preventive actions had been taken. With the new implementation, the National Institute for Student Selection and Placement undertook the recruitment exam. In this way the problem was minimized but did not completely disappear according to the top-down people.

The explanations for why TNP bureaucrats were very sensitive for the political influence come from the bottom-up respondents. Significantly, over 95% of the bottom-up actors stated that they did not experience any political problem or condition that significantly affected their ways of implementation. They stated that top-down people were the primary authorities that dealt with political problems and influence. The TNP bureaucrats tend to accept most of the politicians’ demands since their current power and positions are maintained by politicians. If a TNP bureaucrat is incompatible with politicians, he or she tends to lose his or her power and position with a political intervention.

The Extent of Behavioral Change

With regard to the subject matter of the behavioral changes, over 90% of both top-down and bottom-up respondents reported similar issues. The reform brought a totally new system for basic police education. The status of police schools became vocational school of higher education and new PVSHEs started to function under Police Academy instead of TNP Department of Education. Also, the curriculum of the basic education had been modified by new reforms. Furthermore, organizational charts and
functions were also changed. Shortly, there were lots of behavioral changes for individuals and institutions.

The early years of implementation of the reforms were more problematic since individuals and institutions had problems to adjust to new system. Especially, some of the individuals tried to maintain previous system during the early years and insisted to maintain status-ko even though this reform was planned before and institutions and individuals were aware of this change. However, both individuals and institutions had adapted to new system over time and the problems were minimized. So, the amount of behavioral changes during TNP reform implementation was so great that individuals and institutions faced with adaptation problems during the early years of the reform implementation. The changes affected both top-down and bottom-up people and no differentiation between top-down and bottom-up people were tracked from their responses.

Clarity and Consistency of Policies

The recorded findings indicate that over 85 % of top-down implementers viewed TNP education policies and its objectives as clear and consistent even though most of other TNP policies were problematic in terms of their clarity and consistency. The primary objective in this reform was to enhance the level and the quality of the police education system in order to produce quality police officers. Therefore, most of the reform objectives turned around changing curriculum, creating new status for the police schools, and extending the time period of the basic education. These issues had also been discussed during police education workshops, panels, and conferences and the reform objectives were also suggested as a remedy to solve most of problems before
the reform. Therefore, the policy objectives were very familiar to TNP implementers and they perceived them as clear and consistent.

The other reason for this is that basic police education reform policies were formulated with the collaboration of TNP top-level bureaucrats and legislators. The legislators had little experience and information about basic police education system. Therefore, they had to accept proposals of the TNP bureaucrats for the reform. This situation also created clarity and the consistency of the policies since they dealt with them before and had information about the content of the policies.

However, some of the top-down respondents indicated that they could not take advantage of the clarity and consistency of the policies because of the strict hierarchical structure of the TNP organization. Hierarchical structure created obstacles in communication between superiors and subordinates and this caused complexity for the subordinates. Most top-down people were internalized the reform objectives while most subordinates were unconcerned about the reform objectives and this affected reform implementation negatively.

Surprisingly, around 80 % of the bottom-up respondents stated that they did not have detailed information about the statute of the policies. Accordingly, they had difficulty to make comments about the clarity and the consistency of the policies. In other words, they did not have any idea about them. Significantly, they indicated that their perceptions about the reform objectives were shaped by the reflection of their superiors. They were not aware of the nature and the content of the policies. Traditionally, top-down people were supposed to know and be aware of the nature of the policies and they were supposed to draw directions for the implementation based on
their interpretation of the policies according to the bottom-ups. They indicated that they were not supposed to make comments about the implementation styles of their superiors. They were only responsible for the implementation of what their superiors proposed. Therefore, it was difficult to see the big picture that the policies and their objectives drew for the implementation. The explanation for this situation is also related to the compliment of the top-down people about the bottom-up people’s unconcerned situation against reform objectives. Specifically, strict hierarchy and command chain did not allow functioning bottom-up people in order to contribute implementation effectively.

Availability of Financial Resources

In general, nearly 85 % of both top-down and bottom-up respondents reported that they did not have any financial problems during the implementation of the reforms. The integration to the EU had been a symbolic issue for the government. Therefore, the government aimed to fulfill EU standards in all areas, especially in policing area. The government was supposed to adjust its internal policies and systems based on the EU standards. Policing was one of the most important issues since it would relate to the violation of human rights which would be the major obstacle in democratization of the country. Most of the problems used to relate to the police misbehavior and, accordingly, lack of police education. Therefore, reform in basic police education was offered as a remedy and the government was generous in allocating huge amount of financial resources for the implementation TNP reforms.

However, bottom-up respondents had some concerns about the use of these financial resources effectively. Around 70 % of the bottom-up respondents stated that the TNP took advantage of the allocation of relevant financial resources for the reforms,
but the top-down people could not manage these resources efficiently and effectively. Most resources were used to open and establish new PVSHE institutions in different areas by disregarding the enhancement of the quality standards of education in PVSHEs. There were lots of PVSHE institutions in the country but there were not enough quality educators to teach police candidates in some schools. More importantly, financial resources were not allocated for the development and improvement of educational standards. Therefore, ineffective use of financial resources during the implementation caused to deviation of some of the reform objectives. For instance, new PVSHEs with low capacity were opened in different cities because of political issues. However, opening less PVSHEs with higher capacity and standards would save money and this would increase the quality of education.

Cooperation among Institutions

With regard to the cooperation among institutions, over 90% of top-down respondents stated that there was a significant cooperation problem between the Police Academy and TNP Department of Education institutions. So, this problem significantly hindered the success of the reform implementation. Basically, three major reasons arise for the explanation of this cooperation problem.

First, the primary responsible institution for the basic police education was the TNP Department of Education. However, reform policies changed the primary institution into Police Academy. An institutional conflict emerged because of this transformation. With this transformation, TNP Department of Education had to transfer its power to Police Academy which did not happen willingly. For instance, the budget of TNP Department of Education decreased with these reforms while there was a considerable
budget increase with Police Academy. Therefore, Police Academy and TNP Department of Education were not eager to cooperate during the implementation.

Second, the Police Academy did not want to utilize from the experiences of basic police education that TNP Department of Education had before. In other words, Police Academy did not want any institution to intervene its area. Even though, TNP Department of Education had some proposals for the basic police education based on the experiences they had before, Police Academy did not cooperate with TNP Department of Education. The reason for this is that Police Academy was willing to use their implementation style which was implementing in Police Academy before for mid-level police education. For instance, the TNP Department of Education prepared textbooks for some of the courses with the collaboration with universities; however, the Police Academy did not use them. Instead, the Police Academy prepared different textbooks for the basic police education.

Finally, most top-down respondents also related cooperation problem to the lack of leadership of the head of the Police Academy, which is an individual case. The respondents stated that the head of the Police Academy was so close for the cooperation demands of institutions that nothing new happened during the early years of implementation. He centralized all authorities and did not allow taking any action without its permission. Hierarchical structure of the Police Academy was also primary reason to gather all powers in one individual’s hand and use them based on his or her individual perspective. Later, on, when the head of Police Academy changed, the cooperation with other institutions had increased. The respondents stated that there was not any cooperation problem with the new Police Academy management.
The cooperation among PVSHEs, TNP Department of Education and other outside institutions were smooth. The top-down respondents stated that these cooperation lead to the success of the TNP reform implementation. The only problem stated by respondents was about Police Academy. However, this problem was identified as temporary and limited with the first management of Police Academy after the reform by respondents.

On the other hand, 80 % of the bottom-up respondents did not state any problem with cooperation. What basically comes out from their responses is that bottom-up respondents could not feel and observe cooperation problems since these problems occurred at top level. Bottom-up respondents state that their implementation actions were based on cooperation inside the institution rather than institutional cooperation. So, they assumed that institutions had cooperated effectively and everything went on its way during the reform implementation.

Use of Discretion

The findings derived from both top-down and bottom-up respondents drove significant directions on the structure of implementation. Significantly, almost 100 % of top-down respondents reported that they had enough and relevant discretion while implementing the policies. On contrary, 100 % bottom-up respondents stated that they did not have opportunity to use discretion. Strict hierarchical structure of the organization was presented as the reason for this differentiation. For instance, the head of PVSHE had authority to establish mandatory studying hours for students or he or she can cancel these mandatory hours. However, the bottom-up people are not even
supposed to make any comment about the way of implementation that a head of PVSHE proposed.

In addition, some of the top-down respondents stated that the use of discretion differs according to the leadership style of the heads of the organizations. They indicated that TNP’s constitutional structure was effective to use discretion. However, failure of the leadership with top level implementers and the TNP’s organizational culture do not allow us using discretion during the implementation. Top level implementers are the ultimate decision making authority and subordinates cannot involve in this decision making process if the head of the department lacks leadership skills. Therefore, use of discretion differs among institutions. For instance, the Police Academy had problem with leadership and subordinates could not use any discretion. However, subordinates in the Department of Education were able to use discretion since there was a leadership management style.

On the other hand, almost all bottom-up interviewees stated that they had no discretion during the TNP reform implementation. According to them, the reason why they cannot use any discretion is the strict hierarchical structure of the organization. The bottom-up people were only supposed to obey commands and orders of the top-down people in TNP organization. They had no discretion to interpret the policies and use discretion based on their judgments. However, a number of bottom-up people denoted that they had discretion in technical issues since they have more information than top-down people in technical issues. For instance, bottom-up respondents who worked in computer-based departments stated that they were able to use discretion since their superiors did not have enough information about technical issues.
Commitment and Leadership Skills of Implementers

Although leadership is a practice for each person in an organization, the TNP implementers mostly realized and focused on top level implementers of the organization when explaining the leadership practice in TNP reform implementation. When both top-down and bottom-up respondents were asked their experiences and knowledge of the leadership skills of TNP reform implementers, majority of them expressed their perceptions and experiences about leadership practices in implementation of TNP reforms with reference to top-down implementers. The reason for this situation was explained both top-down and bottom-up respondents indicating that lower level implementers were committed to the implementation but their leadership practices were not influential since the organization was strictly hierarchical.

Over 90% of both top-down and bottom-up respondents specified the same problem regarding the lack of leadership skills of top level implementers during the TNP reform implementation. There were three primary implementing institutions which are the TNP Department of Education, Police Academy, and PVSHEs. Among them Police Academy was the primary institution which was the most influential. The majority of top-down and bottom-up respondents pointed out that the lack of leadership practices of implementers in Police Academy hindered the implementation. The reason for this is that the head of Police Academy was not committed to policy implementation. Required and essential actions were not taken by Police Academy on time. For instance, a proposal for the new curriculum was prepared by TNP Department of Education with the collaboration of universities. However, the head of Police Academy did not take into
consideration that proposal. Therefore, the curriculum had been problematic during the early years of implementation.

Another problem that was stated by respondents was that the actions that were taken by head of the Police Academy were not based on rationality. The reason for this is that Police Academy did not have any experience in basic police education. For instance, they only experienced middle and high level police education system and the implementers in the Police Academy attempted to transfer their previous educational experiences into new basic police education. However, there were various incompatible parts between two different education systems. Therefore, this created various leadership problems.

Because there was a strict hierarchy, the leadership problems of the head of Police Academy directly affected other top-down implementers in Police Academy and other institutions. For instance, the head of police Academy used to be the ultimate decision making authority to recruit new trainers to the PVSHEs but he did not recruit relevant trainers on time. Other top-level implementers were eager to recruit new educators for Police Academy, but the head of Police Academy did not allow for the recruitment. Most of the time, the superiors were supposed to act in a way that they were not willing to do since the head of Police Academy wanted different ways. New educators were recruited after four years from reforms when the academy’s management changed in 2005.

In addition, the respondents stated that if the leadership practice of the head of department is ideal, then everybody in that department can practice their leadership effectively. For instance, the Department of Education had an ideal management which
was practicing effective leadership to implement policies. That created a smooth environment and everybody in the organization was committed and motivated to achieve reform objectives. So, this finding underlines the influential actions of the top-level implementers in an organization.

Furthermore, another leadership problem exists in the appointment of the committed personnel to the educational institutions. Education required dedication, and it is important to be volunteer and eager to work in educational institutions. However, it has been a tradition to appoint high ranked officials who are unsuccessful or problematic during their duties in active policing duties. Therefore, working in an educational institution is perceived as passive duty for high ranked officials in the organization. So, there are various unsatisfied high ranked officials in PVSHEs and they do not practice their leadership skills since they lost their motivation. In other words, they are not committed to the educational activities. Therefore, their actions hindered the effectiveness of TNP reform implementation in PVSHEs.

Also, decisions and the actions of the implementers are closely associated with their leadership skills. Their leadership skills shape the decisions that they make and actions they take. Bottom-up implementers complained that decisions and the actions of the top-down implementers were so influential that they did not have a chance to practice their leadership styles during the implementation. It was pointed that this case was usual in most policy implementation in TNP organization because of the strict hierarchy in the organization. For instance, when the head of Police Academy make a decision, there is no way to make comment or suggest some alternative ways to the same things. Subordinates are responsible to do what exactly superiors want.
Therefore, subordinates actions and decisions were constrained and shaped by top-down implementers.

Time Span

According to 95% of top-down respondents, the reforms were implemented on time and no significant time problem was observed during the implementation. Planning implementation on time is important in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of the program. However, nearly 80% of the bottom-up respondents indicated that there were significant time problems during the early years of implementation. They stated that the top implementers had authority to manage time in TNP reform implementation and they delayed some actions that were essential to take during the starting process. For instance, recruitment of educators did not happen at first. Recruitment process started in 2005 although the reforms were established in 2001. However, the PVSHEs were established and started to educate candidates. The administrations of PVSHE had significant problems to find relevant educators for their institutions. Therefore, the administrations asked help from different universities for the temporary solutions. Later on after 2005, each PVSHE recruited educators. This has been a time problem during the implementation since the top implementers did allow for the recruitment on time. If the recruitment process had started earlier, the education quality in PVSHEs would be better. So, delaying recruitment process caused to the lack of education and hindered implementation.
Social and Economical Conditions

With regard to social and economical conditions, 95% of the top-down and 90% of the bottom-up respondents had the same perceptions on social and economical conditions. They mainly indicated two issues regarding social and economical issues. The first issue is that reform created new job positions in all around the country. This created an economic support for both members of the TNP and Turkish citizens. For instance, the number of police candidates to recruit for the TNP was increased and new PVSHEs were established. Also, the cost of education in PVSHEs was sponsored by government and appointment as public officer was guaranteed for the candidates. Therefore, the TNP reforms increased the people’s demand on being police officer because of the economical conditions. The respondents stated that higher demand lead to better implementation since they were able to recruit candidates with better qualifications.

The other issue that both top-down and bottom-up respondents stated is that the TNP reforms brought higher education system on being a police officers and this lead to recruit police candidates with better qualifications. The reason for this is that having a higher education degree is perceived as a better social statute in the country. That’s why people were not willing to become police officers since it was not related to higher education. However, the TNP reforms required higher education status for being police officers and the number of people who were willing to be police officers had dramatically increased after the reforms.
Public Support

Almost the both entire top-down and bottom-up respondents (90%) stated that there was considerable public support for the TNP reform implementation. So, no top-down or bottom-up differentiation were tracked on their opinions and experiences on public support. In other words, both had the same conclusions on public support. Respondents stated that public was waiting for this change for years and citizens were ready support TNP reforms. The reason for this is that the media was so influential in the country and mass media was broadcasting the failures of police behaviors indicating that education reform would be a remedy. Most of the citizens used to be aware of ideal police implementation and they were complaining police education system. Therefore, public believed that reform in police education was vital for the solution.

Accordingly, the respondents indicated that public support was considerable because of two factors. The first factor is that these reforms were perceived as the development of the democracy since reform objectives aimed to empower the notions of the democratic policing with better education. Public believed that previous education system was not sufficient to educate a police officer with the high democratic values. Therefore, public tended to face with police misbehaviors by violating citizens’ privacy and individual rights and hoped to be treated with democratic policing notions with the new education system. In other words, public supported reforms since these reforms brought some democratic benefits for them. The other factor relied on economical and social benefits of the public as stated previously. Therefore, these benefits lead to greater support of the reforms.
Information Flow Inside and Outside the Organization

Similar to public support, the entire top-down and bottom-up respondents (100 %) stated that information flow inside and outside the organization were perfect. So, no differentiation was captured between top-down and bottom-up respondents in terms of information flow and communication. In general, both top-down and bottom-up respondents stated that information flow inside and outside the organization were smooth. Especially, POLNET was so helpful for the implementers. All kinds of documents and information were share via POLNET securely. This created a smooth transaction of knowledge among implementers and institutions. For instance, a formal decision could be easily transmitted to all units in the country via POLNET. Also, implementers in any part of the country could easily enter data to the system and relevant units were able to use that data immediately.

Improvement in Police Performance

Both top-down and bottom-up actors indicated similar perceptions and experiences about the outcome of the policies. Almost 100 % of the both top-down and bottom-up respondents indicated that the police performance had significantly improved since the reforms. They stated that anticipated outcomes were achieved with the TNP reforms and both sides agreed that there was a significant increase with the police performance since the reforms. So, no significant differentiation was captured from the responses between the top-down and bottom-up actors in terms of their views of policy outcomes.

The most often cited reasons for this finding were improvement with the police image, citizens’ satisfaction, and public trust. Both top-down and bottom-up actors
stated that there was a significant improvement with the police image of the public since the reforms. The police image of public was not satisfying before the reforms. Especially, the media shaped public image of the police negatively by bringing forward the police misbehavior. However, the police have become more professional since the reforms and their behaviors toward public become satisfying. For instance, the TNP established community policing departments and started to cooperate with the citizens for preventing and fighting with crime. Therefore, the police and citizens have been closer by eliminating the barriers that were built in the past with new police image. So, the citizen satisfaction of the police has significantly increased because of the friendly communication of the police with the citizens. This improvement can also be considered as one of the major outcome of the TNP reforms which show that implementation was successful.

Accordingly, public trust of the police significantly increased. The police became more professional than before and established the notions of democratic policing, scientific policing, and community policing. By democratic policing, the police have been a guarantor of the democracy and human rights. Also, the police used scientific methods to solve the crime instead of traditional policing methods such which used to violate human right notions. Finally, the police and citizens cooperated to create safe and enriched communities together. So, these implementations have brought quality services and increased the public trust of the police.

Conclusion of the Chapter

The quantitative part of the study basically evaluated the success or the failures of the TNP reform implementation by constructing a quantitative evaluation model. The
model focused on the outcomes of the implementation and attempted to clarify success or failures by comparing police officers’ performance before the reform and after the reform. Basically, one-way ANOVA analysis, post hoc test, and OLS regression analysis statistical methods were applied in this research. The results of one-way ANOVA analysis indicate that all categories are associated with the performance indicators. The directions of these associations were clarified by post hoc tests indicating that police officers’ performance significantly increased after the reform. Finally, OLS regression analysis provided detailed explanations for relationships between each of the performance indicators and different educational categories. The results also show that police officers after the reform performed better. So, the quantitative analysis indicates that the TNP reform implementation was successful. However, we do not account these findings as the ultimate indicator for the success or the failure of the reform implementation. Instead, the study further investigated the success or the failure of the reforms with qualitative in-dept interviews and the findings of both qualitative and quantitative analysis sheds light on each part.

The qualitative part of the study used the synthesized variables for the analysis of TNP reform implementation. The examination of these variables enabled researcher to observe structural trends which existed in TNP reform implementation. The top-decision makers’ responses were compared to those at the bottom in order to record differentiations and similarities between top-down and bottom-up structures.
Findings of Structure of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND POLICY OUTCOMES</th>
<th>STRUCTURE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENTIATIONS</td>
<td>TOP-DOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Technical Problems</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Political Conditions and Problems</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clarity and Consistency of Policies</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Availability of Financial Resources</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cooperation among Institutions</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Use of Discretion</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Commitment and Leadership Skills of Implementers</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Time Span</td>
<td>HIGHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIMILARITIES

| 9 The Extent of Behavioral Change               | MODERATE | MODERATE   |
| 10 Social and Economical Conditions (Z)        | MODERATE | MODERATE   |
| 11 Information Flow Inside and Outside the Organization (Z) | MODERATE | MODERATE   |
| 12 Public Support (Z)                          | MODERATE | MODERATE   |
With regard to qualitative findings, the examination of TNP reform implementation draws important conclusions in terms of top-down and bottom-up structures. In general, there is significant top-down domination in terms of the magnitude if the influence on TNP reform implementation and policy outcomes. In political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of the policies, allocation of relevant financial resources, cooperation among implementing institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership skills of the implementers, and time span, the decision makers (top-down structure) had greater influence on implementation and policy outcomes than street level bureaucrats.

On the other hand, street level bureaucrats only had higher influence in terms of technical problems of the implementation. In addition, there is no significance variation among decision makers and street level bureaucrats in terms of the extent of required behavior change, social and economic conditions, information flow inside and outside the organization, and public support. Table 6.6 presents a summary of these qualitative findings.

So, the researcher observed some differentiations and similarities among implementation variables which tell us how the top-down and bottom-up actors affected implementation and policy outcomes. Knowing these differentiations and similarities helps researcher to balance the extent of focus on top-down or bottom-up. For instance, regarding to availability of financial resources, top-down structure seems to explain implementation process better than bottom-up one since top-level implementers have higher effect on implementation and policy outcomes than those at the bottom. This means that it is important to use and focus on top-down structure more than bottom-up
in order to understand the actual effect of allocation and availability of financial resources in an implementation process.
CHAPTER 7

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides comprehensive analysis and discussion regarding the theoretical insights of the research findings which were presented in previous chapters. The findings indicate that the practices of implementation differ in several ways but there are still some areas in which the practices of top-down and bottom-up structure do not differ. The analysis of these differentiations and similarities will be presented in the following part.

Analysis

The findings of this research can be analyzed in three main ways. The first way is to analyze the areas where top-down actors view the practice of implementation different than bottom-up actors. The second way is to analyze the areas where both top-down and bottom-up actors practiced implementation alike. The last way is also to analyze the practices of the top-down and bottom-up actors regarding to the outcomes of the implementation. Here, we also use the quantitative findings.

Differentiations in the Practice of Implementation

The findings show that there are some significant top-down and bottom-up differentiations with the practice of implementation in technical problems, political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span. This means that top-down and bottom-up structures are not alike in terms of issues stated above. More specifically, top-down and
bottom-up implementers practice implementation totally different in these issues. For instance, most top-down actors tend to face with political problems during the practice of implementers while most bottom-up implementers do not. So, these findings also specify some characteristics of top-down and bottom-up structures.

Among these differentiations, excluding technical problems, the top-down actors have provided more comprehensive and detailed explanations than bottom-up actors for the implementation since they were dominant. This means that top-down implementers had higher influence on implementation regarding to the political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span.

The most likely explanation for this situation is that these variables of implementation mostly require top-down actions and top-down actors are more influential than bottom-up actors in these areas as predicted by the early top-down advocates such as Matland (1995), Ringquist (1993), Sabatier (1986), Hogwood and Gunn (1984), Hull and Hjern (1982), Hanf (1982), Barret and Fudge (1981), and Elmore (1980). We could expect to find this because TNP is a hierarchical organization where top-down influence is very high during the implementation process. The influence of bottom-up actors is minimal while it is high in terms of top-down actors.

On the other hand, the findings recorded under technical problems show that bottom-up implementers are more influential than top-down ones. As reported in the findings, the top-down actors cited problems with poorly designed curriculum, lack of experience in basic police education, absence of requisite technology, and lack of
qualified educators. Similarly, bottom-up actors also stated the same problems. However, bottom-up actors cited additional technical problems such as long working hours, overloading, and strict hierarchical structure of the TNP. These additional problems were not viewed by top-down actors even though these problems were so influential on implementation and policy outcomes.

The most likely explanation for this finding is that technical issues generally relate to the bottom-level of the organization comparing to top-level. Also, top-level actors tend to have less information about technical issues comparing to top-level actors. Another explanation is that top-level actors function at top-level of the organization which creates difficulty to track technical problems at bottom level.

This finding was predicted by Lipsky’s theory of street level bureaucrats and Peters’ (2007) concerns about policy makers. Lipsky (1980) states that top-level actors are not aware of the problems of bottom-level. However, frontline managers, which Lipsky calls as street level bureaucrats, are able to track all problems since they live and experience problems in the field. In addition, Peters (2007) indicates that decision makers should have relevant information about problems in order to be remedy for the problems. The relevant information about problems can be derived by bottom-up actors who directly experience the problem in the field.

We could expect to find this finding because the top-down actors of the TNP are not aware of the problems which exist at bottom-level. They can only track the problems from a top-down perspective; however, their perspective may not capture the bottom-up problems since their views do not have a bottom-up vision. Bottom-up actors were able to view the implementation from a wider perspective which could capture more
problems comparing to the top-down actors. So, both top-down and bottom-up actors agreed with some technical problems; however, there was a disagreement with the problems related to bottom-up structure. This disagreement is the result of differentiations in the practice of implementation by top-down and bottom-up actors which top-down and bottom-up literature have specified.

Similarities with the Practice of Implementation

So far, the variations between top-down and bottom-up practices were discussed. Specifically, how the top-down and bottom-up actors practiced implementation differently and affected policy outcomes from different angles were clarified. This research also indicates some similarities in the practice of implementation. As recorded in the findings, both top-down and bottom-up respondents drew the same similar trends about the implementation in terms of behavioral change, social and economical conditions, public support, and information flow inside and outside the organization. In other words, the views and practice of top-down or bottom-up about implementation did not differ in terms of the issues stated above. This means that both top-down and bottom-up structures tend draw similar patterns in these issues. In other words, we can expect the same attitudes, practices, or reactions form both top-down and bottom-up implementers in the issues stated above.

The most likely explanation for this finding is that individual actors in an implementation process do not directly influence and shape the issues stated above. Instead, these are external factors that influence and shape the process of implementation and multi-actors, institutions, and factors involve in shaping success or failure of implementation. For instance, social and economic conditions were viewed
alike by both top-down and bottom-up actors. The reason for this is that the perceptions of both structures about social and economic conditions are shaped by external factors such as government’s policies about economic and social issues. A part of this finding was predicted by Ringquist (1993) by showing that change in overall external conditions may affect policy outcomes indirectly. Here, Ringquist does not relate to the differentiations in the structure of implementation in terms of external factors. What exactly Ringquist explains is that individual actions are not primary factors that shape implementation in terms of external factors. Overall external conditions also influence implementation and outcomes in addition to individual actions.

Contrary to our findings, Mazmanian and Sabatier’s (1989) theory indicates that social and economical conditions and public support are non-statutory variables which top-down actors are more influential than bottom-up actors. In other words, top-down view should be different than bottom-up view in terms of social and economic conditions and public support. However, our findings do not drive any differentiations in the views of top-down and bottom-up actors.

We could expect to find this because the early implementation scholars viewed implementation from only top-down or bottom-up perspectives. The combination of top-down and bottom-up perspectives emerged later on. So, our finding reflects contemporary trends of today’s implementation. The contradiction with Sabatier and Mazmanian’s theory would not exist today provided that top-down theories are updated.

So, it can be clearly understood that today’s implementation is closely related with both top-down and bottom-up structures and there is a clear agreement with the views of the implementation by top-down and bottom-up actors in terms of social and
economical conditions, public support, and information flow inside and outside the organization. This agreement is the result of dynamic and evolving structure of the implementation from history up to date.

Structural Trends with the View of Policy Outcomes

The primary objective of the TNP reforms used to be the improvement in police officers’ performance and it had been anticipated as major outcome of the TNP reform implementation. Therefore, the study followed two ways to examine the views of top-down and bottom-up actors in terms of police officers’ performance. First, quantitative model examined the police officers performance from a quantitative standpoint. Second, qualitative in-depth interviews examined how police officers’ performance varied since the reform with the variable “improvement in police performance.” Both qualitative and quantitative findings of this research provide relevant explanations for the evaluation of TNP reforms by top-down and bottom-up actors and each of the findings shed light on each other.

The quantitative findings provided a comprehensive explanation for how police officers preformed better since the reform. Their performance scale was created by performance evaluation grades rewards, appreciations, criminal involvement, and sanctions. As recorded in the findings, the analysis of ANOVA and Tukey’s HSD show that police officers’ performance evaluation grades were significantly better after the reforms (MD=-2.866, $p<.001$ and MD=-3.0816, $p<.001$). Also, their rewards and appreciations findings indicate that police officers received more appreciations and rewards since the reforms (MD= -.1434, $p<.001$). Further, police officers were involved in fewer criminal activities after the reforms (MD=0.00, $p<.001$). Similarly, OLS
regression analysis of personnel evaluation, rewards and appreciations, and sanctions and criminal involvement provides evidence for the success of the program. Personnel evaluation grades are positively statistically significant with basic education ($B_1 = 2.529$, $B_2 = 0.936$, $B_3 = 0.786$, $p < 0.001$). This means that the performance evaluation grades tend to be higher if police officers are educated according to the new system which required two or four years of education. Also, police officers who received new education tend to receive more rewards and appreciations ($B_1 = 0.299$, $B_2 = 0.143$, $p < 0.001$, $B_3 = 6.387$, $p < 0.10$). Finally, police officers tend to involve less criminal activities and sanctions if they graduate from police schools after the reform ($B_1 = -3.15$, $B_2 = -4.88$, $p < 0.001$, $B_3 = -5.39$, $p < 0.001$). These all quantitative findings show that police officers performed better and their performance significantly improved since the reforms.

The most cited evidence for the explanation of this finding is that police officers tend to behave better and increase their job performance with the increase of their education level. In other words, the higher level of education leads better police performance. This finding was predicted by the advocates of the theory of basic police education (Saunders, 1970; Brown, 1974; Weiner, 1976; Lynch, 1976; Goldstein, 1977; Miller and Fry, 1978; Sherman, 1978; Sparling, 1975; Vogel and Adams, 1983; Bittner, 1990; Shernock, 1992; Breci, 1997) indicating that the higher level of education leads higher performance of police officers.

In addition to the quantitative evidence on improvement in police performance, the findings of in-depth interviews derived from both top-down and bottom-up actors indicated that police officers' performance has significantly increased since the reforms.
So, our qualitative findings were supported by quantitative findings and quantitative findings shed light on qualitative findings. The police have become more professional and the attitudes of police are highly appreciated by the public after the reforms. Accordingly, public trust and police image of the public have improved because of the TNP reforms. So, it can be concluded that the reform objectives were met primarily. However, there were still some problems with the implementation. These problems did not cause to the complete failure of the reform in general. Instead, the problems with the implementation affected and hindered implementation to some extent. In other words, both top-down and bottom-up actors agreed that even thought there were some problems during the TNP reform implementation; the reforms were successful in general.

The most likely explanations for the improvement of police performance were cited as the selection process of the police candidates, new curriculum of PVSHE, and effective use of technology. The first reason is the selection process of the police candidates. The respondents indicated that the former system was not ideal to recruit skilled candidates since the candidates had to be over 20 years old. Students from high school graduate by the age of 18 and they choose their profession around this age. They did not have an option to choose policing since they did not meet age requirement. Therefore, students used to enter nation-wide exams to go to colleges and universities and students who used to be unsuccessful preferred to be police officer since there was no other option to have a job. So, the candidates were not so qualified before the reforms. However, the TNP reforms changed the system and students were able to choose police officer as a job at the age of 18. The number of applicants used to
be 20,000 before the reform and it increased to 150,000 after the reforms. So, it has been possible to choose high qualified candidates among 150,000 candidates. The higher quality candidates performed better in the PVSHE and accordingly improved the policing standards in the nation-wide.

Another reason for the improvement of the police performance was the new curriculum of PVSHE. Although the curriculum was criticized by many respondents, its ultimate effect on improvement of the police performance was noteworthy. Comparing to the former curriculum, the new curriculum was better but most respondents indicated that there was still room for the improvement of the curriculum. The new curriculum focused especially on the behavioral and communication courses in order to reduce the human right violations and police misbehaviors. In addition, effective communication and leadership courses aimed to create a friendly relationship with the public.

The other reason for the improvement in police performance is the use of technology effectively. The students were taught the use of technology in PVSHEs. Especially, the students were motivated to follow scientific policing during the two-year education process. This also had been a major goal of the TNP organization as whole and various in-service trainings and programs were established to develop the notion of democratic and scientific policing. So, the quality of policing increased and this lead to perform police officers professionally.

Discussion

This study found that the practices and views of implementation by both top-down and bottom-up actors are similar in terms of behavioral change, social and economical conditions, public support, and information flow inside and outside
organization. In addition, the practices and views of top-down and bottom-up actors differ in terms of technical problems, political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span. Also, the findings indicate that top-down and bottom-up views do not differ in terms of outcomes of the policies.

All of these findings answer research question four by showing that there are some similarities and differences between top-down and bottom-up structures. Top-down and bottom-up structures are alike in terms of behavioral change, social and economical conditions, public support, information flow inside and outside the organization, and improvement with police performance. This means that both top-down and bottom-up implementers practiced implementation in the same way in the issues stated above. So, they think or practice implementation alike in these issues.

However, top-down and bottom-up structures are different with regard to technical problems, political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, allocation of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span by top-down and bottom-up implementers. This means that their practices in these issues are different. So, their ways of practice and thinking about implementation differs in these issues.

What this means for TNP is that both top-down and bottom-up actors can influence the process of implementation and policy outcomes since their practices and views of implementation differ in some ways. So, the authorities should take into account these differentiations and similarities while allocating responsibilities throughout
the organization for the effective implementation. The influence may differ based on the situations and conditions of the variables that top-down and bottom-up actors face. The areas where top-down and bottom-up implementers were in agreement and the areas where they disagree can be a guideline for the effectiveness. In the following, these areas will be discussed.

Trends with the Practices of Implementation and Outcomes

The TNP reforms required considerable behavioral change and this change was clearly observable by all implementers at top and bottom level. Also, the social and economical conditions affected the implementation of TNP policies and no differentiation was recorded in the structure of implementation. In addition, there was significant support from the public to implement these reforms and we did not track any differences in the structure of implementation. In addition, both top-down and bottom-up implementers had the same positive conclusions about the information flow inside and outside the organization.

The technical problems that were stated by top-down respondents were also stated by bottom-up respondents. Additionally, bottom-up respondents presented different technical problems which were not tracked by top-down implementers as a significant problem. Problems such as poorly designed curriculum, lack of experience, absence of requisite technology, and lack of quality educators were tracked by both top-down and bottom-up respondents but problems related long working hours, overloading, and hierarchical problems could only be tracked by bottom-up respondents. These problems that were stated by only bottom-up respondents usually can be observed at lower level of the organizations. So, top-level implementers were not able to recognize
these problems even though these problems directly affect implementation and policy outcomes.

Top-down actors were not able to track some of the problems whereas bottom-up actors captured those problems. The problems which were not viewed as problematic by top-down actors were mostly related bottom actions. So, it seems that there was an agreement with practicing implementation in general areas, but there was a disagreement with the technical problems which relates bottom-up actions. The importance of this disagreement indicates that the accurate view of implementation does not only depend upon the practices of top-down actors. Instead, a mix of top-down and bottom-up structures can provide better and accurate explanation for the implementation.

So, what this means for TNP is that top-level actors should broaden their views while planning and practicing implementation. More specifically, it seems that the distance between top and bottom is very long and this distance creates barriers between top-level actors and bottom-level actors. For instance, top-level actors do not prefer to work with bottom-level actors as team. Bottom-level actors function as a team with their own and top-level implementers act as single team which has only one member. The work environments of top-level actors are significantly better than those at the bottom. Top-level implementers definitely have comfortable offices while bottom-level actors have ordinary shared offices. Interestingly, entering to the top-level implementers offices has strict rules which make bottom-level implementers uncomfortable. So, strict hierarchy keeps top-level implementers away from their subordinates. They only give orders to their superiors from the top but they do not know
the feasibility of achieving the requirements of their orders. They just want their subordinates to achieve duties. Therefore, top-down actors are not aware of the problems of the bottom-up. In this way, a top-down view may miss some important parts of bottom-up.

So, removing the barriers between top-down and bottom-up actors is essential for both an accurate view of implementation and effective policy outcomes. However, the TNP organizational culture creates difficulty to remove these barriers. The organization should take some reform actions which centers the notions of new public service in order to remove these barriers. In addition, top-level implementers should be rescued from being classic manager which used to be discussed in structural are in 1900s. Instead, they should have contemporary police leadership visions which necessitate cooperation, inspiration, and motivation through bottom-levels. To achieve this, the most logical action is that mid-level and top-level implementers should receive a comprehensive education on effective police leadership. This should include improving top-level actors’ decision making, motivation, and communication skills.

Also, the top-down practice is different than bottom-up one in terms of political conditions and problems according to the findings. The bottom-up respondents did not state any political problem since political relation occurred at top level during the TNP reform implementation. Top level implementers were in contact with the politicians and all explanations regarding to the political conditions and problems were provided by top-down respondents. The reason why bottom-up implementers were far from the political issues is that TNP has a strict hierarchical structure and no political relation occur at lower level. Political relations usually occur at top level of the organization.
So, these findings indicate that top-down actors are more influential than bottom-up in terms of political conditions and problems in implementation. In other words, top level implementers tend to be more influential on shaping policy outcomes regarding to the political issues. What this means for TNP is that the top-down actors are vulnerable for the political pressure and influences while bottom-up actors are far from this influence. So, some structural changes are essential in the organization which would prevent political influences during the implementation.

The primary reason for the political influence is that TNP is structured under the Interior Ministry in which political intervention is very high. The ruling party tends to appoints top-level actors of TNP from their supporters. In other words, merit system does not exist while appointing TNP top-level actors. So, the top-level bureaucrats try to keep their positions by accepting all political demands by politics and this creates political influence on TNP top-level actors. Therefore, the TNP should be structured as an autonomous organization under the prime minister. In this way, merit system can be applied while appointing top-level actors and this will create objectivity and professionalism in TNP which would prevent political influences.

Another significant trend emerged from the clarity and the consistency of the policies. Surprisingly, bottom-up respondents stated that they did not have enough information to make comments about the clarity and the consistency of the reform policies. Specifically, they expressed that they did not deal with the nature of the policies. Their superiors, top level implementers, were supposed to deal with the nature of the policies. The top level implementers understand the policy objectives and make decisions to transform the policies into actions. The bottom level implementers only do
whatever top level implementers say or command. This might be a tradition in the TNP organization or in hierarchical organization which is subject for further investigation.

So, the findings indicate that clarity and the consistency of the policies is not important for the bottom-up implementers since they do not directly interact with the policies in TNP reform implementation. Instead, it is very important for top-down implementers. However, there is no enough evidence to generalize this finding since this might relate to some cultural and traditional factors. However, this finding draws important mean for TNP indicating that top-down actors should transfer some of their crucial responsibilities through bottom-up in order to make their superiors comfortable about the nature of the policies. The bottom-up actors should also be aware of the clarity and consistency of the policies for the effective implementation. So, the tradition that only top-down actors know and interpret the policies should be broken down. This can be possible by delegating top-level implementers’ power and responsibility through bottom-level implementers.

Regarding to the financial resources, both top-down and bottom-up respondents were agree that they had relevant resources for the implementation since this reform had been a symbolic issue in order to enter the EU. In general, lack of financial allocation for the program implementation is a major problem in the country and it always hinders implementation. However, this did not happen during the TNP reform implementation. So, availability of financial resources for the implementers should have affected policy outcomes positively. However, the findings from the bottom-up respondents contradict with this argument. What bottom-up respondents stated was that
top level implementers were responsible for the management of financial resources and they did not use the financial resources efficiently.

We can draw two conclusions from this situation. First, just availability or allocation of financial resources itself does not indicate the success or the failure of the implementation. Instead, the use of financial resources efficiently and effectively directly affects the success or the failure of the implementation and their effect on policy outcomes. Second, the use of financial resources efficiently or effectively is mostly shaped by top level implementers in the hierarchical organizations. However, it is subject to further investigation.

In addition, a significant trend has emerged with cooperation among institutions. Some significant problems related to the cooperation were stated by only top-down respondents while bottom-up respondents did not experience or aware of any problems regarding to the cooperation. This means that top-down implementers played important role in cooperation during the TNP reform implementation and several problems existed because of their actions. On the other hand, bottom-up respondents did not aware of the problems that top-down implementers faced since they did not deal with cooperation as lower level implementers. They stated that top level implementers were the primary actors who shaped the cooperation among institutions.

Therefore, it can be concluded that top level implementers had considerable influence on cooperation among institution during the implementation of TNP reforms while bottom-up implementers did not have a significant effect. An effective cooperation leads to the success of implementation while problems with cooperation cause to the failure of the implementation. Accordingly, the condition of the cooperation affects policy
outcomes positively or negatively. So, the findings indicate that top-down implementers are more influential than bottom-up respondents on shaping policy outcomes regarding to the cooperation among institutions. However, this situation might be valid for only hierarchical organizations such as TNP since top level implementers generally shape cooperation issues and this necessitates further investigation.

What this means for TNP is that top-level implementers should initiate cooperation with other institutions. Any self-interested behavior or political issue of top-level implementer might cause to the failure of the cooperation as it was case with the head of Police Academy. So, top-level implementers should act objectively and choose the most efficient and effective ways to cooperate with other institutions. To achieve this, it is essential that top-level implementers have unified agreements with the objectives of the policies which are subject to implement. In addition, they should be eager to implement specific policies and they should believe in positive benefits. Otherwise, it might be common to experience cooperation problems.

Regarding the commitment and leadership skills of implementers, both top-down and bottom-up respondents agreed that there were leadership problems during the implementation. However, the origin of the most problems related to the top-level implementers. Any leadership problem emerged at top level was so influential that it directly influenced other issues in implementation such as financial management and cooperation among institutions.

On the other hand, the leadership problems at bottom level were not emphasized since respondents believed that they were not so influential. So, the findings indicate that the leadership practices of top-down implementers are more influential than it is at
bottom-up. In other words, top-down implementers tend to be more influential on shaping policy outcomes regarding to their leadership practices. For instance, bad leadership of the head of Police Academy hindered implementation of TNP reform implementation and this created huge problems during the implementation. However, bad leadership of a bureau officer in a PVSHE was not so influential comparing to the head of Police Academy. What this means for TNP is that both top-down and bottom-up implementers should be educated in terms of their leadership styles. This can be done with the establishment of some in-service training program which consists of basic police leadership practices. The training programs should focus on both theoretical and practical issues in terms of developing top-down and bottom-up respondents’ leadership skills.

In addition, a significant trend was recorded with the time span of the implementation. Top level implementers stated that everything was implemented on time. On contrary, bottom-up respondents recorded that there were some delays during the implementation and the responsible authorities were top level implementers for the delays. For instance, bottom-up respondents claimed that top-level implementers did not recruit new educators on time. Various appointment proposals were submitted to top level but all of the proposals were refused by top-level implementers. Appointment proposals were accepted by 2005. So, 3 years were wasted by top-level implementers according to bottom-up respondents. Bottom-level implementers were supposed to do what their superiors want on time within the command chain.

Therefore, any delay with the implementation was not possible. On the other hand, top level implementers had discretion to manage time to take actions. So, it can
be also concluded that top-down implementers are more influential than bottom-up implementers in terms of appropriate time management of implementation. If top level implementers use time appropriately to take actions for the implementation, this will affect policy outcomes positively. Otherwise, this hinders implementation and affects policy outcomes negatively. This finding may also relate to only strictly structured organizations or organization cultures of TNP since only top level implementers are the primary player to manage time.

Finally, the outcome related qualitative and quantitative findings show that both top-down and bottom-up actors had similar views. Both views indicate that the outcomes of the policies were positive and the police performance increased since the reforms. Also, these findings provide relevant explanation for the theoretical discussion of whether higher level of education leads higher police performance or not. The reforms proposed higher level of police education in order to improve police officers’ performance and the findings of the quantitative part supported the theoretical basis that advocate the notion that higher level of education leads higher level of police performance. However, the investigation of this theoretical discussion needs a more comprehensive analysis.

These findings answer research question three by showing that the primary objectives of TNP reform implementation were met by achieving positive outcomes of the implementation. The police performance has increased significantly since the reforms and the new educational system was producing the best performances comparing to the previous systems according to the both qualitative and quantitative findings. What this means for TNP is that the reforms were successful but there are still
rooms for the improvement. Here some implications for police training include that the basic police education should not only rely policing curriculum. Instead, the curriculum should include both policing curriculum and general fields that higher level education builds. Also, the education period should continue at least 2 years which a college degree can be obtained. In this way, police officers would be more professional with higher job performance.

Overall, we observe a consistency comparing the desired TNP policy objectives with the overall outcomes of the implementation. The primary policy objectives proposed to improve police performance and the findings of this research provided relevant evidences on significant improvement of police performance. Even though some problems existed during the implementation of the TNP reform policies, the overall success of the implementation made the program very successful. In the following part, the successes and the failures of implementation practices are discussed.

Implementation Successes

Considering the factors that Peters (2007) stated for the effective implementation, the content and the nature of the policies were very effective for the success of the program. The implementers were able to make specific decisions for the effective implementation since the policies were precise, clear for the top-down implementers. They drew specific ways to implement policies and this lead to success of the program. The other issue that brought the success is also related with Peters’ findings (2007). The TNP reform policies provided benefits for the society and public since the police became more professional. This directly affected the citizens’
satisfaction and provided benefits to them. In other words, the TNP reforms solved a significant problem in the society which used to violate individual rights by proposing to improve police officers' performances.

The other success of the program relate to the Lowi’s interest group liberalism. Most program implementations are vulnerable to interest group liberalism. However, the TNP reform implementation was far from the influence of interest group liberalism. The reason for this was that the organization had uniformed and formal structure which did not allow any outside involvement for the implementation of the program. The actions were taken centrally and nationally and any group could not be more vocalized than another.

Also, the analysis of the TNP reform implementation satisfies Lester and Bowman’s (1989) concern about finding relevant solutions for the policy problems. The origin of the problem for the poor police performance was tracked and a reform in basic police education was proposed for the remedy. The findings of the study confirm that the origin of the problem and the solution for that problem was appropriate. So, this issue indicates another success for the program.

In addition, the TNP took advantage of hierarchy and chain of command in delivering duties to the implementers. As Peters (2007) states, there should be “no resistance to commands” for the successful implementation (p.108). The subordinates were not supposed to resist to any command of their superiors during the TNP reform implementation. So, the chain of command was a successful point during the implementation.
Peters’ other point for the effectiveness of the implementation was also a reason for the success of TNP reforms. Peters’ point is that rules and norms of administration should be uniform throughout the organization. The TNP is known for its standardized rules and norms of administration. These standards do not vary inside organization. Each unit is supposed to apply these norms and rules and there are some sanctions for the individuals who neglect the application of them. So, the implementation occurred in a systematic way that each unit could act consistently and this lead to the success of the program.

Implementation Failures

Scholars have indicated various issues for the failure of the implementation. One failure of TNP reform implementation relates to the Dye’s concern about actions on implementation actors. Dye (2007) indicates that implementation tends to fail if implementer’s actions and decisions are not value-free and objective. This problem also relates to the lack of leadership skills of implementers. There were some complaints about top-down implementers because of their subjective actions. For instance, as explained in previous chapters, the Head of Police Academy during the early years of implementation did not allow recruiting new staff for the PVSHEs because of political issues which are individual. This subjectivity also leaded to other problems such as cooperation among the institutions.

Similarly, there was a cooperation failure between Police Academy and TNPDE. These two institutions could not act unitary because the head of Police Academy did not want to cooperate with TNPDE individually. However, Hood (1976) states that administration should be unitary. All relevant implementing institutions should be united
to implement the policies for the success of the implementation. On contrary, the institutions could not be unitary and this hindered implementation.

Another failure of the implementation comes from lack of appropriate planning for the implementation which Peters (2007) calls as a horseshoe-nail problem. The reform objectives required more practical curriculum and quality educators for the education. However, the curriculum had been problematic and there were lack of quality educators in PVSHEs during the first four years of the implementation. These two issues were the most important elements that would enhance the quality of education in PVSHEs and, accordingly, it would enhance police officers' performances. So, lack of availability of these issues resulted in the loss of financial resources and time in implementation of the TNP reforms.

This failure also is closely related to Spillane, Raiser, and Reimer’s (2002) findings which indicate that dysfunction of the adequate supervision of implementation cause to deviation between the desired goals and policy outcomes. In TNP implementation case, it is obvious that inadequate supervision of the Head of Police Academy leaded to the failure of implementation and policy outcomes.

In addition, reviewing the TNP reform implementation, we find that it fell short on one of the Mazmanian Sabatier’s six of the conditions required for effective implementation. Mazmanian and Sabatier’s (1989) fourth condition indicates that top-down implementers should be committed to achievement of policy objectives and they should have relevant skills to ensure these objectives. In TNP implementation case, most top-down implementers were committed and had relevant skills to achieve policy objectives. However, one top level implementers’ lack of commitment and leadership
skills caused to the failure of implementation. So, this result implies that the magnitude of the influence on implementation tends to be greater at top-level.

Conclusion of the Chapter

The analysis of the findings provides us three different trends in the structure of implementation. First, with regard to political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span, top-down structure had higher influence than bottom-up one. However, bottom-up structure was more influential than top-down one regarding to the technical issues. Second, there was no differentiation in the structure of implementation with behavioral change, social and economical conditions, public support, and information flow inside and outside the organization. So, both top-down and bottom-up structures have similar features in these issues. They were both same. Finally, the recorded qualitative and quantitative findings showed that both top-down and bottom-up implementers had agreed that the outcomes were successful.

In addition to these differentiations and similarities, the analysis of findings indicated that the implementation was successful because several reasons. First, both top-down and bottom-up implementers were far from the influence of interest group liberalism. Second, the implementation of TNP reforms caused to some benefits for the society such as better security services. Third, these reforms had been remedy for the problem of police misbehaviors. Finally, standardized rules and regulations and the chain of command of the TNP organization made the implementation more practical.
However, implementation was failure because of the lack of leadership skills of implementers, cooperation problems, and lack of appropriate planning.
CONCLUSION

The primary interest of this research was to explore the variations in the structure of implementation, if any, during the process of implementation in terms of implementers’ impacts on implementation and policy outcomes. Drawing on qualitative in-depth interviews and officially reported quantitative data, this research provided a comprehensive examination of the implementation research by using the case of TNP education reforms that were implemented in 2001 and 2003.

Basically, two models were subject for this research. The quantitative model attempted to evaluate the success or the failure of the TNP reform implementation by looking at performance outcomes of TNP police officers. In addition, the qualitative model examined the process of implementation with in-depth interviews in order to explore similarities and differences, if any, between top-down and bottom-up structures.

The major research question in this research was “Do decision makers and street level bureaucrats practice implementation in the same manner? In what ways do the top-down and bottom-up structures differ through policy implementation and outcomes? ”

To answer this question, the research answered five minor questions throughout the study.

The first minor question necessitated to examine the approaches to implementation. Building on background literature for the approaches to implementation from a wide perspective of public policy through implementation in chapter two, chapter three provided detailed explanation about the structure of implementation in order to
provide theoretical basis for the process of implementation. This theoretical knowledge was also used to record similarities and differentiations in the implementation practices of top-down and bottom-up actors by examining the process of implementation via implementation variables. So, the first minor research question was answered in chapter two and three. The study explained the TNP education reforms with the second minor research question. The underlying theory to propose this reform and the reason for the reform were explained in chapter four. The third minor research question examined the actual outcomes of the reforms. The findings show that police performance improved since the reforms and this question was answered in chapter four.

In addition, the answer for research question four had been central to answer main research question. The findings clarified variations in the structure of implementation by specifying differentiations and similarities in the practice of implementation. Specifically, structural examination about the ways top-down and bottom-up structures practice implementation in the same manner and how they differ took place in this part of the research. This question was answered in chapters six and seven. Meanwhile, chapter five provided relevant methodology to answer for main research question. Finally, the sixth minor research question was answered in chapter eight by providing some implications for the study.

The examination of top-down and bottom-up responses clarified the magnitude of top-down and bottom-up effects on implementation. Accordingly, top-down and bottom-up findings were compared by categorizing the top-down and bottom-up respondents in order to track emerged trends in top-down and bottom-up structures. The variables of
implementation were only used to understand the practices of the implementers. This research chose this way to study structure of implementation. The early scholars of top-down and bottom-up proposed to categorize these variables as only top-down or bottom-up. So, there used to be top-down and bottom-up variables in viewing implementation but it is outmoded today. The contemporary way is to synthesize implementation variables and to look at top-down and bottom-up structural trends by structuring the positions of implementers as top or bottom. So, the synthesis approach combined these variables, but a systematic analysis of how each of these variables work with top-down structure and bottom-up structure had not been clarified. So, our structural analysis of implementation also provides clarifications for the magnitude of the effect on implementation process in different implementation structures.

These findings indicate that the practices of top-down and bottom-up actors differ in terms of technical problems, political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment and leadership of implementers, and time span and top-down influence is greater in all variables except technical issues. On the other hand, their views and practices are alike with the extent of behavioral change, social and economical conditions, public support, information flow inside and the outside the organization, and improvement in police performance.

Not surprisingly, there was top-down domination in this particular implementation case and the reason for this domination is the structural type of the TNP. However, these findings might differ in an organization where hierarchy is not strict. So, the
structural type of an organization might matter in terms of top-down and bottom-up influences on policy outcomes but it is subject to further investigation.

Although a significant domination was recorded in TNP as hierarchical organization, some significant bottom-up influences also emerged. Typically, these bottom-up effects are not taken into account in the hierarchical organizations. However, the findings of this research necessitate the importance of bottom-up structures in hierarchical organization. Especially, it is important to consider differentiations with the practices of top-down and bottom-up actors in order to balance bottom-up effects on implementation in strictly structured organizations.

At this point, Lipsky’s bottom-up theoretical assumption is noteworthy to state since it provides relevant explanation for this differentiation between top-down and bottom-up structures. Lipsky (1980) states that top level implementers are far from the origin of the problems at street level where the most important actions are taken for the implementation. Top level implementers could only see the problems around them but they were not able to see the specific problems that their subordinates faced. Interestingly, the problems that were stated by top level implementers were general problems which could easily be tracked by bottom-up respondents as well. So, the findings of this research provide evidence for Lipsky’s argument from this point of view. For instance, regarding the effect of top-down and bottom-up structures to the reform outcome, the findings indicate that a bottom-up perspective tends to be more influential than the top-down one in terms of technical problems in implementation. So, it can be concluded that both top-down and bottom-up implementers affect policy outcomes
significantly, but bottom-up implementers tend to have higher influence than top-down implementers in terms of technical problems.

Comparing the issues which drew differences in the structure of implementation and which did not drew any differences in the practices and views of top-down and bottom-up actors, we come up with an important conclusion. From a general perspective, the practices which are similar do not basically depend on the actions of the implementers. Instead, they depend on the systems and the conditions that individuals do not involve. In other words, individual influence in an implementation process tends to be rare in the issues which are similar. For instance, both top-down and bottom-up implementers do not have an effect to shape social and economic conditions. These conditions are shaped the various issues in the country for years. Implementers just take positions under the available social and economic conditions. They do not directly shape and influence social and economic conditions.

However, individuals take important roles in the issues which drew some differences in the structure of implementation. For instance, implementers individually have the authority to influence the level of cooperation among institution with their decisions and the ability to create effective relationship with other institutions. This situation is also valid for other variables which drew differentiation. So, we can conclude that if a determinant that influences implementation requires individual actions, it tends to create differentiation in the structure of implementation. Conversely, if a determinant which does not require the involvement of implementers’ individual actions, it tends to draw no differentiation between top-down and bottom-up approaches.
Limitations of the Study

Although this dissertation has produced many important findings, some limitations exist. The first limitation exists with the linkage between policy implementation and policy outcomes. This study uses a synthesis approach to try to understand the successes and failures. Implementation research suggests that implementation and the direction or how it was implemented matters. Therefore, the researcher attempted to find out which influences were the most influential via interview. The interview data provided the reasons for success or failure. There are lots of things going on in policy cycle. The reasons for success or the failures may not match up with the policy outcomes. There might be totally different issues that the top-down and bottom-up approach simply doesn’t get at and affect policy outcomes such as political condition of the country or war condition.

Also, the organization culture of the TNP cause to the deviations in research findings since the reasons to failure or success might relate to the culture of the organization. These conditions create limitation in this study. However, using a bottom-up, top-down or synthesize model is reasonable to use and to link to our understanding of the success or the failure of that policy implementation process with policy outcomes. Accordingly, this study attempted to make that linkage that there was something useful about talking to top-down and bottom-up people, who were involved in policy implementation. Also, it attempted to find out why they think something succeeded or failed that have something to do with how the researcher characterized the findings and these approaches.
In addition, the findings on similarities and differences in the top-down and bottom-up structures might be specific to only TNP reform implementation. The practices of top-down and bottom-up actors might depend upon the content of the policies to be implemented. So, these differentiations and similarities may be similar in another implementation case or in another organization. A more comprehensive analysis which includes implementation cases in different organizations with different contexts is needed to strengthen the findings of this research and it is subject to further investigation.

Also, the findings in qualitative interviews are based on the respondents’ practices, experiences, and perceptions. In some cases, the respondents only expressed their perceptions and beliefs about implementation. In most cases, the respondents expressed their experiences and practices during the implementation. And the researcher tried to understand what happened during the TNP implementation with their perceptions, experiences, and practices. However, the respondents might forget or misrepresent some practices of the implementation, they might add their perceptions while expressing their practices, or they might be affected from some of the practices while expressing their perceptions. So, all of these issues create some limitations in this study.

Further, the study categorized the top-down and bottom-up respondents based on the positions that they hold in TNP organization. However, there is not a straight line which divides top-down and bottom-up actors in the organization. The top-down and bottom-up respondents were divided in two categories based on the perceptions of respondents and TNP organizational structure. The respondents were asked if their
positions were a top-down or bottom-up one. Also, the researcher used organizational structure to determine the respondents’ positions. However, there were few respondents who held bottom-up positions but acted as top-down implementers during the TNP reform implementation since they used to work in the main office of the Police Academy. Their positions in the main office were bottom-up and these respondents were considered as bottom-up considering the organizational structure of the TNP. So, the perceptions of respondents contradicted with the organizational structure while determining the top-down and bottom-up positions and this creates limitation for the study.

Moreover, in the quantitative model, personnel evaluation forms were used to determine one of the dependent variables to measure police officers’ performance. These forms were filled out by the police officers’ 1st, 2nd, and 3rd supervisors. The grades were specified based on the supervisors’ perceptions. Even though supervisors worked with police officers and observed their performance, they might not capture all actions of the police officers and supervisors might mistreat police officers while grading police officers’ performance. So, their grading criteria may not be objective. However, the degree of the subjectivity decreases since three different supervisors fill grade each police officer. This study used an average of three grades as the personnel evaluation grade. Therefore, the justification of three different perceptions increased the objectivity of the performance evaluation grades.

Another limitation is that this study used the number of the sanctions, criminal activities, rewards, and appreciations as an indicator of the performance. The level of the sanctions and the amount of the rewards differed based on the situations and
conditions that police officers were involved in. Examining the type and the level of the sanctions and criminal activities might provide more reliable measures instead of only using the number of the sanctions and criminal activities. Similarly, careful examination of the amount and the type of the rewards and appreciations might provide stronger evidence for the research. However, the TNP authorities did not allow releasing the relevant data for this research.

Furthermore, the study uses relevant theories which are not tested in the Turkey so far. Although the scope of the theories is wide enough, the case in Turkey might differ in terms of the validity of the theories. Especially, Turkey lacks implementation research. Therefore, the study used the literature from the general school of public policy implementation. Using the relevant literature from the Turkey would help readers to understand the implementation process in Turkey better. There is no relevant implementation study that would be a model for this study and this creates a limitation for this study. However, this study aims to be reference for the future implementation studies in Turkey.

Finally, the study borrows Mazmanian and Sabatier's (1989) and Ringquist's (1993) Models as well as other implementation researches to study implementation in Turkey. The variables that affect the implementation process were examined in the literature and selected the most relevant variables that would fit to the case of TNP Education reforms. Additionally, new variables were added to understand the implementation process and the success of the policy implementation in this research. The model that this study constructed to understand the implementation and evaluation process proposed a new way to study public policy implementation. The construct of the
variables that were added and selected may have some limitation since they were not tested the way this research proposed before. This was the first time to use these variables in an implementation research.

Policy Implications

The field of public policy implementation is attempting to move away from the traditional limited approaches. In its stead, a new emphasis is being given to the comprehensive and dynamic models to understand what is going on in implementation. Within these efforts, this study draws both scholarly and practical implications. The following part presents some of these implications.

a) Scholarly implications

The analysis and discussion of these findings divert us to new trends in implementation research. There are some trends with the structure of implementation in the issues which relate to the individual actions of implementers. So, a comprehensive analysis of implementation requires tracking actions of implementers in accordance with their influence on policy outcomes. For instance, top-down implementers are more influential than bottom-up implementers in terms of their leadership skills. An implementation analyst should take into account the magnitude of influence of the top-down and bottom-up actors to determine the actual effect of the actors on policy outcomes with the emphasis on the top level or the bottom level. The central implication of this dissertation, then, is that understanding implementation process depends on a systematic analysis with a synthesis of both top-down and bottom-up views and the structure of implementation clarified in this dissertation provides a guideline for an
effective analysis of implementation. Accordingly, better policy and program outcomes can be reached through an integrated understanding of the implementation process.

The researcher proposed this particular study in order to provide an explanation for how the top-down and bottom-up perspectives differ in an implementation structure. The central question of this study attempted to find out similarities and differentiations with the practice of implementation in which decision makers and street level bureaucrats involve. Specifically, what were the issues that lead to success or failure of the TNP education reform? Was the implementation successful, in what ways? How did top-down and bottom-up implementers practice the process of implementation? In what ways do they view implementation in the same or different way? How does their view of implementation differ? The answer to all these questions provided clarifications for the ways of the effects of top-down and bottom-up implementers on policy implementation and outcomes from top-down and bottom-up perspectives. More importantly, the findings on variations in the structure of implementation can be considered as “the structural characteristics of implementation” in the literature.

From a theoretical and conceptual standpoint, this study also provided a general understanding of the need to synthesize top-down and bottom-up approaches in military-type hierarchical organizations, in which top-down approach has a wide range of use, to get fuller answer to understand the policy process. In general police organizations are semi-military organizations in which top-down hierarchical associations are dominant. Accordingly, most policing literature uses top-down model to understand problems and issues in these organizations, but this neglects bottom-up perspectives. The TNP has historically used and continues today to use a hierarchical
structure. In hierarchical structures, typically a top-down approach is used to understand the implementation process works. There are benefits to using a top-down model. Some of these include capturing the actions of the central actors and the influence of their decision making style on policy outcomes. But even with these, the larger implication of the study are to show that, even in hierarchical organizations, when we look at policy implementation, we still need to synthesize these two approaches for better understanding of policy implementation and policy outcomes. In this way, this study builds on an acknowledgement in the literature of the need of the synthesis. Specifically, using both top-down and bottom-up approaches in this research helps us to understand something that have not been fully investigated.

This study also contributes to the academic literature on public policy implementation by providing empirical research analysis in the policing area. As Seatren (2005) states, doctoral dissertations are the most ignored, but provides the best empirical results in implementation research. Although, there are lots of policy implementation studies in educational area, there is a lack of implementation research in policing, especially in police education. Most of the implementation studies on education have focused on K-12 and higher education policies (McLaughlin, 2006). However, the case might be different in the implementation of police education policies. Therefore, this research adds something new to policy implementation field by providing an examination of police education policy.

Finally, this study included both implementation and evaluation parts of the policy process. The findings of this study are based on the perceptions of the participants of the study and these findings are not definitive. However, it provides suggestive findings.
It provides suggestive links between evaluation and implementation that may later lead to additional study.

b) Practical Implications

This study provides clear explanations to policy maker of basic police education system for TNP and Turkish Government. The government may use the findings of this study for the future policy formulations. Or, some additional policies might be proposed based on the findings of the research. Also, this study can be a model to initiate policy implementation problems in Turkey.

In addition, the findings of this study also present potential failures of implementation during the implementation of police education policies. Especially, the problems existed in TNP police education reforms may also exist in other police education policy implementation cases. So, being aware of these problems will help police education implementers solve their specific problems by looking at the theoretical and practical causes of the problems sated in this research.

Another practical implication is that the bottom-up implementers in hierarchical organizations should not be neglected for the effectiveness of the implementation. For instance, the findings of TNP bottom-up implementers did not use any discretion and their leadership practices were completely disregarded draws important practical implication for the hierarchical organization. The top-level actors should share their responsibilities and allow bottom-up actors to use and practice their leadership in order to make the implementation process effective in whole.

Also, the findings might be a guideline for the practical implementation of police education policies while allocating tasks to implementers. The decision making
authorities will be able to know how top-down and bottom-up implementers would practice in specific issues and they will be able to make consistent decisions in delivering right tasks to the right positions and persons. So, this will improve the effectiveness of implementation and policy outcomes.

Finally, this research presents a systematic analysis of top-down and bottom-up implementers which contributes to their development on program implementation. Both top-down and bottom-up implementers will be able to know to what extent they are influential in financial, political, and other issues stated in this research. So, they will be able to balance and choose appropriate actions to implement the policies effectively.

Final Conclusion

This research draws an important final conclusion. By looking at the structure of implementation (top-down and bottom-up), this research found some variations in the structure of implementation which draw some differentiations and similarities that related to either success or the failure within particular policy implementation and outcomes. Decision makers (from a top-down structure) have higher influence on implementation and the policy outcomes in terms of political conditions and problems, clarity and consistency of policies, availability of financial resources, cooperation among institutions, use of discretion, commitment of leadership skills of implementers, and time span. In addition, street level bureaucrats (from a bottom-up structure) have higher influence on implementation and policy outcomes in terms technical problems. Further, the influence is alike in the extent of behavioral change, social and economical conditions, information flow inside and outside the organization, and public support in both top-down and bottom-up structures. So, it can be concluded that top-down
structure has higher influence on implementation and policy outcomes in hierarchical organization, but still there is a need for the synthesis of top-down and bottom-up since bottom-up approach is more influential to some aspects. So, knowing these differentiations and similarities in the structure of implementation is important since that matter in terms of policy outcomes in a particular organization or in general.
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Informed Consent Form

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: Reform and Change in Police Education: Analyzing the Implementation of the Turkish National Police (TNP) Education System

Principal Investigator: Alican Kapti, a graduate student in the University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Public Administration.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in research that studies the implementation and evaluation of the policies that reformed the TNP’s education system.

Study Procedures: You will be asked to explain your observations and experiences during the implementation process of the TNP education reforms. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes.

Foreseeable Risks: No foreseeable risks are involved in this study.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others: This study is expected to contribute to the advancement of the TNP education system. It may allow us to better understand how the reforms that were undertaken have changed the TNP. In addition, we hope to fill some gaps in the literature on the implementation of public policy.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study. Upon transcribing the audiotapes into text, the audio records will be destroyed. The transcribed text files will be saved electronically in a word file with a password to a USB drive. The email records will be transferred to a word file too with the same process. Once the email interviews are saved into word, the emails will be deleted permanently from the email account.

No personally identifiable information will be recorded or kept in this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Alican Kapti at telephone number +90-212-352-3690 or the faculty advisor, Dr. Ethan Bernick, UNT Department of Public Administration, at telephone number +1-940-565-4893.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights: Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve
no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.

- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

________________________________
Printed Name of Participant

________________________________
Signature of Participant
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Calismanin Konusu: polis Egitiminde Reform ve Degisim: Turk Polis Teskilati (EGM) Egitim Sisteminin Kanun Uygulama Analizi

Arastirmaci: Alican Kapti, Kuzey Texas Universitesi Kamu Yonetimi Bolumu Doktora Ogrencisi

Calismanin Amaci: Turk Polis Teskilati Egitim politikalarindaki degisimlerin kanun uygulama ve degerlendirilmesi ile ilgili bir calisma icin katiliminiz isteniyor.

Arastirmanin Prosedurleri: Bu calismada size Turk Polis Teskilatinin egitim kanunlarinin uygulanmasi asamasindaki bir takim hususlar hakkında goruslerinizi sorulacak. Roportaj yaklasik olarak 30 dakika surecek.

Ongorulen Riskler: Bu calsimada herhangi bir ongorulen risk bulunmamaktadir.

Size veya Baskalarina Faydasi: Bu calisma genel anlamda Turk polisinin egitim politikalarinin gelisimine katki bulunmayi umit etmekedir. Bu calismayla polis teskilatinin uygulamis oldugu reform kanunlarının ne sekilde uygulandigi ve neler degistigini daha

**Arastıma Kayıtlarının Gizliliğinin Sağlanması ile ilgili Prosedürler:** Kisilere dayalı bilgilerin gizliliği her türlü yayın ve sunumlarda gayet derecede muhafaza edilecektir. Kunusma kayıtları kasetten yazıya dokulduktan sonra tamamen imha edilecektir. Yaziya dokulen bilgiler elektronik olarak bir word dosyasına sıfırlı olarak kaydedilecek ve arastırmacı tarafından bir USB memoryde muhafaza edilecektir. Email kayıtlarında aynı prosesle word dosyasına kaydedilip yukarıda belirtilen metodla muhafaza altında alınacaktır. Kayıt işlemi tamamlandığından sonra tüm email kayıtları tamamen silinecektir. Kisileri aydınlatıcı hiç bir bilgi ve belge bu çalışmada kullanılmayacak ve kayıt altına alınmayacaktır.

**Arastırmada Hakkında Sorular:** Eğer arastırma ile ilgili bir bir sorunuz olursa, +90- 212-352-3690 nolu telefondan Alican Kaptı’ya veya onun tez danışmanı UNT Kamu Yönetimi bölümü profesörlerinde Dr. Ethan Bernick’e +1-940-565-4893 nolu telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.
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- Arastırma personeli sizing katiliminizi her an durdurma hakkına sahiptir.
- Siz bu çalışmanın ne için düzenlendiğini ve nasıl yurutulacağını anlamıs durumdasınız.
- Bir arastırmaya katılımcısı olarak tüm haklarını anladınız ve golu olarak bu çalışmaya katılmaya razi oldunuz.
- Bu formun bir nushasını alacagınız size söylendi.
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Below is the basic interview schedule used for conducting in-depth interviews. It is possible that interviews will not follow the order developed below. In addition, questions will be asked to develop general responses.

Opening:

My name is Alican Kapti and as a member of the TNP, I would like to interview you, so that I can better understand the implementation of the TNP education reforms. I would like to ask you some questions about your professional background, some experiences you have had, and some of your thoughts about the success and failure of the implementation of the TNP education reform. I hope to use the information and findings of this interview to conduct an empirical research on policy implementation which will promote the quality of the police education in the TNP organization. The interview should take around 30 to 45 minutes. I would like to start by asking general questions to our interview;

General Intro Questions

1. How long have you been with your agency?

2. What are your everyday responsibilities?

3. What role did/do you play in the implementation of the education reforms?

Policy Specific Questions
1. What kind of difficulties did you face while implementing the TNP Education reforms? Were there any substantial problems? Did you face with any political problem? How about technical problems and difficulties?

2. To what extent did the TNP policy reforms required behavioral change in the organization?

3. Do you think that TNP education reform objectives were clear and consistent?

4. How did Turkey’s social, economical, political, and technological conditions affect the implementation and attainment of reform objectives? How so?

5. Do you think that TNP education reforms were supported by public? Why or why not?

6. Do you think that the resources were available to you to implement the education reforms the way you thought they should? Why or why not?

7. How much cooperation was/is with stakeholders in TNP General Directorate, Interior Ministry, and other agencies such as Government Personnel Department, Department of Treasury, and The Council of Higher Education?

8. How well did Police Academy and Department of Education cooperate during the implementation of Higher Education Act in 2001? How so? How successful was the information flow inside and outside these organizations?

9. Do you think that the TNP officials who had to implement the reforms were committed to the achievement of the reform’s objectives? How sufficient were their decisions and actions?

10. Do you think that there were some actors outside the TNP who were biased in favor of the reform’s objectives?
11. Do you think that you had enough discretion and guidance to implement the policies?

12. Do you think that reform policies were implemented in an adequate time period? Were the relevant resources available on time?

**Outcome Related Questions**

1. Have the reforms objectives been achieved? Why or why not? Where have they done well? Where they have struggled?

2. Do you think that implementation of the TNP education reforms improved the quality of police officers’ behaviors?

3. How has police officers perceived and responded the reforms?

4. How has the public perceived and responded to the reforms?

5. Do you think that public trust has increased with these reforms?

**Closing**

Summary of the main points that interviewee made.

I appreciate the time you took for this interview. Is there anything else you think would be helpful for me to know so that I can generate this research? I should have all the information I need about the implementation of the education reforms. Do you have any other points that you want to make?
ROPORTAJ SORULARI

Asagida detayli roportajlar icin kullanan temel roportaj sorulari bulunmaktaadir. Soru sirasina roportaj sirasinda takip edilmesi gerekmektedir. Ek olarak bazi genel cevaplari derinlestirmek icin o baglamda ek sorular sorulabilir.

Giris:


Genel Sorular:

4. Su anda calistiginiz kurumda kac yildir calisiyrsunuz ve su anki sorumlulugunuz ve yetki alaniniz nedir?
5. Isinize ilgili gunluk yapmak zorunda oldugunuz sorumluluklariniz nelerdir?
6. Yukarida aciklanan polis egitim reformunun uygulanmasinda nasil bir rol aldiniz? Ne tur etkileriniz oldu?
Kanun Uygulama Soruları

13. Polis eğitim reformlarını içeren kanunların uygulanmasında ne tür zorluklarla karşılaştınız? Yeni kanun ve sistem değişiklikleri uygulamak zor muydu?

Herhangi politik veya teknik prolem veya zorluklarla karşılaştınız mı?

14. Yeni kanunlar ve sistem değişiklikleri, yani reformlar, kurumlar için çok büyük değişimler gerektiriyor muydu? Ne derece?

15. Sizce çıkan kanunlar ve yapılışı ve sonucta ulaşılması gerekenler gayet derecede açık ve uyumlumuydu? Yoksa bir belirsizlik söz konusumuydu?

16. Bu değişimlerin uygulanmasında ve kanunlarda istenen sonucılara ulaşılmasında Türkiye’nin sosyal, ekonomik, politik, ve teknolojik durumları etkili oldumu? Olduysa nasıl?

17. Sizce polis eğitimindeki bu değişim halk tarafından desteklendi mi? Nicin desteklendi veya nicin desteklenmedi?

18. Sizce eğitim reformların iyi bir şekilde uygulanabilmesi için olması gerektiği olcude gerekli herturu destek yapıldımı? Hersey bu reformların uygulanması için seferber edildımı?

19. Bu kanunların uygulanması sırasında sizin ilgi alanınızdan baktığınızda genel mudurluk, icisleri bakanlığı, devlet personel bakanlığı, hazine bakanlığı, ve Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarıyle koordineli bir şekilde çalışdım mı?

21. Sizce genel olarak bu kanun değişikliklerini uygulamada görevli kişiler kanunun uygulanmasına istekli ve arzulumu idiler? Bu değişimi inanarak mı gerçekleştirdiler yoksa yapmaları gereken herhangi bir iş olarak düşünüp sıradan bir gibi mı gördüler?

22. Sizce bu kanunun uygulanmasını istemiyen iceriden veya disaridan hangi bir kişi veya kuruluş var mı? Varsa bunların kanun uygulamadaki etkileri ne oldu?

23. Siz bu kanunların iyi bir şekilde uygulanması için gerekli olan insiyatif kullanma yetkisine sahip miydiniz? Ve gerekli makamlar uygulama konusunda yönlendirici davranışlırdı mı?

Sonuçlarla İlişkin Sorular:


7. Sizce polis eğitimindeki bu değişim ülkede polis memurlarının ise kaliteinin yükselmesinde etkili oldumu? Varsa ne tur değişimler gözlemliyorsunuz?

8. Polis memurları be değişimleri nasıl algıladı ve ne şekilde reaksiyon gösterdiler?

9. Halk bu değişimleri nasıl algıladı ve karşıladı? Hissedilir derecedede bir değişim hissettirmi?

10. Sizce halkın polis imaji bu reform lardan sonra değiştimi? Halkın polise olan güveni daha çok arttı mı? Eğer değişim sozkonusuysa sizce bu değişimlerde rol oynayan faktörler nelerdir?
Kapanis:

APPENDIX D

IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES AND IMPLEMENTERS
IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES AND IMPLEMENTERS

1. The Department of PVSHE in Police Academy
   a. The Head of the Department (1)
   b. Heads of Divisions (4)
   c. Bureau Managers (5)

2. 25 Police Vocational Schools of Higher Education (PVSHE)
   a. The Heads of Divisions (2* 10=20)
   b. Bureau Managers (2*10=20)

3. TNP Department of Education
   a. The Head of Department (1)
   b. Heads of Divisions (4)
   c. Bureau Managers (5)
APPENDIX E

TNP PERSONNEL EVALUATION FORM
16TH ARTICLE OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS’ PERSONNEL EVALUATION ACT

Grading procedures to fill out personnel evaluation forms and evaluation the grades

Article 16: Supervisors evaluate their officers over 100 point scale in terms of the job knowledge, management, and representation abroad skills. The average grade of an officer is found by dividing the total number of points into the total number of questions.
According to this method, the officers are classified as follows based on the grades they receive. They are considered as:

a) 60 to 75 Poor
b) 76 to 89 Average
c) 90 to 100 Good,

However, the officers whose grades are 59 and below are considered insufficient and unsuccessful.

Fractional numbers are rounded in calculating the average grade.

(Changed: 11/29/1989-89/14841 K.) Agencies may include additional questions to the job knowledge part of this form in terms of service needs, upon obtaining an approval from the Turkish National Personnel Department. Additional questions are also evaluated with 100 point scale.

-End of page 1-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments of supervisors on the general attitudes and behaviors of the police officer (Character Evaluation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.S.: This column should be filled with considering the good and bad habits together with the abilities of officer in accordance with the 17th article of this regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments of the 1st Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grades of supervisors on the job requirements of the officer

## (Evaluating job performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1st Supervisor Grades</th>
<th>2nd Supervisor Grades</th>
<th>3rd Supervisor Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Responsibility? (Working without supervision and ability to give feedback about the tasks that are done)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Loyalty and enthusiasm for duty, initiative thoughts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Professional knowledge, written and oral expression ability, and self-development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Orderliness and attentiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Success in cooperation and adaptation to different circumstances and duties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- End of p.2-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>– Impartiality? (While performing his/her duty; Objectivity in language, race, gender, political ideas, philosophical beliefs, religion, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>His /her manner and behavior against his/her supervisors or colleagues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect to human rights? (Showing respect to people’s personality and rights, restraining from treatments that are contrary to human dignity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Compliance to discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Efficiency, ability, and diligence in performing the job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ability to represent the department’s professional capacity and language knowledge in international duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintenance and protection of tools equipment and weapons and the ability of using them when it is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tendency to interpose others (politics or other powerful authorities) for self-benefit?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garades of supervisors on the management abilities of the officer (Only for the officers who are in supervisory positions)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Marks</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Marks</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Ability of making timely and correct decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Planning, organization, and coordination ability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Representation and negotiation ability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Control inspect and being exemplary ability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Adapting to new legislation and technological developments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Level of success to deploy and develop subordinates efficiently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Work knowledge and self confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Social and personal relations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of the officers who are working abroad**

(Evaluating the level of success in representing the nation and protecting its interests)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Grades</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Grades</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Knowledge of foreign language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Level of success in creating and improving relationships that are necessary and beneficial?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Level of thoughtfulness and susceptibility in protecting the nation’s benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Level of success in fulfilling the requirements of the representation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Ability in adapting to the conditions of the working country, adherence to Turkish culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor’s Grade</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisor’s Grade</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Supervisors Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Grade of the Officer: --------------------------------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Supervisor</th>
<th>2nd Supervisor</th>
<th>3rd Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name:</td>
<td>Last name:</td>
<td>Last name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title:</td>
<td>Job title:</td>
<td>Job title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-End of the form-
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