INTRODUCTION

Implementation analysis appears to promise that rare combination of rigorous methodology and social relevance often sought in policy analysis. In theory, implementation analysis seems to offer not simply evaluation techniques for the assessment of public program performance but also guidance, if not rules, for the successful attainment of policy objectives. In a seminal article, typical of the state of implementation analysis, Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979) ventured to state conditions for the accomplishing of policy objectives or ‘effective implementation’. Implementation analysis would, if its potential is realized, take policy analysis further than evaluation research (ER) or social impact analysis (SIA); contrary to the narrow focus of traditional public administration on program execution, implementation analysis would not only highlight the extent to which the policy objectives have been attained but also come up with directives for planners and policy makers as to how they should mould their program in order to achieve ‘effective implementation’. A warning against excessive optimism about implementation analysis may result in a realistic understanding of the difficulties involved, and may rescue the concept from the narrowly pessimistic notion that implementation analysis cannot be anything but evolution analysis. In this chapter we will apply an implementation analysis to a case study of the policy of creating a University of Norrland.

When one moves to an implementation analysis of an empirical case, the latter should be selected on the grounds that the concept of implementation is indeed applicable. If so, one may focus upon the components of a process of implementation: policy, outcomes, initiator, formator, implementor and time. The analysis should include policy execution analysis and assessment. Maybe the policy analyst will remain content if the analysis indicates something about
the extent to which objectives have been accomplished, as well as some of the conditions that affected the implementation process. One may fail to identify any general conditions conducive to successful implementation, as it is always a tricky question as to how much may be learned in general from a case study. Applying the conceptual framework derived in the preceding analysis the subsequent empirical descriptions will focus upon the basic components of the implementation perspective. First, the policy execution phases will be examined: goals of the formators and the implementors, program outputs, and time allowing for the static-dynamic distinction. Second, questions relating to policy evaluation will be dealt with: outcomes and policy success or policy failure.

In order to make the analysis of policy execution and policy evaluation meaningful it will be necessary to look at the steps through which the goals were arrived at; thus, what follows will necessarily contains pieces of policy enactment analysis.

NORRLAND AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The 1977 reform of the Swedish system of higher education consolidated the reforms of the past thirty years which introduced units of higher education into Norrland. The system of higher education in Norrland includes two types of units, state higher education and communal higher education. Communal higher education consists mostly of the training of nurses, which is arranged by the various regional governments. The system of higher education units in Norrland comprises: Umea University, The College of Lulea, the Colleges in Ostersund, in Sundsvall/Harnosand and the Forestry School in Umea. Twenty years after the first contests between the major cities of Norrland for the site of a Norrland university had been decided to the advantage of Umea (1957) all the major cities had received higher education resources. The idea of one Norrland university had been replaced by the existance of a system of higher education units all over the northern counties. A regional board was created in 1977 to coordinate training and research at these units.¹

Any understanding of the University of Norrland requires a recognition of its environment, the provinces of Norrland. What the standard idioms about Sweden carefully neglect is the regional cleavage. Sweden consists of two parts, the North and the South. The difference between Norrland, the northern provinces, and the South,