

Public Policy Making in Kuwait

*Mohammad Q. Al-Qarioti and Hilayel M. Mutaiiri **

ABSTRACT

This study was based on a survey of a stratified random sample consists of (365) government employees from four government ministries. The main objective of this study is to improve the policy making process in the State of Kuwait after examining whether performance measures are applied in the policy making process, and the interrelationships and role of political, internal organizational, rational, and personal factors in the adoption and implementation phases of this process. Four hypotheses were tested regarding the role of those. The study revealed that performance measures and objective standards are applied to a great extent in the policy making process, and that political factors play the most important role in this process, while organizational and rational factors- which are highly correlated- are respectively in second and third orders in their influence on policy making. The study reveals statistically significant differences between policy adoption and ministry, age, gender, type of jobs, rank, and experience, but not with policy implementation. But the study reveals no differences in policy adoption and implementation which can be attributed to education and nationality. In view of the study results, it is recommended that ministries enhance employees' capabilities in applying objective and rational criteria in policy making, especially women and new employees by familiarizing and training them in applying rational tools in policy making, and to benefit from more experienced staff.

Keywords: Policy Adoption, Policy Implementation, Kuwaiti Administration, Political, Organizational, Rational Factors, Demographic Characteristics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Government organizations are under increasing pressure to make informed decisions, and to demonstrate that their goals have been achieved. Performance measurement systems, as mechanisms to guide organizations toward achieving their purposes, have been an object of increasing interest since the late 1980s. Nevertheless, few developing countries have developed performance systems despite their importance, and fewer use the available measurement systems to improve the decision making process. The adoption stage of policy making involves developing measures of outputs, outcomes, and efficiency. The implementation stage involves the actual use of performance measures for: strategy planning, resource allocation, program management, monitoring, and evaluation, reporting to internal management, elected officials, citizen and the

media. (Cronbach et al.; 1980; Birks, 2002; Beyer and Trice, 1982; Fischer, 1986). Some of the methods used to achieve more efficiency are: allocation of human and financial resources, collecting adequate data, and goal orientation. Likewise, goals, strategies, and performance measures are often developed continuously, to respond to changing situation and external requirements. (Berry and Iked, 1996; Hoilzer and Halachmi, 1996; Jackson, 1996).

With regard to factors that affect policy making, political, cultural, organizational, internal factors as well as external stakeholders play important roles in either in policy adoption or policy implementation phases. (Marshall, 1996; Bowden, 1996; Cannon, 1996; Pettigrew, Ferlie and Mckee, 1992; Carnall, 1995; Pettigrew, Ferlie, and Mckee, 1992). In a normal political process, most decision makers do not spend much time discussing the results they want from the money they spend. Therefore, it is important to integrate and reconcile rational and political factors, and considers them relevant in policy adoption and implementation, and to see how they interplay in real situations. (Rich 1979; (Marshall, 1996; Bowden, 1996; Cannon, 1996; Carnall, 1995). The objective of this study is to examine rational

* Department of Public Administration, College of Administrative Sciences, Kuwait University, Kuwait. Received on 28/1/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 24/7/2007.

* This research project was supported by the Research of Administration, Kuwait University.

and subjective contents of public policies in Kuwait, and to identify how demographic characteristics affect the way that employees see how policies are adopted and implemented. It is hoped that this can motivate government agencies to rationalize their way of policy making.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Policy making involves two major stages. The first stage is the adoption stage which represents developing measures of outputs, outcomes, and efficiency. The second stage is program implementation which refers to the actual use of performance measures, strategy planning, resource allocation, program management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting to internal management, elected officials, citizen and the media. (Cronbach et al., 1980; Julnes and Holzer, 2001; Birks, 2002). Policy adoption, due to its general nature, is less specific and tends to gain a larger audience and mobilize political interests, more than the implementation process. (Beyer and Trice, 1982; Fischer, 1986). Organizations, most often, apply rational planning, based on scientific analysis, aiming at reconciling rational and technocratic decision making, in order to maximize efficiency. Some of the methods used are: allocation of human and financial resources, collecting adequate data, a goal orientation, and external requirements to use performance measures. (Berry and Iked, 1996; Hoilzer and Halachmi, 1996; Jackson, 1996).

Performance measurement is an important tool which serves as a frame of reference, for deciding whether organizations various processes meet specified criteria such as quality, relevance, timeliness, action ability, and efficiency. (Lonnqvist and Pirttimaka, 2006). Definitions of performance may differ depending on the perspectives from which they are examined. The traditional way of measurement focuses only on financial profitability, which is not necessarily suitable in the sphere of public policies, because some of the issues are non financial in nature. (Neely, 1999). Governments exist to serve the needs of the public efficiently, effectively and fairly, in order to have high standards for governance and accountability. Nevertheless, governmental organizations are under increasing pressure to make informed decisions, and to demonstrate that their goals have been achieved. Some of the techniques used in this regard, include setting direction, focusing on results in terms of outcomes, and constituent

value. Among strategies which can be followed is providing full transparency for critical activities and decisions, including budget preparation and execution, measuring results relative to overall strategic goals, using performance measures to define success, and establishing a clear relationship between activities and outcomes.

One of the earliest recorded publications on performance measurement dates to 1938, is when the International City Management Association (ICMA) in the U.S.A published a Survey of Suggested Criteria for Appraising Administration. (International City/County Management Association (1997). In the middle of the 1970s, performance measurement activities by public entities, and attempts to report such measurements were rare, due to the fact that the development and using such measures of government, and non-profit organizations have been cumbersome, complex, imperfect, and sometimes are threatening to some organizations. (i and Lombardo, 1999; Osborne et al., 1995; Perrein, 1985; Marshall, 1996; Merjanian, 1996). But since the 1980s, there has been a growing interest in decision making, and performance measurement in the literature, as a part of a long lineage of research efforts at the turn of the previous century (de Lancer Julnes, 1999). (ASPA, 1992; Wholey and Hatry, 1992). The performance measurement field which started in the private sector with a number of productivity initiatives, defined by the total quality management (TQM) movement, expanded to consider the notions of service quality, customer satisfaction, and managing by results. Popular titles of this decade included, *In Search of Excellence* (1982), by Peters and Waterman, and *Out of the Crisis* (1986) by Deming. (Waterman, Peters, 1986; and Deming, 1986). Significant differences are noted between the operation of public and private sectors. Generally, private sector managers are concerned with operational commitments to produce outcomes for shareholders, while public sector organizations historically leaned towards being relatively stable and predictable. (Keating, 1988 and Alford, 1989). In public organizations, continuity and efficiency are emphasized, where managers tend to improve the current working arrangements, and make decisions bounded by existing systems and practices (Foxall and Payne, 1989). Research findings suggest that even when government agencies develop performance measures, they hardly get them used (Kamensky, 1995; Cavalluzo and Ittner, 2004). Moreover, there is a tendency, on part of most

government agencies, to oppose the idea of tying outcome measures to programs, and to the budget process. (Aristigueta, 1999). This explains why government goals are often ambiguous, due to conflicts over interests, and a lack of knowledge about relationships between measures and goals. Emphasis on Management By Objectives (MBO) is a call for government agencies, to regain public confidence in government performance, and to hold them accountable for achieving results (Wholey, 1999; OEI, 1994). However, critics suggest that the capacity of public sector managers to make good decisions, may be impeded, by their increasingly complex working environments (Hepworth, 1999). This increasing complexity is viewed to be a product of public sector reform. (Clark, 1997).

Nevertheless, in the real world, external and internal political and cultural factors play important roles in policy adoption and implementation. Therefore, it is imperative for researchers to place the perspective of policy adoption and implementation in the political and cultural context. (Pettigrew, Ferlie and Mckee, 1992; Carnall, 1995). Internal stakeholders, and external interest groups for whom information makes a difference, play an important role in policy adoption and implementation. (Marshall, 1996). It is important in this regard to integrate and reconcile rational, cultural, organizational and political factors, in policy adoption and implementation. (Rich, 1979).

In Less Developed Countries (LDCs) including the State of Kuwait, few government agencies, report performance indicators which focus on reporting data on a sufficiently frequent and timely basis, as a guide to program managers or other stakeholders, in their improvement efforts. (Cavalluzo and Ittner, 2004; Wholey and Hatry, 1992; Hatry et al., 1990). The mechanisms and outcomes of managerial decision-making, do not lend themselves readily to experimental analysis, in real organizational settings. This is due to many interacting factors, that are difficult to identify, or subject to experimental control. In the landmark book, *Reinventing Government* (1993), Osborne and Gaebler, point out that the ability of citizens, elected officials, and others, to access information, in a manner that they understand, is crucial because concerned parties do not have adequate information, their decisions may be flawed (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993).

Definition of main concepts

Decision making process involves identification of a program, statement of purpose, identification of program inputs and outputs; efficiency and productivity indicators, setting targets for accomplishment; monitoring; performance reporting; analysis and action. (Wholey and Newcomer, 1989). Performance measurement refers to the ratio of an organization's outputs to inputs, effectiveness refers to the relationship of an organization's outputs, to what is intended to accomplish; quality refers to an output, or the process by which an output is produced and is indicated by attributes such as, accuracy (or error rate), thoroughness, and complexity; and timeliness refers to time involved in producing an appropriate output. Performance indicators include inputs which is the amount of resources that have been used for a specific service, or program, which are ordinarily presented in budget submissions; output/workload indicators is the direct units produced, or services provided by a program and indicate the amount of work performed, or the amount of services received; outcome/effectiveness refers to the results of the service or the degree, to which services are responsive to the needs and desires of the beneficiaries; efficiency indicators indicate how well a government is performing the things it is doing, or the ratio of the quantity of the service provided to the cost, in money, or labor required to produce the service; productivity indicators refer to the dimensions of efficiency and effectiveness as a single indicator. (Ammons et al., 1999; Ammons et al., 2001; Crandon and Merchant, 2006.).

Questions and Hypotheses:

The study aims at answering the following questions: are performance measures and standards, as seen by respondents, applied in policy adoption and implementation?. What is the role of political, internal organizational and rational factors in policy adoption and policy implementation? What are the relationships between policy making (adoption and implementation) and political, organizational, and rational factors?. Moreover, two hypotheses are tested. The first hypothesis relates to statistical significant differences in employees' opinions regarding the role of political factors, organizational factors, rational factors, in policy adoption and policy implementation. The second hypothesis relates to statistical significant differences in employees' opinion attributed to demographic characteristics regarding the way policies are adopted and implemented.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study follows a descriptive analytical approach. Data were collected through a questionnaire which was based on current literature. The questionnaire was refined by a panel of experts to ensure that it suits the Kuwaiti culture, and can be understood by respondents. A first draft of the questionnaire was distributed to (30) employees from the study population, which provided an input which was taken into consideration in the final draft. The Cronbach Coefficient Alpha for score reliability for all dependent and independent variables was (91.8) which reflects a satisfactory degree of reliability. Questionnaires were distributed during

summer of 2007, to a random sample of employees from four ministries, who are involved in decision making. Data was statistically analyzed to answer questions and test hypotheses. The study instrument consists of two main parts. The first part includes demographic characteristics of the employees (ministry, job, rank, experience, education, gender, age, and nationality). The second part consists of five sub-parts cover various aspects of dependent variables which include factors that affect adopting and implementing public policies, the role of political, organizational, and rational factors in policy making. Alternative responses range from 1 to 5 on the Likert-scale. SPSS package software was used to analyze the questions and test the hypotheses.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of policy making and various factors affecting the process

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Policy Adoption	3.7571	.85416
Policy Implementation	3.6021	.72889
Political factors	3.6021	.72889
Organizational factors	3.4317	.88728
Rational factors	3.3293	.83406

Table 2. Correlation relationships between variable

Variables		Policy Adoption	P policy Implementation	Political Factors	Organizational Factors	Rational Factors
Policy Adoption	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 365	.519(**) .000 365	.519(**) .000 365	.562(**) .000 365	.636(**) .000 365
Policy Implementation	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.519(**) .000 365	1 365	1.000(**) .000 365	.462(**) .000 365	.507(**) .000 365
Political Factors	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.519(**) .000 365	1.000(**) .000 365	1 365	.462(**) .000 365	.507(**) .000 365
Organizational Factors	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.562(**) .000 365	.462(**) .000 365	.462(**) .000 365	1 365	.726(**) .000 365
Rational Factors	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.636(**) .000 365	.507(**) .000 365	.507(**) .000 365	.726(**) .000 365	1 365

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Sample's Characteristics

The total sample of the study consists of 365 employees. A majority of respondents (88.2%) consider their work of technical nature, while (11.8%) consider it of administrative nature. Respondents were divided into (4) administrative and experience levels. University graduates constitute (63.6%) of the sample, and (8.5%) had a secondary level education or less. (66.3%) of

respondents are males and (33.7%) are females. Regarding age, (39.7%) of the sample are in the age group (25- less than 35) years, those who are under 25 years old constitute (24.4%), and (20.3%) are 45 years old and above, and (15.6%) are in the (35- less than 45 years) age group. With regard to nationality, a vast majority of respondents (98.9%) were Kuwaitis while non Kuwaitis constituted only (1.1%).

Table 3. Multiple Regression of Policy Adoption, Policy Implementation and Political Factors

Policy Adoption			Policy Implementation			
Source	Regression	Residual	Total	Regression	Residual	Total
Sum Square	124.460	141.112	265.572	193.386	.000	193.386
Df	3	361	364	3	361	364
Mean Square	41.487	.391		64.462	.000	
F	106.134					
Sig.	.000(a)			.(a)		
a Predictors: (Constant), Rational factors, Political factors, Organizational factors b Dependent Variable: Policy adoption R= .685 R Square= .464			a Predictors: (Constant), Rational factors, Political factors, Organizational factors b Dependent Variable: Policy Implementation. R= 1.000 R Square= 1.000(a)			

Analyzing Study Questions:

In order to answer the study questions, means and standard deviations were calculated. Taking in consideration that the mean is (3), responses were classified as follows:

- 1 > than 3 is considered low.
- 3 > 4 is considered high.
- 4 -5 is considered very high.

Regarding the question whether employees think that performance measures and standards are applied in adopting and implementing public policies, the study reveals as shown in Table (1), means of (3.7571) and (3.6021) for policy adoption and policy implementation respectively. This indicates that objective criteria are applied in adopting public policy, to a high degree. With regard to the role of political, internal organizational and rational factors in adopting and implementing public policies, the study shows that means of political, organizational, and rational factors are respectively (3.6021), (3.4317), (3.3293) as shown in Table (1). This shows that political factors play the most important role, while organizational and rational factors are in a second and a third order in affecting policy making. These results

are in tune with prevailing trends in the literature, which refer to the dominant influence of political and subjective factors in policy making, in comparison with less important roles of objective and rational factors (Kamensky, 1995; Cavalluzo and Ittner, 2004). This is due to the fact that policy makers are driven by political influence and pressures of interest groups, rather than by rational and objective criteria.

Regarding relationships between policy making (adoption and implementation) and political, organizational, and rational factors, the study reveals as shown in Table (2) positive statistical correlations at a significance level of (0.00) between policy adoption and political factors (0.519), organizational factors (0.562), and rational factors (0.636). Likewise, there are similar strong positive correlations between policy implementation and: political factors (1.00), organizational factors (0.462), and rational factors (0.507). Moreover, there are strong positive correlations, between political factors and: organizational factors (0.462), and rational factors (0.507), and between organizational factors and rational factors (0.726).

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis between Policy Adoption, Policy Implementation and Organizational Factors

Policy Adoption				Policy Implementation		
Source	Regression	Residual	Total	Regression	Residual	Total
	83.983	181.589	265.572	41.290	152.096	193.386
Df	1	363	364	1	363	364
Mean Square	83.983	.500		41.290	.419	
F	167.883			98.544		
Sig.	.000(a)			.000(a)		
a Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Factors b Dependent Variable: Policy Adoption R= .562(a) R Square= .314			a Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Factors b Dependent Variable: Policy Implementation R= .462(a) R Square=.214			

Table 5. Regression Analysis between Policy Adoption, Policy Implementation and Rational Factors

Policy Adoption				Policy Implementation		
Source	Regression	Residual	Total	Regression	Residual	Total
	107.255	158.317	265.572	49.767	143.619	193.386
Df	1	363	364	1	363	364
Mean Square	107.255	.436	364	49.767	.396	
F	245.923			125.788	.	
Sig.	.000(a)			.000(a)		
a Predictors: (Constant), Rational Factors b Dependent Variable: Policy adoption R =.636(a) R Square = .404			a Predictors: (Constant), Rational Factors. b Dependent Variable: Policy Implementation. R = .507(a) R Square = .257			

Testing hypotheses

First hypothesis: There are no statistical significant differences in employees' opinions regarding the role of political factors in policy adoption and policy implementation. In order to test the hypothesis, a multiple regression was made between policy adoption and political factors. As shown in Table (3) the (F) value is greater than its tabular value, which leads to the rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of political factors in the policy adoption process. The (R square) value shows that political factors explain (46%) of the way policies are adopted. With regard to policy implementation and political factors, the (F) value as shown in Table (3) is greater than its tabular value which leads to rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of political factors in the policy implementation process. With regard to ways policies are

implemented, the (R square) value shows that political factors explain these ways (100%).

Second hypothesis: There are no statistically significant differences in employees' opinions regarding the role of organizational factors in policy adoption and policy implementation. In order to test this hypothesis a multiple regression was made between policy adoption and organizational factors. As shown in (Table 4) the F value, is greater than its tabular value which leads to rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of organizational factors in the policy adoption process. The (R square) value shows that organizational factors explain or determine (31%) of the way policies are adopted. With regard to policy implementation and organizational factors, the (F) value as shown in Table (4) is greater than its tabular value which leads to rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of

organizational factors in policy implementation. The (R square) value shows that organizational factors determine

(21%) of the way policies are implemented.

Table 6. ANOVA of Demographic Characteristics and Policy Making

Demographic characteristics	Policy Adoption		Policy Implementation	
	F	Sig.	F	Sig.*
Ministry	1.918	.036	1.242	.238
Job	1.356	.192	.666	.818
Rank	2.133	.018*	1.244	.237
Experience	2.139	.017*	1.291	.205
Education	1.622	.091	.859	.611
Gender	1.581	.102	1.511	.099
Age	3.199	.000*	1.579	.077
Nationality	1.478	.137	.257	.925

* significant at the 0.01 level.

Third hypothesis: There are no statistical significant differences in employees' opinions regarding the role of rational factors in policy adoption and policy implementation. In order to test this hypothesis a multiple regression was made between policy adoption and rational factors. As shown in Table (5), the (F) value is greater than its tabular value which leads to rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of rational factors in the policy adoption process. The (R square) value shows that rational factors determine (40%) of the way policies are adopted. With regard to the role of rational factors in policy implementation a, the (F) value as shown in Table (5) is greater than its tabular value. This leads to rejection of the hypothesis and indicates an important role of rational factors in policy implementation. The (R square) value shows that rational factors determine (26%) of the way policies are implemented.

Fourth hypothesis: There are no statistical significant differences in employees' opinion regarding the way policies are adopted and implemented, attributed to demographic characteristics. Regarding this hypothesis, the study reveals as shown in Table (6), statistical differences at significant levels in employees' opinion on the way policies are adopted which can be attributed to the type of ministry, rank, experience, and age but no differences at any significant levels in their opinion's regarding policy implementation.

To sum up, it can be concluded that in general there are few statistical significant differences in employees' opinion regarding the way policies are adopted, but not towards policy implementation, which can be attributed

to demographic characteristics. This result lead to acceptance of the hypothesis.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The study reveals that employees see that policy making in Kuwait are generally guided by performance measures in the phase of policy adoption (3.7571) and to a lesser degree in policy implementation phase (3.6021). This is a high level, assuming that respondents are objective, and present researchers have no reason to assume the opposite. With regard to factors which influence policy making in Kuwait, the study shows that the most important factors which affect policy making are the political factors, in comparison to organizational and rational factors which have less influence on this process. It is not strange in the present researcher's opinion that political factors come first in their effect on policy making especially in a country where public administration is highly politicized. This situation is explained by the simple fact that Kuwait, as the case in many traditional political systems in the region, does not believe strongly enough in the scientific nature of running public affairs. The civil service system in government, with all modernization efforts, is still mainly a spoils system as was the case in the United States up to the 1880's. In a country like Kuwait, where people are not familiar with taxation and are not taxpayers, it is not strange that policies in most cases are made arbitrarily. Likewise, even when calls for accountability and transparency, are heard, these are not more than slogans and are not taken seriously. The change of direction

towards more responsiveness and real transparency is slow because citizens do not finance public policies in any way. This does not justify however, ignoring a limited role of organizational and rational factors in policy making. Some efforts in that direction are led by some elites, academicians, legislators, and administrators who are trying their best to induce reform and enhance government ability in rationalizing public policies. Moreover, there is an increasing pressure on government to develop performance measures for adopting and implementing public policies. Along with this goal, Kuwaiti parliament is increasingly exerting efforts to improve government's performance and make it accountable for its policies. Moreover, the media is increasing public awareness and playing an influential role in motivating government to shape itself up. It is unfair in this regard to state that Kuwait is peculiar in not applying fully objective standards in policy making. Prevailing trends in the literature refer to the dominant influence of political and subjective factors in the policy making process, in comparison with less important roles of objective and rational factors. This is due to the fact that Policy makers worldwide are driven by political pressures of interest groups, rather than by rational and objective criteria. ((Kamensky, 1995; Cavalluzo and Ittner, 2004).

With regard to interactions among various factors affecting policy making, the study reveals strong statistical relationship at a significance level of (0.00) between policy making and political factors, organizational factors, and rational factors. Moreover, multiple regressions between policy adoption and political factors indicate an important role of political factors. The (R square) for political factors and policy implementation explains (100%) of the way policies are implemented. The (R Square) for political factors and policy adoption is (46%). Likewise, multiple regressions between policy adoption and organizational factors indicate an important role of organizational factors in the policy adoption process, the (R Square) shows that organizational factors determine to (31%) the way policies are adopted and to (21%) the way policies are implemented. Regarding the role of rational factors in policy adoption, multiple regressions indicates that they determine ways policies to an extent of (40%) are adopted and to an extent of (26%) the ways policies are implemented.

With regard to the question whether there are

significant statistical differences between employees' demographic characteristics and their views on the way policies are adopted and implemented, the study reveals as shown in Table (6) some statistical significant differences only in policy adoption which can be attributed to type of ministry, rank, experience, and age, but no differences with regard to policy implementation. These differences in opinion according to type of ministry may be understood in view of the fact the services' ministries are expected to work harder in order to justify and explain their policies, which have direct effect on people, for the general public better than the case in technical ministries. That is due to the fact that the latter policies are very technical and henceforth cannot be explained as easy as the case with services' ministries.

The study reveals statistically significant differences in employees' opinion attributed to age at a (0.000) significance level, rank at a (0.01) significance level, and to experience at a (0.02) significance level regarding ways policies are adopted but not regarding ways policies are implemented. This means that employees who are young, at high administrative levels, and with more experience view their ministries apply rational criteria in policy adoption.

Regarding lack of differences in employees' opinion regarding policy adoption and implementation due to education and nationality; this can be explained that majority of respondents (79.2%) are of same educational level and Kuwaitis (98.9%).

The general conclusion, is no statistical significant differences in employees' opinion on how policies are adopted and implemented which can be attributed to most demographic characteristics.

Recommendations:

In view of the study results and previous analysis many recommendations can be suggested as follows:

1. The study results show rational and organizational criteria are of less priority as a base for policy making in comparison with political and irrational factors. Therefore, it is very important that Kuwaiti ministries enhance employees' capabilities concerning policy making, especially in a country which enjoys abundant resources, which allows it to narrow the gap between its potentials and its present situation.
2. The study results reveal that policy making in service-oriented ministries are more guided by

- rational factors than ministries of technical nature. Therefore, it is important that ministries of technical nature focus more on applying objective and rational criteria in policy making and explain their policies in a plain language to stakeholders in order to be more understood and supported by citizens.
3. The study reveals statistical differences between men and women regarding methodology of policy adoption and policy implementation in favor of men. Therefore, women should be given more attention, in terms of enhancing their role in policy making, as they are less prepared for traditional and social reasons to join in this process. It is worth noting that Kuwaiti women constitute a greater proportion in academic institution, but do not have their equal share in leadership positions, where they can positively influence policy making.
 4. The study reveals that in contrast to their older peers, younger employees see that policy making is based on subjective factors rather than on organizational and rational factors. Henceforth, special importance should be given to training new employees to apply rational tools in policy making. This is of prime importance because young people represent the future of the State of Kuwait, and should be encouraged to be more involved in this process.
 5. Special efforts should be exerted by ministries to benefit from more experienced, and those in the top of the hierarchy, because the study reveals that they appreciate more than others, the importance of applying objective criteria and performance measures in policy making. Their implicit knowledge should be publicized in order to benefit less experienced people, and reach employees at lower administrative levels. It is becoming so clear that knowledge, especially implicit knowledge, constitutes the hard core of intellectual capital in any organization. This is more achievable in public organizations than private organizations because private organizations tend to monopolize knowledge and are not always careful enough to publicize such knowledge.
 6. Finally, more studies are needed in this area and to include other government institutions in Kuwait, because in additions to ministries, there are other (35) public organizations and institutions which are entrusted in managing huge resources and therefore should be guided by rational criteria in policy adoption and policy implementation.

REFERENCES

- Alford, J. 1989. Management education for the Public Sector, RAIPA Seminar, Canberra.
- American Society for Public Administration. 1992. *Resolution Encouraging the Use of Performance Measurement and Reporting by Government Organizations*. Washington, DC.
- Ammons, David, Coe, N. and Lombardo, Michael. 2001. Performance Comparison Projects in Local Government: Participants' Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 61(1): 100-110.
- Ammons, David. et al., 1999. Mini-Symposium on Intergovernmental Comparative Performance Data, *Public Administration Review*, 59, 2: 101-104.
- Aristigueta, Maria. 1999. Measuring Performance in State Government. In *Handbook of State Government Administration*, edited by John J. Gargan, 347-61. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Berry, Mick, and Ikerd, Judy. 1996. *Outcome Budgeting: Catawba County*, NC. Washington, DC: ASPA Center of Accountability and Performance.
- Beyer, Janice M. and Harrison M. Trice. 1982. The Utilization Process: A Conceptual Framework and Synthesis of Empirical Findings, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 4:591-622.
- Birks, Stuart. 2002. Public Policy Making. A Conference paper for the New Zealand Association of Economists Conference. Wellington.
- Bowden, Mison. 1996. *Development and use of Outcome Information in Government: Oregon Department of Transportation*. Washington, DC: ASPA, Center of Accountability and Performance.
- Breusch, J. 2000. Public Service Has Lost Expertise, *The Australian Financial Review*, Sydney, 26.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. 1979. Review of Approaches to Productivity, Performance, and Organizational Effectiveness in the Public Sector: Applicability to Non-

- Profit Organizations, *PONPO Working Paper 10*, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Brown, Richard E. and James B. Pyers. 1988. Putting Teeth into the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, 48, 735-742.
- Carnall, Colin A. 1995. *Managing Change in Organizations*. 2nd ed. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Cannon, John. 1996. *Utah Tomorrow*. Washington, DC: ASPA Center of Accountability and Performance.
- Cavalluzzo, Ken S. and Christopher D. Ittner. 2004. Implementing Performance Measurement Innovations: Evidence from Government. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. 29, 4: 243-267.
- Clark, D. 1997. More Public Sector Change to Come, *The Australian Financial Review*. Sydney, 26.
- Crandon, Davis S. and Kenneth A. Merchant. 2006. Performance Improvement, *Silver Spring*, 45, 2: 17-40.
- Cronbach, Lee J. et al., 1980. *Toward Reform of Program Evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- De Lancer Julnes, Patria. 1999. Lessons Learned About Performance Measurement. *International Review of Public Administration*. 4, 2:45-55.
- Deming, Edward. 1986. *Out of Crisis. Quality, Productivity and Competitive Position*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Frank. 1980. Reforming Bureaucratic Theory: toward a Political Model:. In *Bureaucratic and Democratic Reform*. Edited by Donald Calista, 35-53. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Foxall, G. and Payne, A. 1989. Adaptors and innovators in organizations: A cross-cultural study of the cognitive styles of managerial functions and sub functions”, *Human Relations*, 42, 7: 639-649.
- Hatry, Harry. 1999. *Performance Measurement, Getting Results*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Hepworth, A. 1999. Parliament puts spotlight on contract management, *The Australian Financial Review*. Sydney.
- Holzer, Marc and Halachmi, Arie. 1996. Measurement as a Means of Accountability. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 19,11/12:1921-44.
- International City/County Management Association. 1997. *Comparative Performance Measurement: FY1996 Data Report*. Washington, DC: ICMA
- Jackson, Marilyn. 1996. *Lessons Learned From Minnesota's government performance Report*. Washington, DC: ASPA Center of Accountability and Performance.
- Kamensky, John M. 1995. Program performance Measures: Designing a System to Manage for Results. In *Competent Government: Theory and Practice. The Best of Public Productivity and Management Review*. 1985-1993., edited by Arie Halachmi and Marc Holzer, 239-46, Burke, VA: Chatelaine Press.
- Keating, M. 1988. Change and the challenge ahead. *Directions in Government*.
- Kopcynski, Mary and Lombardo, Michael. 1999. Comparative performance measurement: Insights and lessons learned from a consortium effort. *Public Administration Review*. Washington, 59: 124-135.
- Lonnqvist, Antti and Pirttimaka. A. 2006. The Measurement of Business Intelligence, *Information Management Systems*. 23 (1): 32-40.
- Marshall, Martha. 1996. *Development and use of Outcome Information in Government, Prince William County, Virginia*, Washington, DC: ASPA, Center for Accountability and Performance.
- Merjanian, Ara. 1996. *Strategic Budgeting in Texas: A Systems Approach to Planning, Budgeting and Performance Measurement*. Washington, DC: ASPA Center of Accountability and Performance.
- Neely, A. 1999. The Performance Measurement Revolution: Why Now and What Next? *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 19, 2: 205-228.
- Newcomer, Kathryn E. 1997. Using Performance Measurement to Improve Programs, *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 75:5-14.
- Oh, Cheo H., and Robert F. Rich. 1996. Explaining the Use of Information Knowledge and Policy, *International Journal of knowledge Transfer and utilization*. 9, 1:3-35.
- Osborne, S., Bovaid, T., Mahon, M., Tricker, S. and Waterson, P. 1995. Performance Management and Accountancy in Complex Public Programs, *Financial Accountability and Management*, 11, 1:19-38.
- Osborne, David and Gaebler, Ted. 1993. *Reinventing government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming The Public Sector*. New York, N.Y.
- Perrin, Burt. 1998. Effective Use and Misuse of Performance Measurement. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 19, 3: 367-79.
- Pettigrew, Andrew, Ferlie, Ewan and McKee, Loma. 1992. *Shaping Strategic Change, the Case of National Health System*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rich, R. 1979. The Pursuit of knowledge. *Knowledge*. 1:6-30.
- Shaw, A. 1990. *Reforming the Public Sector: A Handbook*

for Public Sector Managers and Unionists. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.

Waterman, Peter and Peters, Tom. 1986. *In Search of Excellence. Lessons from America's Best-run Companies.* Harper and Row.

Wholey, Joe. 1999. Performance- Based Management:

Responding to Challenges. *Public Productivity and Management Review.* 22, 4:228-307.

Wholey, Joseph S. and Harry P. Hatry. 1992. The Case for Performance Monitoring. *Public Administration Review,* 52, 6: 604-610.

*