Policy dialogue and engagement between non-governmental organizations and government: A survey of processes and instruments of canadian policy workers

Bryan Evans
Ryerson University

Adam Wellstead
Michigan Technological University

Policy Dialogue and Engagement between Non-Governmental Organizations and Government: A Survey of Processes and Instruments of Canadian Policy Workers

Bryan Evans
Ryerson University

Adam Wellstead
Michigan Technological University[1]

nificant knowledge-base has been acquired respecting what government policy analysts do and their attitudes toward their work but very little is known about external interactions with non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

BRYAN EVANS – Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada • b1evans@politics.ryerson.ca

ADAM WELLSTEAD – Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan, USA • awellste@mtu.edu

Abstract: *Various analysts have raised concerns respecting declining research, evaluation and analytical capacities within public services. Typically, the decline is attributed to reforms associated with neoliberal restructuring of the state and its concomitant managerial expression in New Public Management (NPM). This has given rise to a conceptual shift now commonly captured as a movement from 'government' to 'governance'. Policy advising from a new governance perspective entails an image of a more distributed policy advisory system where a plurality of actors, including non-state actors, engages with government in deliberating policy interventions to address collective problems.*

The original research presented here suggests that those responsible for policy work across four policy communities in the three Canadian provinces surveyed differ in terms of their capacities, depth of commitment to a specific policy file/field, roles and functions, as well as perceptions of the policy work that they undertake. Over the past several years, a number of primarily quantitative analyses examining the processes, tools and perspectives of Canadian federal and provincial government policy analysts have been published. Consequently, a sig-

INTRODUCTION

Various analysts have raised concerns respecting declining research, evaluation and analytical capacities within public services (Baskoy, Evans, & Shields, 2011; Edwards, 2009; Christensen & Laegreid, 2001; 2005; Peters, 2005; Rhodes, 1994). Typically, the decline is attributed to reforms associated with neoliberal restructuring of the state and its concomitant managerial expression in New Public Management (NPM). This observation has given rise to a conceptual shift now commonly characterized as a movement from 'government' to 'governance' (Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998; Peters, 2000; Treib et al., 2007; Tollefson et al., 2012). With respect to policy analysis and advice, this shift has resulted in an environment of new governance arrangements entailing a more distributed policy advisory system where a plurality of actors, particularly non-state actors, engage with government in deliberating policy interventions to address collective problems. In this context, it has long been suggested, "a healthy policy research community outside government can (now) play a vital role in enriching public understanding and debate of policy issues" (Anderson, 1996, p. 486). Or, is this conceptualization of an expanded policy advisory system, composed of a broad spectrum of state and non-state policy actors, a misreading of what is taking place on the ground? The assumption is that there is some equitable distribution of policy capability throughout the system. For many non-governmental organizations, analytical resources, and hence the

ability to effectively influence the policy process, may be minimal to non-existent. This limitation may be exacerbated by the movement toward a more evidence-based policy-making process, which places a premium on the possession of analytical skills (Howlett, 2009b). Apart from business associations and corporations, however, such capacity in the non-governmental sector is limited (Stritch, 2007; Howlett, 2009b, p. 165). Indeed, the redistributed policy advisory system deriving from the shift to a governance paradigm may simply reconstitute old hierarchies of power and influence (Jordan, 2007).

Given a near-to-orthodoxy status of the governance perspective and the derivative pluralist frame of multi-actor policy engagement, it is important to build an empirically-based insight into how the two worlds of government and non-government policy work compare. This paper is a first stage in exploring these two worlds. Here, how each conducts the work of policy is examined on data derived through survey research. From this data analysis, we can test the degree to which, at least in a Canadian setting, government and non-government policy functions compare and contrast. Of course, the methodology and focus employed in this study could be replicated in any jurisdiction.

While both government and non-government policy actors may compose a specific policy community, their roles in the process – their work – is consequently different. NGO policy work involves "constant advocacy of certain positions and criticism of other stances" by injecting ideas, policy proposals, and expertise into the policy advisory system (Stone, 2000, p. 47–48). They do this by employing either or both of two main strategies. First, by pursuing an "insider" strategy where the objective is to "attain influence by working closely with … governments by providing policy solutions and expert advice" and, second, through an "outsider" strategy of campaigning to mobilize public opinion in support of a policy change (Gubrandsen & Andresen, 2004, p. 56). The onus is upon the NGO policy actors to make their case to government whose role in turn is to decide on a course of action and on the precise details of what that would or would not include.

The findings presented below here suggest that those responsible for policy work within government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), across four policy communities[2] in the three Canadian provinces (Ontario, British Columbia and Saskatchewan) surveyed, differ in terms of their capacities, depth of commitment to a specific policy file/field, roles and functions, as well as perceptions of the policy work that they undertake. The choice to focus on the Canadian provinces is based on two reasons: first, the fact that in Canada,

the provinces are responsible for important policy areas, in whole or in part, including the fields surveyed here, and second, the paucity of knowledge relating to the policy analysis and advisory functions at this level (Howlett & Newman, 2010, p. 125). Based on the results of an online survey of government and NGO policy workers, this comparison allows us to ask if differences between these two groups will impact the shift to new governance arrangements. The results suggest that the ideal, if not the idea, of a new governance terrain may be composed of a wider set of actors, but these actors are by no means equal.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various definitions of policy capacity have been formulated since interest in the subject emerged in the 1990s. The literature reflects this definitional pluralism as several schools of thought are discernible. At the base of all such definitional debates is an understanding of policy as "a choice that follows an intellectual effort to determine an effective course of action in a particular context" (Aucoin & Bakvis, 2005, p. 190). However, as this research is concerned with the deliberative process contributing to the framing and, perhaps, the construction of policy options for government decision makers to choose from, we are concerned with what happens prior to and after the 'choice'. Ultimately, the substantive contribution and effectiveness of policy actors in the process of engagement is dependent upon the policy capacity inherent in their institutional home. For our purpose, we treat the concept broadly to include policy formulation and political responsiveness to the demands of social forces (Peters, 1996, p. 11; Peters, 2008; Peters, 2010). And, with respect to the process of policy engagement between state and non-state actors, this more encompassing perspective allows one to think of the role of the public bureaucracy as one providing a space for public participation (Peters, 2010). Somewhat more narrowly, policy capacity is also understood as "the ability of a government to make intelligent policy choices and muster the resources needed to execute those choices" (Painter & Pierre, 2005, p. 255). It is in this respect that these contributions influence and shape policy decisions resonate with the study of policy engagement. Policy capacity is as much concerned with discussion of alternatives, managing competing demands of diverse stakeholders, and finally making a decision (Goetz & Wollmann, 2001, p. 864).

The new governance arrangements literature suggests that there has been an opening of the policy advice system where a "new range of political practices has emerged between institutional layers of the state and between state institutions and societal organizations" (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003, p. 1). Both

---

2 Approximately 4,000 NGOs were invited to respond to the survey. A list of organizations contacted will be provided upon request.

ARTICLES – Evans, Wellstead • Policy Dialogue and Engagement between Non-Governmental...

Central European Journal of Public Policy – Vol. 7 – № 1 – June 2013

state and non-state policy actors should work in an increasingly collaborative environment, in a process of deliberative policy analysis, to determine the "points of solidarity in the joint realization that they need one another to craft effective political agreements" (ibid, p. 3). Indeed, "governance is broader than government, covering non-state actors" (Rhodes, 1997, p. 53). A 2010 New Zealand government study examining the improvement of policy advice noted that such advice is no longer the monopoly of public servants and is increasingly contested by non-governmental policy actors.

Consequently, public servants must accommodate "the contribution that can be made to analysis and advice by the wider policy community" (Government of New Zealand, 2010, p. 1–2). In short, government is one actor in the policy advice process which must learn to better engage across policy communities. Such public engagement processes bring NGO actors into the day-to-day activities of government agencies and departments (Rowe & Frewer, 2005, p. 253). Consequently, there is now an expectation that government policy analysts will engage in greater consultation and dialogue with the public as a core part of their professional role (Wellstead et al., 2009, p. 37). The emergence of collaborative involving the direct engagement of government and non-government actors in a deliberative process of policy development (Robertson & Choi, 2012, p. 85) signals a new era in government-stakeholder policy engagement. In such arrangements, the centre of policy work and deliberation is located not within government policy units, but in civil society sites of collaboration (Bradford & Andrew, 2010, p. 5). In this way, collaborative governance re-designs the policy process from an approach that occurs within government institutions to one that is situated outside, and where policy is informed by the experience and knowledge of a variety of actors. The policy constructed through this process is not the product of competition and power politics, but rather the result of a consensus-oriented process producing policy outcomes. These partnerships provide a venue for the sharing of information and perspectives across sectors. Not only does this positively impact the policy produced, but also, more significantly, mutual learning increases the capacity of policy actors to work collaboratively in the solution of collective problems (Booher, 2004, p. 43). And it must be acknowledged that to be effective, collaborative governance processes must openly recognize power disparities between actors within a policy community and strive to mitigate the impact of power imbalances (Purdy, 2012).

As such, in order to enhance policy capacity, there needs to be a dispersal of actors within each policy community and where each possesses "unique organizing capacities" (Van Buuren, 2009, p 213). This differs from more traditional forms of policy-making where decision-making processes occur within the "black-box" of government, and presents a new interpretation of the policy

process which "is not imprisoned in closed institutions and is not the province of professional politicians" (Newman et al., 2004, p. 204).

There have been several studies of policy capacity within Canada's federal and provincial governments. The studies range from expert panels and reports (Fellegi, 1996; Peters, 1996; Savoie, 2003), reflections of senior officials (Anderson, 1996; Rasmussen, 1999; Voyer, 2007), and surveys (Howlett, 2009a; Howlett & Bernier, 2011; Howlett & Joshi, 2011; Wellstead et al., 2011; Howlett & Wellstead, 2012, Wellstead & Stedman, 2012). This recent spat of quantitative research delves into the nitty gritty details of the 'who and how' of front-line policy work. Given the important policy fields for which the Canadian provinces are responsible, further research is required. Howlett (2009a) places the NGO (and this includes business, labour, and civil society organizations) dimension on the research agenda when he asks: "What do policy analysts actually do in contemporary governmental and non-governmental organizations?". And he goes further, urging that students of public policy and management ask if the training and resourcing of policy workers is adequate for the task (ibid., 163–164). Moreover, taking Howlett's suggestions for additional research further, this work explores how public service policy workers and NGO policy workers engage with one another.

Although these quantitative studies of front-line workers are a noteworthy contribution to understanding the nature of policy work, they are limited to the narrow scope of government-centered decision-making and fail to account for policy work in new governance arrangements. The point is that "policies can no longer be struck in isolation in government" (Lindquist, 2009, p. 9). Contradicting this now axiomatic statement is a body of research (Wellstead & Stedman, 2010; Howlett & Wellstead, 2012) that has found that government policy workers are notorious for their low levels of interaction outside of their immediate work environment. This paper is, to our knowledge, the first to empirically examine front-line policy work on 'the other side', outside of government. More importantly, it gauges the extent of relationships of these two worlds. As this study is concerned with comparing government and NGO approaches and perspectives toward policy work, some consideration of policy capacity within each sector is undertaken. The resourcing and availability of policy expertise (Lindquist & Desveaux, 2007) within the public service and beyond, the practices and procedures used to apply these resources toward addressing a policy issue, is a basic dimension for investigation (Fellegi, 1996, p. 6) Given that both the political legitimacy and practical efficacy of new governance arrangements is theoretically premised upon a broadly pluralist framework of enabled policy actors, it is necessary to test the veracity of this conceptualization. If policy advisory systems have indeed become "more fluid,

pluralized and poly-centric" (Craft & Howlett, 2012, p. 85), there must be some indication of this new policy development environment in how policy workers, both government and non-government, perform their tasks. And, for this pluralised policy advisory system to work optimally, it must be premised on the existence of a "healthy policy-research community outside government" (Anderson, 1996, p. 486). The data analysis here raises serious questions respecting both this assumed policy pluralism and its 'health'.

There are several components of policy capacity relevant to this research: 1) the policy network environment – especially the department's position relative to other players in the policy development process; 2) the human inputs – the number of people involved in policy work, their education, career experience and skills; and 3) the information inputs – the range and quality of the data available to inform the decision-making process (Edwards, 2009, p. 291–92). Howlett (2009b) has formulated a more focused conceptualization of 'policy analytical capacity'. This is defined as the "amount of basic research a government can conduct or access, its ability to apply statistical methods, applied research methods, and advanced modeling techniques to this data and employ analytical techniques such as environmental scanning, trends analysis, and forecasting methods in order to gauge broad public opinion and attitudes, as well as those of interest groups and other major policy players, and to anticipate future policy impacts" (ibid., p. 162). All of these functions and methods are exercised through the efforts of policy workers. By integrating the insights of Edwards (2009) with Howlett's definition we construct an additional frame of 'how' and through what processes the policy worker applies (or does not apply) these skills and techniques. These are the 'tools' of the trade, but how are they employed and to what end? What are the processes and structures in which they are applied? How might the processes of policy work affect which tools are used or not used? What knowledge becomes 'applied' in the development of policy and what is discarded and why? How do relationships with other actors within the policy community, both governmental and non-governmental actors, contribute to what knowledge is acceptable and not acceptable; are some actors privileged in the process and if so how? These are important questions the answers to which can assist in unpacking the day-to-day content of the policy process.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Recent Canadian policy capacity surveys, in particular the variables derived from Wellstead and Stedman's (2010) Canadian federal government study, served as the basis for an analysis of this study comparing government policy-

workers and their NGO counterparts. Three key questions about the nature of government and NGO policy work in a changing governance environment are posed. First, are public service and NGO policy workers different with respect to key demographic characteristics and work environment?

Second, how similar or dissimilar are public service and NGO-based policy functions and capacities? More specifically, we compare the size of the respective policy units and the specific policy tasks, both of which are important factors in understanding policy capacity (Wellstead & Stedman, 2010). Lastly, we focus on whether or not there will be differences in the attitudinal characteristics between the groups. Wellstead and Stedman (2010) found that in many cases attitudes towards the larger policy environment is critical in determining levels of perceived policy capacity. More specifically, we compare what the respondents thought about the role of evidence in policy-making, political involvement in the policy process, the influence of outside organizations on policy work, and the importance of networking.

DATA AND METHODS

To probe the above research questions, two survey instruments were designed: 1) a government-based 192 variable (45 questions) questionnaire based in part on previous capacity surveys by Howlett and Wellstead (Howlett, 2009; Wellstead et al., 2009), and 2) an NGO-based 248 variable questionnaire (38 questions). Both surveys addressed the nature and frequency of the tasks, the extent and frequency of their interactions with other policy actors, and their attitudes towards and views of various aspects of policy-making processes, as well as questions addressing their education, previous work, and on-the-job training experiences. Both also contained standard questions relating to age, gender, and socioeconomic status.

The survey instrument was delivered to 2458 provincial policy analysts and 1995 analysts working in the NGO sector in the Canadian provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia. Four policy communities were selected for this survey: environment, health, immigration, and labour. The specific provinces and policy sectors dealt with in this study were chosen because they represent heterogeneous cases in terms of politics, history and economic and demographic scale. With respect to the three provinces, they present cases which include Ontario – Canada's largest province in economic and population terms (13.5 million people and representing 40% of Canadian GDP). Unlike most of Canada's other provinces, Ontario has a competitive three-party political system where since 1990, all three have governed. British

ARTICLES – Evans, Wellstead • Policy Dialogue and Engagement between Non-Governmental...

Central European Journal of Public Policy – Vol. 7 – № 1 – June 2013

Columbia presents a mid-size province (population of 4.4 million and 12 percent of national GDP). Provincial elections have been polarized contests between social democrats and a free-market coalition which has been housed within various parties. Saskatchewan was chosen as a small province (population of one million and 3 percent of national GDP). Its economy has largely been based on natural resources and agriculture. Politics have also been highly polarized where the provincial government has alternated between social democrats and a conservative party.

Mailing lists for both surveys were compiled, wherever possible, from publicly available sources such as online telephone directories, using keyword searches for terms such as "policy analyst" appearing in job titles or descriptions. In some cases, additional names were added to lists from hard-copy sources, including government organization manuals. Based on preliminary interviews with NGO organization representatives, we suspected that respondents would undertake a variety of non-policy-related tasks. As a result, we widened the search to include those who undertook policy-related analysis in their work objectives. Due to the small size of both study populations, a census rather than a sample survey of each was taken. This method is consistent with other expert-based studies (see e.g., Laumann & Knoke, 1987; Zafonte & Sabatier, 1998).

The authors implemented an unsolicited survey in January 2012 using *Zoomerang®*, an online commercial software service. A total of 1510 returns were collected for a final response rate of 33.99 percent. With the exception of the labor NGO respondents, the percentage of respondents corresponded closely with population developed by the authors. For more details see Table 1 in Appendix A. The data was weighted using the iterative proportional fitting or raking method. The data was analyzed using SPSS 20.0. The data generated by the survey provided the basis required to test the hypotheses about tasks, the nature of broad issues, perceived policy capacity, the attitudes relating to climate change and policy process, and the nature of the relationship between government policy analysts and those in the environment, health, immigration, and labor NGO communities. The analysis includes a presentation of descriptive analysis, comparison of mean scores between government and NGO responses[3] and exploratory factor analysis[4].

---

3 Inter-sector differences were tested using comparison of means (independent samples) T-tests.
4 Factor analysis is a statistical procedure used to uncover relationships among many variables. This allows numerous inter-correlated variables to be condensed into fewer dimensions, called factors. The internal consistency of the factored variables was estimated using reliability analysis and Cronbach's α (alpha) statistic.

RESULTS

Who are the respondents (and their work environment)?

Both groups are highly educated, with the government respondents holding more professional or graduate degrees (See Table 2 in Appendix). The government respondents tended to be younger. An age difference between the two populations is clearly discernible. The NGO cohort tends to be older where 52 percent of respondents were 51 years old or older. By comparison, only 37.1 percent of government respondents were in this age range. Younger government policy analysts tended to be a much larger proportion of the total field of government respondents: slightly more than 37 percent were 40 or younger. In contrast, slightly more that 20 percent of the NGO cohort were in this age range. Since NGO respondents tend to be older, it may not be too surprising that the survey found this cohort to demonstrate significantly longer attachment to both their present position and organization in comparison to government policy analysts (Table 1).

Table 1 Years in department or organization***

	Government		NGO	
Years	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1 year	77	14.7	18	3.0
1–5 years	298	57.0	203	34.0
6–9 years	77	14.7	116	19.4
10–14 years	35	6.7	109	18.3
15–20 years	18	3.4	65	10.9
Greater than 20 years	18	3.4	86	14.4
Total	523	100.0	597	100.0

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)

Nearly 43 percent of the NGO respondents had ten or more years of experience with their organization (Table 4). Of these, just 14 percent had 20 or more years in their organization, this in contrast to only 6.8 percent of the government policy analysts. And with respect to the long-term veterans, only 3.4 percent had 20 or more years with their organization. A similar disparity is revealed with respect to future commitment to one's organization (Table 2). Here, 53.4 percent of NGO respondents stated that they planned to remain with

their current organization for another decade. Government respondents were not interested in long-term organizational commitments—only 16.2 percent indicated that they intended to remain for ten or more years.

Table 2 Years anticipated being in Department or Organization***

Sector	Government		NGO	
Anticipated years	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Less than 1 year	43	9.3	25	4.3
1–5 years	222	42.9	142	24.3
6–9 years	63	12.2	105	17.9
10–14 years	44	8.5	85	14.5
15–20 years	29	5.6	102	17.4
Greater than 20 years	11	2.1	126	21.5
Don't know	101	19.5	0	0.0
Total	**518**	**100.0**	**585**	**100.0**

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)

What do the respondents do?

Policy-based NGO respondents did not fall under the generic policy role like their government counterparts. The specific tasks of both groups are highlighted later in the paper. However, in Table 2, the general roles of the NGO respondents reveal that they undertake a host of different tasks, most notably management-type roles such as director (31.8%) or manager (21.9%). Only a minority (15.4%) considered themselves to be policy analysts. A Crombach's Alpha = .787 from a reliability test of these roles (with director, coordinator, and manager variables removed) meant that NGO respondents were highly likely to be engaged in all or many of the above roles.

We found that NGO policy units were much smaller than those housed in government ministries. In fact, 67.2 percent of NGO respondents reported that there was no unit dedicated to policy research or advocacy (Table 4). A further 24.1 percent reported that while a policy unit did exist, it was composed of ten or fewer staff. These findings contrast significantly with government policy units with 61.2 percent who reported the presence of dedicated policy units of up to ten staff and 24.3 percent who indicated that their policy unit was still larger than this.

Table 3 Roles of NGO respondents

Role	Number	Percent
Advisor	106	15.3
Analyst	52	7.5
Communication officer	69	9.9
Coordinator	103	14.8
Director	221	31.8
Liaison officer	32	4.6
Manager	152	21.9
Planner	65	9.4
Policy analyst	107	15.4
Researcher	112	16.1
Strategic analyst	73	10.5
Other	127	18.3

Table 4 Size of policy work unit***

	Government		NGO	
How many people work in your policy work unit	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 (there is no dedicated policy unit)	75	14.5	393	67.2
1–5	140	27.0	90	15.4
6–10	177	34.2	51	8.7
11–20	72	13.9	51	8.7
21–30	25	4.8	0	0.0
More than 30	29	5.6	0	0.0
Total	518	100.0	585	100.0

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)

The prevalence of multi-tasking within NGO policy work is a function of the smaller size of NGOs generally. Consequently, a division of labour within these organizations which allows for a policy role specialization is not possible in many cases. In contrast, governments have the resources which allow for larger policy units staffed with dedicated policy workers. The differential

Table 5 Tasks of Respondents

	Government			Non-government		
	N	Mean (% Weekly)	SD	N	Mean (% Weekly)	SD
Appraise/assess policy options***	479	3.49 (31.5)	1.34	545	3.09 (17.1)	1.32
Brief cabinet ministers and ministerial staff***	489	2.16 (6.5)	1.27	543	1.77 (1.3)	.993
Brief senior management***	488	3.38 (23.8)	1.34	536	2.02 (1.9)	1.08
Brief low or mid-level policy managers***	485	4.11 (54.4)	1.18	534	2.49 (4.9)	1.22
Collect policy-related data or information***	484	3.96 (48.1)	1.27	538	3.22 (23.2)	1.34
Conduct policy-related research***	483	3.54 (34.8)	1.39	516	2.75 (16.7)	1.37
Conduct scientific research	478	1.76 (6.3)	1.19	522	1.75 (7.7)	1.27
Consult with decision-makers***	471	3.60 (27.6)	1.25	522	3.06 (12.6)	1.19
Consult with stakeholders	482	3.33 (24.7)	1.33	536	3.44 (19.6)	1.21
Consult with the public	479	1.98 (4.2)	1.16	536	2.11 (5.6)	1.06
Evaluate policy processes and procedures*	476	2.79 (10.5)	1.27	518	2.59 (7.3)	1.16
Evaluate policy results and outcomes*	478	2.81 (11.2)	1.23	534	2.63 (9.2)	1.17
Identify policy issues	472	3.64 (30.3)	1.20	514	3.21 (18.5)	1.21
Identify policy options	477	3.55 (27.5)	1.22	523	2.94 (12.6)	1.23
Implement or deliver policies or programs**	483	3.01 (26.7)	1.53	522	2.70 (20.5)	1.52
Negotiate with program staff	483	3.10 (24.0)	1.50	521	2.38 (8.4)	1.34
Negotiate with stakeholders on policy matters*	485	2.45 (8.2)	1.30	532	2.33 (5.1)	1.22

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)

size and policy specialization observed here raises questions respecting the inferred pluralism of new governance arrangements insofar as they apply to policy engagement between government and non-government policy actors.

The survey data further indicates that government and NGO policy analysts work differently. Table 5 lists the mean score and the percentage of those respondents who engage at least weekly in 17 possible specific policy tasks. In many cases, government respondents are engaged more frequently in all of these tasks. For example, 54.4 percent of the government respondents brief low or mid-level managers compared to 4.9% of the NGO policy workers. Similarly, 34.8 percent of government workers engage at least weekly in policy research compared to 16.7 percent of the NGO respondents.

A factor analysis of the above 17 items was conducted (Table 6). There are four distinct loadings with 68.1% of the variance explained and where labelled: "policy work", "briefing", "consulting", and "conducting research".

Table 6 Factor analysis of tasks undertaken

	Component			
	Policy Work	Briefing	Consulting/ Administering	Conduct Scientific research
Appraise/assess policy options	.687			
Brief cabinet ministers and ministerial staff		.731		
Brief senior management		.886		
Brief low or mid-level policy managers		.749		
Conduct scientific research				.926
Consult with stakeholders			.756	
Consult with the public			.645	
Evaluate policy processes and procedures	.754			
Evaluate policy results and outcomes	.789			
Identify policy issues	.817			
Identify policy options	.822			
Implement or deliver policies or programs			.568	
Negotiate with stakeholders on policy matters			.724	

In Table 7, the group differences between mean scores from two of the new variables (policy work and briefing) were statistically significant, meaning that government respondents undertook more policy work and briefing activities. Again, this corroborates our earlier observation respecting government departments' size and how this translates into capacity for staff to specialize in policy work as opposed to necessity of multi-tasking required in NGOs.

Table 7 Comparison of means of the factored tasks

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Policy Work***	442	3.24	1.03	461	2.92	1.01
Briefing***	483	3.21	.99	518	2.10	.95
Consult Implementation	470	2.78	.99	504	2.75	.87
Conduct scientific research	478	1.76	1.23	522	1.75	1.27

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05) (Where 1 = Never and 5 = Weekly)

The large number of issues across all four policy communities in the three provinces made specific questions impossible. We replicated Wellstead et al.'s (2011) more generalized issue questions (see Table 8). There were a number of significant differences between government and NGO respondents across nearly all of the items. Government respondents spent more time on these critical issue areas. The government respondents indicated (35.2%) that they spent a considerable amount of their time (50 percent of their time or more) examining issues that required a specialist or technical knowledge and issues where it was difficult to identify a single, clear, simple solution (40.2%). In contrast, only 23.1 percent of the NGO respondents spent more than half of their time examining those issues where it was difficult to identify a single, clear, simple solution (17.9%) followed by issues where the data was not immediately available.

A factor analysis of the 14 items in Table 8 was conducted (with a 66.25 percent of the variance explained) and it produced two distinct loadings (Table 9): "public" and "complex" issues. For both broad issue areas, the government respondents were more engaged. A comparison of mean scores of these can be found in Appendix A (Table 3).

Again, government policy work is housed in a comparatively resource-rich context allowing for this observed focused attention.

Table 8 Type of issues dealt with

	Government			NGO		
Issues that…	N	$\overline{X}$ (> 50% of time)	SD	N	$\overline{X}$ (> 50% of time)	SD
Require public consultation***	463	2.21 (9.3)	1.21	507	1.97 (1.4)	.860
Emerge as the result of political priorities in the Premier's Office or Cabinet***	461	3.17 (20.8)	1.31	498	2.02 (1.6)	.936
Emerge as a result of public pressure on government***	462	2.92 (13.2)	1.20	498	2.44 (4.8)	1.01
Gave a single, clear, relatively simple solution	453	1.96 (1.5)	.907	495	2.04 (2.6)	.906
Require coordination with other levels of government***	455	2.90 (14.7)	1.28	498	2.42 (6.6)	1.17
Require specialist or technical knowledge***	457	3.66 (35.2)	1.25	495	2.79 (13.3)	1.22
Difficult to identify a single, clear, simple solution***	456	3.75 (40.1)	1.28	494	3.14 (23.1)	1.30
Issues where data is not immediately available***	459	3.48 (25.7)	1.22	499	2.98 (17.0)	1.24
Demand the creation or collection of policy-relevant evidence***	453	3.41 (28.5)	1.31	502	2.99 (17.9)	1.27

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05) (Where 1 = 0% of my time and 5 = >50% of my time)

Respondents were asked how often stakeholders were invited to work with the government on both an informal and a formal basis. A comparison of means and the frequency of answers that such interaction occurred often (monthly) revealed distinctly different perceptions of stakeholder involvement with government officials between the two groups (Table 10). Nearly a third (29.9%) of government respondents indicated that NGO stakeholders worked with them informally on at least a monthly basis, compared to 9.3 percent of NGO respondents who saw themselves meeting informally and infrequently with government officials. The reverse held true for formal encounters between government and NGO officials, with a quarter of the NGO respondents indicating they met with government officials compared to 14.8 percent of the government respondent reporting the same sort of formal meetings.

Table 9   Factor Analysis of issues types

	Component	
	Complex	Public
Require public consultation		.695
Emerge as the result of political priorities in the Premier's Office or Cabinet		.770
Emerge as a result of public pressure on government		.798
Require specialist or technical knowledge	.755	
Difficult to identify a single, clear, simple solution	.851	
Issues where data is not immediately available	.841	
Demand the creation or collection of policy-relevant evidence	.754	

Table 10   Invitation to work with government

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean (% monthly)	SD	N	Mean (% monthly)	SD
How often are stakeholders invited to assist with your (their) work on an informal basis?***	458	3.32 (29.9)	1.498	463	2.21 (9.3)	1.215
How often are stakeholders invited to assist with your (their) work on a formal basis?***	459	2.94 (14.8)	1.344	464	3.13 (25.0)	1.367

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05) (Where 1 = Never and 5 = Monthly)

What are their attitudes towards policy-making?

Table 11 lists 15 variables measuring policy attitudes concerning the effectiveness of policy work. Of them, the comparison of means tests (and the percentages who agreed) revealed statistically significant differences between the government and NGO respondents on ten of these items. For example, when asked if "urgent day-to-day issues seem to take precedence over thinking long term," 43.1% of the government respondents strongly agreed with the statement compared to 30.4% of their NGO counterparts.

Table 11   General Governance Attitudes

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean (% s. agree)	SD	N	Mean (% s. agree)	SD
Urgent day-to-day issues seem to take precedence over thinking 'long term.'***	436	4.17 (43.1)	.93	450	3.79 (30.4)	1.07
I am increasingly consulting with the public as I do my policy-related work.**	435	2.52 (3.7)	1.11	441	2.74 (5.2)	1.04
Policy directions seem to increasingly be on what is most politically acceptable*	434	3.80 (26.3)	.94	442	3.64 (22.2)	1.04
There seems to be less governmental capacity to analyze policy options than there used to be***	430	3.42 (15.3)	1.01	436	3.69 (23.2)	.96
My policy-related work increasingly involves networks of people across other regions, or levels of government, or even outside of government	429	3.55 (22.6)	1.16	434	3.70 (25.3)	1.12
Policy problems increasingly require strong technical expertise	427	3.58 (14.1)	.92	436	3.59 (14.9)	.92
Much of the existing policy capacity is outside the formal structure of government***	425	2.84 (6.1)	1.03	428	3.51 (13.6)	.88
Those who have more authority in decision-making usually have less specialized technical expertise*	432	3.92 (31.7)	.94	427	3.80 (23.4)	.91
An important role of government is to foster involvement in the policy process by other non-governmental organizations/stakeholders	428	3.70 (18.2)	.88	440	4.31 (50.7)	.85
Interest groups seem to have a greater influence in the policy-making process than they used to**	427	3.43 (13.1)	.90	437	3.22 (13.3)	1.08

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean (% s. agree)	SD	N	Mean (% s. agree)	SD
Well-organized data, research and analysis originating from government department is used in policymaking***	430	3.42 (15.1)	1.06	429	2.74 (3.0)	1.01
Formal government institutions are becoming less relevant to policy-making**	423	2.89 (4.3)	.93	423	3.08 (5.7)	.89
Decisions about government programs and operations are increasingly made by those outside of government**	426	2.71 (3.1)	.91	432	2.89 (7.2)	1.02
Evidence is increasingly being asked for in government policy development and evaluation***	432	3.79 (26.2)	.95	436	3.51 (20.9)	1.09

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05) (Where 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree)

A factor analysis (Table 12) of the items in Table 13 resulted in five distinct loadings with 68.9% of the variance explained: "evidence" (the importance of evidence-based policy work), "political" (the role of political influence in policy work), "network" (the importance of networking), and "outside" (the influence of organizations outside of the formal policy process). These five new items reveal multifaceted set of common attitudes between the two groups that influence policy work.

The mean scores from the summed variables in Table 17 illustrate that the government respondents considered evidence-based policy work and political influence on policy work to be more important than their NGO counterparts. However, the NGO policy workers surveyed placed more importance on networking and the role of outside organizations in policy making. A comparison of mean scores of these can be found in Appendix A (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In this paper, three major questions about the nature of government and NGO policy workers in three Canadian provinces across five significant fields were posed. The first question focused on whether or not there were demographic and work environment differences between the two groups. In other words,

Table 12   Factor Analysis of General Governance Attitudes

	Component				
	Evidence	Political	Network	Influence	Outside
Urgent day-to-day issues seem to take precedence over thinking 'long term.'		.855			
I am increasingly consulting with the public as I do my policy-related work.			.857		
Policy directions seem to increasingly be on what is most politically acceptable		.787			
My policy-related work increasingly involves networks of people across other regions, or levels of government, or even outside of government			.750		
Much of the existing policy capacity is outside the formal structure of government					.668
An important role of government is to foster involvement in the policy process by other non-governmental organizations/stakeholders					.823
Interest groups seem to have a greater influence in the policy-making process than they used to				.792	
Well-organized data, research and analysis originating from government department is used in policymaking	.768				
Decisions about government programs and operations are increasingly made by those outside of government				.727	
Evidence is increasingly being asked for in government policy development and evaluation	.818				

who were the respondents? The government-based respondents had a higher level of education, but were younger than their NGO counterparts. Government respondents were more likely to leave their organization within five years that is consistent with the literature respecting job mobility in large bureaucracies (Page & Jenkins, 2005).

The second major question asked whether or not there are differences in the tasks and working environments of these two groups. Not surprising

is the greater institutional support that government policy workers have in terms of the policy unit. When it came to the actual work that the respondents did, those working for government departments were more engaged in what the public management literature called 'policy work'. This may be in part explained by the more encompassing roles that NGO policy actors play. We suspect that NGO-based policy work is done 'from the side of the desk.' With large supporting policy units and more time to engage in policy work, government respondents will be more engaged in specific and complex policy tasks than NGO respondents. The perceived level of engagement between NGO and government officials had mixed results. NGO respondents saw themselves less engaged in an informal sense, but more involved in formal arrangements with government officials. We can further deduce that NGO respondents may see their participation as marginal players in the decision-making process. As for the types of issues addressed by the respondents (different from the factor analysis of issue areas), we found that the government respondents dealt with issues emerging from the public either directly or from their political masters. They also dealt with more complex issues. This, we suspect, based on Wellstead et al. (2009), is a function of policy units.

The last question attempted to gauge what the study's respondents thought of policy making in general. This raises concern about the role and legitimacy of evidence-based policy work in new governance arrangements. In addition to working more regularly on issues that stem from public concern, government respondents were more like to agree that their work had become more politicized and was under greater outside scrutiny. Therefore the greater importance placed on networking by NGO respondents was expected.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

What this comparative analysis reveals is that the worlds of Canadian provincial government and NGO policy analysts are rather different in terms of structures, understanding, and perhaps, speculatively, policy knowledge and expertise. Further data analysis will explore this in more depth. However, at this stage we can say a few things about how these policy work worlds are constructed.

One of the most significant findings distinguishing the two groups is the depth of long-term commitment found amongst NGO policy analysts to their organization and substantive policy field. This seems to imply a much great degree of conviction and commitment to the 'cause' amongst this cohort as compared to their public service counter-parts. Perhaps the shift to a more

corporate or enterprise-wide career track model in the public services, as opposed to growing deep roots in a specific field, has created a much more mobile policy professional. And, the clearly larger and more steeply hierarchical career ladders of public service require such mobility if one is to enter senior management.

The other major difference, though not a surprising one, is the sheer difference in organizational size and scale. NGOs, for the most part, simply do not have the capacity to create dedicated policy units and policy work is thus only one aspect of work in this sector. Multi-tasking is the order of the day. In contrast, public services tend to have sizable policy units in place dedicated to a singular policy function.

What policy analysts in each sector do is also telling. The number one function of government respondents was briefing mid-level managers. In contrast, the primary function of NGO staff was consulting with stakeholders. Obviously the first indicates a priority to internal policy work cohesion while the second appears to express a more outward looking orientation. No doubt this is the need for NGOs to engage their funders, members, and communities. The service delivery and advocacy roles identified in this survey would support this conclusion, at least in part. And, the types of issues each world deals with tend to be starkly different. This reflects the different structural and political realities of each sector. But this may well speak to the need for a more formal and institutionalized environment to facilitate a better dialogue between both sides of each policy community to better deliberate with one another, if that is a genuine objective. While contemporary governance arrangements appear to speak to shifts in the patterns of interaction found in policy advisory systems (Craft and Howlett 2012, 86), the image of a pluralist, polycentric model of governance is far from realized in the process of policy engagement in the three Canadian provinces surveyed here.

REFERENCES

Aberbach, J. & Rockman, B. (1989). On the rise, transformation, and decline of analysis in the US government. *Governance, 2*(3), 293–314.

Ansell, Ch. & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571.

Anderson G. (1996). The New Focus on the Policy Capacity of the Federal Government. *Canadian Public Administration, 39*(4), 469–488.

Aucoin, P. & Bakvis, H. (2005). Public service reform and policy capacity. In M. Painter & J. Pierre (Eds.). *Challenges to state policy capacity: Global trends and comparative perspectives* (pp. 185–204). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baskoy, T., Evans, B., & Shields, B. (2011). Assessing policy capacity in Canada's public services: Perspectives of deputy and assistant deputy ministers. *Canadian Public Administration*, *54*(2), 217–234.

Booher, D. E. (2004). Collaborative Governance Practices and Democracy. *National Civic Review, 93*(4), 32–46.

Bradford, N. & Caroline, A. (2010)*. Local Immigration Partnership Councils: A Promising Canadian Innovation.* Report prepared for Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Bridgman, P. & Glyn, D. (2003). What Use is a Policy Cycle? Plenty, if the Aim is Clear. *Australian Journal of Public Administration,* 62(3), 98–102.

Bridgman, P. & Glyn, D. (1998). *Australian Policy Handbook*. St. Leonards NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Christensen, T. & Laegreid, P. (2005). Autonomization and Policy Capacity: The Dilemmas and Challenges Facing Political Executives. In M. Painter and J. Pierre (Eds.). *Challenges to State Policy Capacity: Global Trends and Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Christensen, T. & Laegreid, P. (2001). *New Public Management: The Transformation of Ideas and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Cohn, D. (2006). *Jumping into the Political Fray: Academics and Policy-Making*. *IRPP Policy Matters*. Policy Matters series, Vol.7, No. (3). Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP): Montréal, Québec.

Colebatch, H. (2010). Giving Accounts of Policy Work. In Colebatch, H., Hoppe, R. & Noordegraaf, M. (Eds.). *Working for Policy*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Colebatch, H. (Ed.) (2006). *Beyond the Policy Cycle: The Policy Process in Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Colebatch, H. (2006). *The Work of Policy: An International Survey*, Oxford: Lexington Books.

Craft, J. & Howlett, M. (2012). Policy formulation, governance shifts and policy influence: location and content in policy advisory systems. *Journal of Public Policy*, *32*(2), 79–98.

Davies, T., Nutley, S. M. & Smith, P.C. (Eds.). *What Works? Evidence-based Policy and Practice in Public Serves*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press.

Davis, G. (2000). Conclusion: Policy capacity and the Future of Governance. In Glyn, D. & Keating, M. (Eds.). *The Future of Governance*. St. Leonards (AUS.) Allen Unwin.

Edwards, L. (2009). Testing the Discourse of Declining Policy Capacity: Rail Policy and the Department of Transport. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *68*(3), 288–302.

Fellegi, I. (1996). *Strengthening our Policy Capacity. Report of the Deputy Ministers Task Force.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

George, A. & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Goetz, K. H. & Wollmann, H. (2001). Governmentalizing Central Executives in Post-Communist Europe: A Four-country Comparison. *Journal of European Public Policy, 8*(6), 864–887.

Government of New Zealand. (2010). *Improving the Quality and Value of Policy Advice*, Review of Expenditure on Policy Advice.

Gubrandsen, L. & Steinar, A. (2004). NGO Influence in the Implementation of the Kyoto Protocol: Compliance, Flexibility Mechanisms and Sinks. *Global Environmental Politics*, 4(4), 54–75.

Hajer, M. & Wagenaar, H. (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoppe, R. (1999). Policy Analysis, Science, and Politics: From "Speaking Truth to Power" to "Making Sense Together". *Science and Public Policy*, *26*(3), 201–210.

Howlett, M. (2002). Policy Development. In Dunn, C. (Ed.). *The Handbook of Canadian Public Administration* (pp. 173–191). Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Howlett, M. (2007). Policy Analytical Capacity as a Source of Policy Failure. Presentation at the Workshop on Policy Failure, Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Howlett, M. (2009a). Policy Advice in Multi-Level Governance Systems: Sub-national Policy Analysts and Analysis. *International Review of Public Administration*, *13*(3), 1–16.

Howlett, M. (2009b). Policy analytical capacity and evidence-based policy-making: Lessons from Canada. *Canadian Public Administration*, *52*(2), 153–175.

Howlett, M. & Newman, J. (2010). Policy analysis and policy work in federal systems: Policy advice and its contribution to evidence-based policy-making in multi-level governance systems. *Policy and Society, 29*(2), 123–136.

Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems., (2nd edition).* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Jayasariya, K. (2005). Capacity Beyond the Boundary: New Regulatory State, Fragmentation and Relational Capacity. In Painter, M. & Pierre, J. *Challenges to State Policy Capacity: Global Trends and Comparative Perspectives*. Editors. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnston, E. W., Hicks, D., Nan, N., & Auer, J. C. (2011). Managing the Inclusion Process in Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 21*(4), 699–721.

Jordan, G. (2007). Policy without Learning: Double Devolution and Abuse of the Deliberative Idea. *Public Policy and Administration*, *22*(1), 48–73.

Lindquist, E. (1996). New Agendas for Research on Policy Communities: Policy Analysis, Management and Governance. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds). *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art* (pp. 219–241). Toronto: IPAC/University of Toronto Press.

Lindquist, E. (1992). Public Managers and Policy Communities: Learning to Meet New Challenges. *Canadian Public Administration*. *35*(2), 127–59.

Lindquist, E. (2004). Three Decades of Canadian Think Tanks: Evolving Institutions, Conditions and Strategies. In Stone, D. & Denham, A. (Eds.). *Think Tank Traditions: Policy Analysis Across Nations* (pp.264–280). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lindquist, E. (2009). *There's More to Policy Than Alignment*. CPRN Research Report.

Lindquist, E. (2006). *Think Tanks, Foundations and Policy Discourse: Ebbs and Flows, Investments and Responsibilities.* Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.

Lindquist, E. & Desveaux, J. (2007). Policy Analysis and Bureaucratic Capacity: Context, Competences, and Strategies. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds). *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art* (pp. 116–142). Toronto: IPAC-University of Toronto Press.

Lomas, J. (2000). Connecting Research and Policy. *ISUMA*, Spring, 140–144.

McArthur, D. (2007). Policy Analysis in Provincial Governments in Canada: From PPBS to Network Management. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds). *Policy*

Studies in Canada: The State of the Art (pp. 116–142). Toronto: IPAC-University of Toronto Press.

Mayer, I., Bots, P. & van Daalen, E. (2004). Perspectives on Policy Analysis: A Framework for Understanding and Design. *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management, 4*(1), 169–191.

Meltsner, A. (1976). *Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Newman, J., Barnes, M., Sullivan, H., & Knops, A. (2004). Public Participation and Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Social Policy, 33*(2), p. 203–223.

Nutley, S., Davies, H., & Walter, I. (2003). Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Cross Sector Lessons from the UK. Social Policy Research and Evaluation Conference, Wellington, New Zealand, July 2–3.

Nutley, S. M., Walter, I., & Davies, H. (2007). *Using Evidence: How Research Can Inform Public Service*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press.

Page, E., & Jenkins, B. (2005). *Policy Bureaucracy: Government with a Cast of Thousands*. London: Oxford University Press.

Painter, M. & Pierre, J. (2005). Conclusions: Challenges to policy capacity. In Painter, M. & Pierre, J. (Eds.). *Challenges to state policy capacity: Global trends and comparative perspectives* (pp. 255–61). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parsons, W. (2004). Not Just Steering but Weaving: Relevant Knowledge and the Craft of Building Policy Capacity and Coherence. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 63*(1), 43–57.

Peters, B. G. (2010). Bureaucracy and Democracy. *Public Organization Review, 10*, 209–222.

Peters, B. G. (2008). Meta Governance. In Osborne, S. (ed.). *New Public Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Peters, B. G. (2005). Policy Instruments and Policy Capacity. In Painter, M. & Pierre, J. (Eds.). *Challenges to state policy capacity: Global trends and comparative perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peters, B. G. (2000). *The Future of Governing, 2nd edition*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Peters, B. G. (1996). The policy capacity of government. *Research paper no. 18,* Canadian Center for Management Development. Retrieved December 27, 2007, from http://csps-efpc.gc.ca/Research/publications/pdfs/p62e.pdf.

Pollitt, C. (2005). Ministries and Agencies: Steering, Meddling, Neglect and Dependency. In Painter, M. & Pierre, J. (Eds.). *Challenges to state policy capacity: Global trends and comparative perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Purdy, J. M. (2012). A Framework for Assessing Power in Collaborative Governance Processes. *Public Administration Review, 72*(3), 409–417.

Radin, B. (2006). *Challenging the Performance Movement: Accountability, Complexity and Democratic Values*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rasmussen, K. (1999). Policy Capacity in Saskatchewan: Strengthening the Equilibrium. *Canadian Public Administration, 42*(3), 331–338.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997). Shackling the leader? Coherence, Capacity and the Hollow Crown. In Weller, P., Bakvis, H., & Rhodes, R.A.W. (Eds.). *The Hollow Crown? Counterveiling Trends in Core Executives*. London: Macmillan.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996). The new governance: governing without government. *Political Studies, 44*(4), 652–67.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1994). The Hollowing Out of the State: The Changing Nature of the Public Service in Britain. *Political Quarterly, 65,* 138–151.

Roberts, N. C. (2002). Keeping Public Officials Accountable through Dialogue: Resolving the Accountability Paradox. *Public Administration Review, 62*(6), 658–669.

Robertson, P. J. & Taehyon, C. (2012). Deliberation, Consensus, and Stakeholder Satisfaction. *Public Management Review, 14*(1), 83–103.

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology and Human Values*, *30*(2), 251–290.

Savoie, D. (2003). *Strengthening the Policy Capacity of Government*. Report to the Panel on the Role of Government. Research Paper Series, 1, 239–290.

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, *50*(155), 17–28.

Stone, D. (2000). Non-governmental Policy Transfer: The Strategies of Independent Policy Institutes. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, *13*(1), 45–62.

Stritch, A. (2007). Business associations and policy analysis in Canada. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M, & Laycock, D. (Eds.) *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tenbensel, T. (2006). Policy knowledge for policy work. In Colebatch, H. (ed.). *The Work of Policy: An International Survey* (pp. 199–216). Latham, MD: Lexington Books.

Treib, O., Bahr, H., & Falkner, G. (2007). Modes of Governance: Towards a Conceptual Clarification. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *14*, 1–20.

Tollefson, C., Zito, A., & Gale, F. (2012). Symposium Overview: Conceptualizing New Governance Arrangements. *Public Administration*. 90(1), 3–18.

Van Buuren, A. (2009). Knowledge for Governance, Governance of Knowledge: Inclusive Knowledge Management in Collaborative Governance Processes. *International Public Management Journal*, *12*(2), 208–235.

Voyer, J. (2007). Policy Analysis in the Federal Government: Building the Forward-looking Policy Research Capacity. In Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds.) *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art* (pp. 123–131). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Wellstead, A. & Stedman, R. (2010). Policy Capacity and Incapacity in Canada's Federal Government: The Intersection of Policy Analysis and Street Level Bureaucracy. *Public Management Review. 12*(6), 893–910.

Wellstead, A., Stedman, R., & Lindquist, E. (2009). The Nature of Regional Policy Work in Canada's Federal Public Service. *Canadian Political Science Review, 3*(1), 34–56.

Zafonte, M. & Sabatier, P. (2004). Short-Term versus Long-Term Coalitions in the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal, 32*(1), 75–107.

APPENDIX A

Table 1 Sectors respondents employed in

Sector						
	NGO			**Government**		
Policy Community/ Field	Number	Respondent %	Population %	Number	Respondent %	Population %
Environment	102	16.5	20.5	167	30.5	27.5
Health	241	38.9	34.3	216	39.4	39.5
Immigration	66	10.6	14.8	54	9.9	11.7
Labour	104	16.8	30.3	69	12.6	15.2
Other	107	17.3	0	42	7.7	6.0
Total	620	100.0		548	100.0	

Table 2 Background of Respondents

	Government		NGO	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gender (NS)				
Male	205	41.4	214	44.1
Female	290	58.6	274	55.9
Age***				
30 or younger	54	10.8	23	4.7
31–40	131	26.3	80	16.4
41–50	129	25.9	131	26.8
51–60	148	29.7	171	35.0
Over 60	37	7.4	83	17.0

	Government		NGO	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Education***				
High school graduate	11	2.2	24	4.9
College or Technical Institute diploma	39	7.7	72	14.6
University degree	148	29.2	146	29.6
Graduate or professional degree	308	60.9	252	51.0

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)

Table 3 Comparison of means of the factored issues

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Public issues***	458	2.77	.995	481	2.71	.684
Complex issues***	434	3.12	.753	470	2.14	.811

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05) (Where 1 = 0% of my time and 5 = >50% of my time)

Table 4 Summed governance attitudinal variables.

	Government			NGO		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Evidence***	429	3.61	.8454	424	3.13	.8369
Political***	433	3.99	.7831	441	3.72	.8538
Network**	428	3.04	.9292	430	3.22	.8608
Influence	420	3.08	.7321	426	3.06	.8136
Outside***	422	3.28	.7088	421	3.91	.6751

(*** P < .001, ** P < .01, * P < .05)