



Research on the Evaluation System of Government Policy Implementation Under Rural Tourism

The Example of Jiangdong Town, Chaozhou City

Xixi Chen¹, Zhongyan Li¹(✉), Huishan Liang¹, Fangyi Liao¹, Xiaohan Hong²,
and Yisong Deng¹

¹ College of Statistics and Mathematics, Guangdong University of Finance and Economics,
Guangzhou 510320, Guangdong, China
20141230@gdufe.edu.cn

² College of Finance and Taxation, Guangdong University of Finance and Economics,
Guangzhou 510320, Guangdong, China

Abstract. This paper constructs a policy implementation evaluation system from the dimensions of policy cognition, implementation environment and implementation result, selects Jiangdong town as the sample object, conducts empirical analysis on it with the help of fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method, and takes Shawan town of the same type as reference for comparative and comprehensive analysis, in order to effectively explore the government policy implementation power under rural tourism. Finally, based on the above research, it is concluded that there is a need to strengthen in the areas of personnel execution, execution supervision, and resource coordination, and combined with the advanced experience of policy implementation at home and abroad such as Shawan Town, targeted enhancement strategies are formulated in terms of strengthening the supervision mechanism of policy implementation power, improving the resource coordination mechanism and strengthening quality training. This is with a view to providing effective reference for local governments' policy implementation in rural tourism development in the future.

Keywords: rural tourism · government policy implementation · evaluation system

1 Introduction

First, the concept of “enforcement” was first applied to the field of Chinese jurisprudence and later permeated to the political, economic, cultural and social spheres. In domestic academic circles, Professor Ding Huang and others define “policy implementation” as a dynamic process in which policy implementers transform the content of policy concepts into actual effects by establishing organizational structures, using various policy resources, and taking various actions of advocacy, coordination and monitoring, so that

the established policy objectives can be achieved [1]. However, there has been no unified understanding of the concept of public policy implementation in domestic academic circles. In terms of definition, foreign academics have defined the concept of “policy implementation power” in terms of the ability to apply policies scientifically and the effect of policy implementation, and there are only vague definitions and no definite judgment on this.

Second, due to the different definitions of the connotation of policy implementation, a series of studies on policy implementation evaluation from the perspective of different influencing factors have appeared in the domestic academic community [2]. By sorting out the existing research results of policy implementation evaluation in China, in general, the research idea is mainly based on the elements and variables in the theoretical model of policy implementation, combined with the actual situation of the evaluated policy, and set feasible and reasonable indicators so as to make empirical evaluation of the strength, ability, and effectiveness of policy implementation. Among them, scholars generally classify the constituents of high and low levels of policy implementation into four categories, which are policy implementation subject, policy implementation object, implementation resources and implementation environment, while some scholars separate the policy itself from the target group in the implementation object thus classifying the elements into five categories [3]. However, foreign academic research on rural tourism policy can be broadly divided into two categories: on the one hand, it starts from the two major stakeholders, villagers and tourists, and focuses on mobilizing villagers’ participation, exploring the motivation of tourists’ perception and consumption behavior, and the contribution of both to the sustainable development of rural tourism [4–6]; on the other hand, it is based on policy implementation theories that have matured since the 1970s (e.g., Raine and Rabinowitz’s implementation cycle model, Sabatier and Mannion’s implementation synthesis model, etc.). Models (e.g., Raine and Rabinowitz’s implementation cycle model, Sabatier and Mazmanian’s implementation synthesis model, etc.), which practically explore how to reasonably adjust and structure the policy system by studying the scientific application capacity and implementation effects of policies, attaching importance to the process of policy implementation and the capacity of implementation subjects [7], and focusing on interregional government agencies for horizontal sectoral collaboration. In conclusion, the rich and detailed references not only provide a certain theoretical foundation for the research logic and line of thought of this paper, but also provide directional guidance for the construction of the governmental execution evaluation system and the selection of many core indicators in this study, which is of great reference significance for the design of this study.

Finally, from the above research process, the domestic academic community has been keen on research related to the implementation of government functions and development policies for rural tourism in recent years, and such topics have become important issues of general concern to the government, academia, and the public at present and even in the future. Foreign academics have expanded their research on policy implementation to include policy demand, policy formulation, and other aspects, even across a wide range of countries with different levels of development. The purpose of this study is to reflect the specific situation of government policy implementation comprehensively and objectively, to understand the policy implementation process, to clarify the policy effects,

to improve the quality of policy supply by establishing a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of rural tourism policy implementation thereby enhancing the policy's own vitality, to improve government policy implementation, to cater to current events, and to comply with a major requirement of promoting rural revitalization and building a service-oriented government [8].

2 Conclusion

2.1 The Construction of Government Policy Implementation Evaluation Index System

Determination of Government Policy Implementation Evaluation Indicators

Because the development of a governmental implementation evaluation system contains many indications, the key indicators must be extracted. As policy implementation is gradually used in administration-related research abroad, it is also gradually applied in China's field of policy implementation. For instance, scholars Zhan Nie [9] examined the mechanism of policy execution generation and energy sources, outlining the evaluation indicators as execution attitude, execution strength, execution speed, and execution effectiveness, while scholars Donglan Liao [7] addressed the shortcomings of the current system for evaluating policy implementation by summing up four indicators: policy consensus, implementation synergy, implementation credibility, and implementation culture. Moreover, Wenjuan Wang [10] distinguished six indicators—governing personnel, governing resources, governing organization, governing mechanism, implementation process, and implementation environment—after dividing the relevant variables into determining and influencing factors and thoroughly examining the power sources of each factor. Combining the above related studies and the theme of this paper, this paper constructs a government policy implementation evaluation system including five first-level indicators and twenty-one second-level indicators, such as implementation credibility, personnel implementation, implementation planning, implementation supervision, and resource coordination, as shown in Table 1.

Determination of Evaluation Index Weights

This paper selects the AHP method to determine the weights, calculates the indicator weights by expert ratings, invites experts in relevant fields to judge the importance of each indicator based on their own experience and professional level, and assigns values to the relative importance of each indicator based on the 9-level scale method combined with expert ratings to construct a judgment matrix. The calculation process of the method is as follows:

- 1 Calculate the judgment matrix of the first-level and second-level indicators, the product of the elements of each row $M = \prod a_{ij}, i = 1, 2 \dots$, and calculate its n th root $\bar{W} = \sqrt[n]{M_i}$;
- 2 Regularize the vector $\bar{W}_i = (\bar{W}_1, \bar{W}_2, \dots, \bar{W}_n)^T$, which is $W_i = \frac{\bar{W}_i}{\sum \bar{W}_i}$, and solve for the eigenvector $AW_i = (\bar{W}_1, \bar{W}_2, \dots, \bar{W}_n)^T$, followed by the maximum eigenroot $\lambda_{max} = \sum \frac{(AW)_i}{nW_i}$;

Table 1. Government Policy Implementation Evaluation System

Target layer	Level 1 Indicators	Level 2 Indicators
U Policy Implementation	u_1 Execution Credibility	u_{11} Involvement of implementation subjects in the policy
		u_{12} The implementation subject's agreement with the policy
		u_{13} The importance of the implementation subject to the policy
		u_{14} Target group importance of the policy
		u_{15} Target group's satisfaction with the policy
		u_{16} Target group identification with the policy
	u_2 People Execution	u_{21} Comprehension of policies by implementation subjects
		u_{22} Responsibility of the executive subject
		u_{23} Resolution rate of policy issues
		u_{24} Government Image and Reputation
	u_3 Execution Plan Power	u_{31} Science of the policy program
		u_{32} Integrity of the policy program
		u_{33} Flexibility of policy options
		u_{34} Equity in policy programs
	u_4 Executive Oversight	u_{41} Monitoring of policy implementation subjects
		u_{42} Monitoring of the policy implementation process
		u_{43} Evaluation of the effectiveness of policy implementation
	u_5 Resource Coordination Power	u_{51} Execution resource sufficiency
		u_{52} Resource utilization validity
		u_{53} Degree of organizational coordination
u_{54} Target group cooperation coordination		

3 Next, substitute the consistency formula $CI = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n - 1}$, and find the corresponding average random consistency indicator RI , to obtain the consistency ratio $CR = \frac{RI}{CI}$. If $CR < 0.1$, the judgment matrix of the first-level and second-level indicators can be considered to have passed the consistency test; conversely, if $CR > 0.1$, it is considered to have failed the consistency test;

4 Finally, we get the judgment matrix: $A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}$, and rank the first-

level indicators “executive credibility”, “personnel execution”, “executive planning”, “executive monitoring”, “resource coordination” according to their weights.

Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation.

The fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method is taken into consideration in this paper for comprehensive evaluation since the indicators are primarily qualitative indicators and the evaluation criteria are fuzzy.

1. Determine the set of factors of the policy implementation evaluation system as: $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\}$, where u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5 stands for “executive credibility”, “people execution”, “execution planning”, “execution monitoring”, and “resource coordination” respectively. The second level factor set is $U_1 = \{u_{11}, u_{12}, \dots, u_{15}\}$, $U_2 = \{u_{21}, u_{22}, u_{23}, u_{24}\}$, $U_3 = \{u_{31}, u_{32}, u_{33}, u_{34}\}$, $U_4 = \{u_{41}, u_{42}, u_{43}\}$, $U_5 = \{u_{51}, u_{52}, u_{53}, u_{54}\}$, Among them, $u_{11}, u_{12} \dots u_{54}$ represent 21 secondary evaluation indicators such as the degree of participation of executive subjects, respectively;
- 2 Based on the features of the questionnaire options, the interval scores for each grade in the set of rubrics are set as follows: excellent [80,100], good [60,80], fair [40,60], rather poor [20,40], poor [0,20];
- 3 Using a five-point rating scale, the options for the questionnaire questions were divided into five levels for the rating evaluation of the factor set: poor, rather poor, fair, good, and excellent. The ratings of the impact factors related to the target group were obtained by sending questionnaires to the participants, interviewing government employees, and participating tourism workers to collect ratings of the effect aspects related to the implementation group;
- 4 Calculate the first level of fuzzy comprehensive evaluation:

$$R_i = A_i \cdot R_{ij}$$

Among this, i is the number of factors in the set, j is the j the indicator of subfactor set i .

- 5 Calculate the second-level fuzzy comprehensive evaluation:

$$B = A \times R$$

According to the principle of maximum subordination, the government policy implementation can be rated, and the median of the corresponding rating value at each level can be used to calculate the overall score together with the comprehensive evaluation result.

2.2 Application of Local Government Policy Implementation Evaluation

In order to verify the feasibility of the evaluation system, Jiangdong town, which already has a good development foundation but has room for development in terms of policy implementation effectiveness, is selected as the sampling target, and Shawan town, which has a similar but experienced development model, is selected as the control target. Therefore, this paper focuses on the policy execution under rural tourism in Jiangdong Town, and combines the excellent experience of Shawan Town, so as to optimize the policy execution in Jiangdong Town and promote the development of rural tourism projects to increase the quality and efficiency.

Collection and Collation of Relevant Data.

Firstly, the evaluation subjects are determined, mainly including the general public, government staff, etc. Secondly, To ensure that the options are fully understood, face-to-face interviews with the interviewees are conducted whenever possible. Finally, the corresponding questionnaires and interview outlines of the two towns are designed for the evaluation index system, such as For example, how satisfied villagers are with the local tourism policy.

The data of 142 and 137 questionnaires were collected in Jiangdong Town and Shawan Town in July 2022, respectively, of which the questionnaire return rate was 86.7% and 83.2%, respectively. Then, SPSS25 was used to test the reliability and validity of the sample. The Cronbach- α coefficients were 0.921 and 0.897, respectively, indicating high reliability. The KMO coefficients were 0.837 and 0.892, respectively, and the significance of Bartlett's test of sphericity were less than 0.05, indicating good structural validity of the questionnaire.

Determination of Evaluation Index Weights and Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation.

Firstly, the weight of evaluation indicators is calculated, based on the theory related to policy implementation, experts' opinions on the importance of each indicator were solicited. Then the relative importance of each indicator is assigned according to the 9-level scale method combined with experts' scores to establish the judgment matrix. Finally the weights of each indicator are calculated by the AHP method, seeing Table 2:

Firstly, the survey data are analyzed and processed to take the weight of the questionnaire options corresponding to each indicator. Then the fuzzy matrices of the two towns are established separately. Finally, the first-level fuzzy comprehensive judgment matrix was calculated by combining the weights, as detailed in Table 3:

The second-level comprehensive judgment matrix of Jiangdong town is calculated separately by applying the formula:

$$B = A \cdot R = [0.1335 \ 0.5072 \ 0.2481 \ 0.0816 \ 0.0296]$$

According to the principle of maximum affiliation, the policy implementation of Jiangdong Town is assessed as general, and the median of the corresponding rating value corresponding to each grade is taken, and the comprehensive score is calculated with the comprehensive judgment result, then the comprehensive score is

$$S = 0.1219 \times 90 + 0.2396 \times 70 + 0.3927 \times 50 + 0.1636 \times 30 + 0.0669 \times 10 = 52.955$$

Table 2. The weight of each indicator

Criterion layer		Scheme layer	
First-level	weight	Second-level	weight
Executive credibility U1	0.2857	U11	0.0654
		U22	0.0763
		U33	0.4578
		U44	0.1144
		U55	0.2289
		U66	0.0572
Personnel execution U2	0.4286	U21	0.6486
		U22	0.0811
		U23	0.1622
		U24	0.1081
Executive credibility U3	0.0952	U31	0.0870
		U32	0.1304
		U33	0.2609
		U34	0.5217
Executive supervision U4	0.0476	U41	0.1818
		U42	0.2727
		U43	0.5455
Resource coordination U5	0.1429	U51	0.0870
		U52	0.5217
		U53	0.2609
		U54	0.1304

Table 3. First-order fuzzy comprehensive evaluation

	Shawan Town					Jiangdong Town				
	Excellent	Good	Generally	Relatively poor	Poor	Excellent	Good	Generally	Relatively poor	Poor
U ₁	0.1012	0.3771	0.284	0.1576	0.0801	0.118	0.4909	0.2244	0.1271	0.0397
U ₂	0.1181	0.1303	0.4662	0.1957	0.0758	0.1562	0.5543	0.2376	0.0389	0.013
U ₃	0.2139	0.4313	0.2287	0.1196	0.0483	0.1883	0.4226	0.2317	0.1117	0.0457
U ₄	0.1509	0.1900	0.4645	0.1391	0.0555	0.0973	0.4127	0.2791	0.1564	0.0545
U ₅	0.1035	0.1817	0.4748	0.117	0.0274	0.0722	0.4865	0.3274	0.0735	0.0404

The second-level comprehensive judgment matrix of Shawan Town is calculated as follows

$$B = A \cdot R = [0.1335 \ 0.5072 \ 0.2481 \ 0.0816]$$

According to the principle of maximum affiliation, the policy implementation of Shawan Town is rated as good and the overall score is

$$S = 0.1335 \times 90 + 0.5072 \times 70 + 0.2481 \times 50 + 0.2481 \times 30 + 0.0816 \times 10 = 62.668$$

Comprehensive Analysis.

From the results, there is a large difference in the overall scores of the two towns, which indicates that Shawan Town's policy implementation is better than Jiangdong Town's. This section then analyzes the data for each of the indicators that are lower in Jiangdong Town than in Shawan Town.

The first is the personnel execution, Jiangdong Town's evaluation grade is average, while Shawan Town's evaluation grade is good, where the biggest influencing factor is the execution subject's understanding of the policy, from which it can be seen that Shawan Town's government understands the policy better than Jiangdong Town, which is shown in the policy interpretation and communication, professional skills level. Shawan Town focuses on internal activities, such as 'policy interpretation training seminars', inviting experts with relevant qualifications to explain the tourism industry under the market management, safety supervision, etc. In addition, professional skills training classes are held regularly to improve the level of professional skills of the executive. Although Jiangdong Town also carries out internal policy interpretation and exchange activities, but more internal staff discussions, lack of participation of relevant professionals.

The executive supervision power, Jiangdong Town's evaluation grade is average, while Shawan Town's evaluation grade is good. The key factor that leads to the difference in affiliation is the evaluation of the executive effect, from which it can be seen that Shawan Town's evaluation of the executive effect is better than Jiangdong Town's. Shawan Town's tourism assessment work in real time and transparent, and are open on the political dynamics, its related to the tourism market, inspection of cultural and creative work, etc., while compared with Shawan Town, the network can hardly search for content related to the assessment work of Jiangdong Town.

The third is the resource coordination power, Jiangdong Town's evaluation grade is fair, while Shawan Town's evaluation grade is good, where the biggest influencing factor is the resource utilization effectiveness, which indicates that Shawan Town's resource utilization effectiveness is better than Jiangdong Town's. Based on the 14th Five-Year Plan, Shawan Town attaches great importance to the protection and inheritance of cultural and tourism resources, and they actively carry out cultural inheritance and non-foreign heritage project protection and other exchange activities. Although Jiangdong Town has been actively using its resources to carry out rural tourism in recent years, some tourism resources have not been developed and are still suffering from damage.

Through the above analysis, it can be seen that the evaluation system constructed in this paper can essentially dig out the strengths and weaknesses of local governments in the process of policy implementation, and can comprehensively reflect the validity of policy implementation.

2.3 Policy Suggestions for Policy Implementation Enhancement

Based on the previous paper, it can be seen that there is still room for the development of policy implementation in Jiangdong Township. Therefore, combining the advanced experience of Shawan Township and excellent governance experiences at home and abroad, the following countermeasures are proposed to the future Jiangdong Township government to enhance the policy implementation under rural tourism.

Supervision Mechanism to Strengthen Government Execution.

On the one hand, it is to strengthen administrative internal supervision. Jiangdong Township Government may conduct regular special studies on supervision and evaluation, and establish a discipline inspection and supervision office to evaluate and supervise policy implementation.

On the other hand, it is to strengthen the administrative external supervision efforts. Jiangdong Township stimulates public participation by adding on the interactive communication interface on the home page of the government's official website, simplifying the supervision procedures and the reduced acceptance time. In addition, it can also take the initiative to publicize the work progress on the official government website or on the public affairs board, so as to stimulate the public's enthusiasm for participation.

Sound Resource Coordination Mechanism.

In response to the lack of talents, the policy of introducing tourism talents should be improved to attract talents by raising salaries and giving preferential treatment for buying houses, and giving financial support in terms of technology and land. At the same time, monthly training on tourism work should be carried out for the introduced talents, so that they can gain relevant experience and policy knowledge through intensive training and other means.

In terms of tourism resources, we need to pay attention to the protection and inheritance of tourism resources, actively carry out exchange activities such as the protection of non-foreign heritage projects, and combine with self-promotion media so that more people can participate in the protection actions.

Strengthen the Quality of Executive Development.

In order to cultivate the spirit of dedication of policy implementers in Jiangdong Township, the Jiangdong Township Government can organize monthly viewing of film and television works such as craftsmanship to cultivate the spirit of dedication and let party members and cadres take the lead in promoting the belief of "serving the people wholeheartedly".

Finally, in order to improve the professional skills of policy implementers in Jiangdong Township, "skill-based cadre training courses" should be conducted in accordance with the knowledge required for rural tourism development by means of scenarios and simulations, focusing on such categories as cultural creation and tourism services.

References

1. Ding Huang, Li Xinge. The executive dilemma in grassroots government management and its governance[J]. Dongyue Theory

2. Chen, Nianfa, Jin, Fuzi. Assessment of rural science and technology innovation policy implementation - an example from Hebei Province[J]. *Practical Rural Technology*,2021(12):46–48.
3. Ma Jing. Study on the Evolution of Rural Tourism Policy and the Evaluation of Implementation Effectiveness [D]. Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, 2021.
4. Firdaus, Sudarsono Hardjosoekarto, Robert M.Z.Lawang. The Role of Local Government on Rural Tourism Development: Case Study of Desa Wisata Pujonkidul, Indonesia[J]. *IJSDP*,2021,16(7).
5. BARBU IONEL. 013,6(6).
6. López Sanz José María, Penelas Leguía Azucena, Gutiérrez Rodríguez Pablo, Cuesta Valiño Pedro. Rural Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals. A Study of the Variables That Most Influence the Behavior of the Tourist [J]. *Frontiers in Psychology*,2021,12.
7. Nilsson P Å. Staying on farms: An Ideological Background[J]. *Annals of Tourism Research*,2002,29(1):7–24.
8. Liao Donglan. Research on the evaluation system of local government policy implementation [D]. Guangzhou University, 2012.
9. Nie Zhan. Research on the Construction of Evaluation Index System of Local Government Public Policy Execution[D]. Xiangtan University, 2009.
10. Wang Wenjuan. Research on the evaluation system of public policy execution of grassroots government[D]. Shenyang University of Technology, 2011.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

