Chapter 5

Public Policy Analysis

MPA Comprehensive Exam
Study Guide

5.1 History of Public Policy

While the study of politics has a long history, the systematic study of public policy, on the other hand, can be said to be a twentieth century creation. It dates, according to Daniel McCool, to 1922, when political scientist Charles Merriam sought to connect the theory and practices of politics to understanding the actual activities of government - that is public policy." (p.4) (see McCool, Daniel C. Public Policy Theories, Models, and Concepts: An Anthology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1995.)

The "policy orientation" after 40 years: Review major developments and their implications for researchers and practitioners.

Harold J. Lasswell (1951) used the action-characterizing term "policy orientation" to distinguish it from the "policy sciences" in the first chapter of the book he edited with Daniel Lerner, Policy Sciences: Recent Developments of Scope and Methods (1951).

- **"the Praxis of Policy"** - interdependence of scholarly disciplines dependent on the knowledge of policy process and knowledge responding to the particular intelligences needs surrounding particular policy choices.
- Emphasis on foresight and 'development constructs'
- The policy orientation, according to Lasswell, is a problem-orientation. Problems are complex and often involve complex answers drawing from many disciplines. He clarified the parameters that later became decisive in analyzing the content of what politics is: analysis must focus on problems; it must be multi-subject and clearly normative.

Graham(1988): Lasswell was concerned for macro-level analysis and realized that someone must apply the intelligence in a choice.

The policy sciences were initially conceived by Harold Lasswell (1951) and others as a means to improve the quality of information to governments, as a means of improving the governmental decision process (see deLeon, 1988). They were designed to be problem oriented, multidisciplinary, and explicitly normative (i.e., explicitly considering values) in their approach. Yet early on, the policy sciences were "captured" by many of the heavily quantitative disciplines, which sought to bring the putatively

"proven powers" of the natural sciences to the social sciences. So it was not unusual to find systems analysis, operations research, and quantitative modeling providing the early impetus to policy research, its proponents encouraged by their widely acclaimed successes from the Second World War. They were succeeded by welfare economists with their particular "answer" to policy questions, typically framed in terms of cost-benefit analysis.

As Etzioni (1988) and others have pointed out, however, their influence on public-policy makers has largely been ancillary, because, in their orientation towards strictly "objective" analysis (e.g., Stokey and Zeckhauser, 1978), they tended to overlook (because they could not openly include) the normative bases of politics.

Worse yet, there is a widespread implication that the policy sciences, while widely accepted, have become instruments protecting the status quo, that their "research, insofar as it exercises independent influences on opinions about complex social questions, tends over time to be profoundly conservative in its impact" (Aaron, 1987, p. 2). As traditionally practiced, the policy sciences have been unable to effect a shift in the structure or process of governance, because they were widely perceived to have been co-opted by government offices, programs, and priorities.

More Programs: On the more positive side, there has been tremendous growth in the policy analytic community, in terms of both supply and demand. On the supply side, hardly a major university does not now have a program to train incipient policy analysts, with a large number of schools also offering a doctoral degree. On the demand side, there is hardly a federal agency that does not have an analytic (or evaluative) section as part of its organization; increasingly, similar offices are appearing on the state and local levels.

Participatory Policy Analysis: In recent years, there has been a growing awareness of this tension within some parts of the policy analysis community. In response, drawing in part on the writings of the Frankfurt School (see, most notably, Habermas, 1975 and 1996), policy scientists have move to a "postmodernized" policy analysis (Danziger, 1995) and, more operationally, to a "participatory policy analysis" (Durning, 1993). The impetus of the movement (which, to be fair, hardly represents a consensus;

Lynn, 1999) is the observation that citizens perceived their opinions were no longer important when new programs were devised or revised, and that they were largely being excluded from the governing process. As a result, not only were they distancing themselves from government (that is, they viewed policy as being imposed upon them, all the while, apparently, for them) but also it was clear that the programs being produced without their voice were nowhere near as successful as could otherwise be the case (deLeon, 1992).

The participatory policy analysis case is relatively straightforward: Citizens deserve a greater say in their governance, based upon the knowledge that they are best able to articulate their special "needs." Given this voice as a basis for action, government can be more informed and responsive (or, in many cases, more limited), thus promoting a more involved, engaged, and, in many perceptions, (see Barber, 1984, and Mansfield, 2001), a better citizenry. The result would be an enhanced (maybe even a good) society.

5.2 Public Policy Defined - Various definitions

According to Thomas A. Birkland in An Introduction to the Policy Process (2001), there is a lack of a consensus on the definition of public policy. Birkland outlines a few definitions of public policy (Table 1.3 on p. 21):

Clarke E. Cochran, et al.: "The term public policy always refers to the actions of government and the intentions that determine those actions".

Clarke E. Cochran, et al.: "Public policy is the outcome of the struggle in government over who gets what".

Thomas Dye: Public policy is "Whatever governments choose to do or not do".

Charles L. Cochran and Eloise F. Malone: "Public policy consists of political decisions for implementing programs to achieve societal goals".

B. Guy Peters: "Stated most simply, public policy is the sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as it has an influence on the life of citizens".

Birkland indicates that the elements common to all definitions of public policy are as follows:

- The policy is made in the name of the "public".
- Policy is generally made or initiated by government.
- Policy is interpreted and implemented by public and private actors.
- Policy is what the government intends to do.
- Policy is what the government chooses not to do.

According to Encarta, in its definition of political science, "The field of public policy involves the study of specific policy problems and governmental responses to them. Political scientists involved in the study of public policy attempt to devise solutions for problems of public concern."

5.3   Public Policy Analysis outline

Lowi: The End of Liberalism

- Argues why pluralistic interest group liberalism does not fulfill the goals of the constitution
- Interest-group liberalism (IGL) is a new public and pluralistic philosophy, which began in the depression and solidified in the 1960s. It expects that competing interest groups represent the people's will to government decision makers through competitive group interaction.
- Lowi finds fault in IGL in that like automatic regulation in economics (laissez-faire) is imperfect, so is automatic regulation imperfect in group dynamics (pluralistic). He also finds that IGL idealizes the conception of groups.

The results of IGL are

- The regulated hold power over the regulators (Capture theory).
- It removes legitimacy from the representative government.
- This loss of legitimacy removes the ability to plan because it takes authority to plan.
- Example: U.S. works best in crisis when representative leader is given authority.
- Bargaining replaces planning and is reactionary.
- Lowi's solution is a juridical democracy and involves clear and formal law making from elected representatives.

Three policy streams: economic, domestic, and foreign policy

Policy arenas

- John Kindon: Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies
- Kindon's theory for public policy is called primeval soup
- His primeval soup has three policy streams

Mix of ideas

- Many ideas

- Some survive, die, or combine
- Combination of ideas is called coupling
- Combination of streams is also coupling
- Problems with solutions have better chance for survival

James E. Anderson: Public Policy Making: An Introduction

- Scientific policy approach
- Rational
- Ordered approach
- Ideal type
- Definitions of policy
- Public policy cycle
- Problem identification and agenda setting
- Policy environment
- Officials
- Unofficial
- Political culture
- Levels of politics
- Iron triangle
- Congressional committees
- Administrative agencies (bureaus)
- Interest groups

Charles E. Lindblom & Edward J. Woodhouse: The Policy Making Process

- Improved analysis will improve policy
- Improved intelligence will improve policy
- Movement toward public equity of voice in policy
- Definition of public policy

Deborah Stone: Policy Paradox and Political Reason

- Policy making rationality – Three pillars
- Market verse Polis

- Market vs polis value tradeoffs

Model	Definition/Characteristics	Traditional PA Theorists	Class Theorists
Institutionalism From: organization theory PA policy view: moderate to weak.	Policy as institutional output Relationship between structure and policy outputs Characteristics from government Legitimacy Universality Coersion Questions What impact does division of responsibility have on policy What impact do levels of government have on policy		Lowi (Moderate)– Lowi's greatest concern is the structure of government. Rule of law to avoid capture theory. Kingdon (Weak) Anderson (Weak) Lindblom (Weak) Dye (Weak)
Process From: Political Science or Public Administration PA policy view: moderate	Policy as political activity Patterns of activity – How decisions are made (not content) Implementation is one activity in the policy process ?? six tenants		Anderson (Main – Well defined) Kingdon (Weak) Lindblom (Weak) Dye (Weak)
Rationalism From: (From closed system business model) PA policy view: moderate	Policy as maximum social gain Strict cost/benefit analysis based on rationality Comprehensive Exhaustive knowledge of options Exhaustive knowledge of consequences An ideal – not attainable Limitations of rationality Not attainable Ineffective – constraints of time, information, and cost (Janice said inefficient. I think it is more a result of not meeting human nature	Taylor	Anderson (Moderate) Stone (Moderate) But, her definition is different than traditional modern rationalism. Lowi (Weak) Kingdon (Weak) Lindblom (Weak) Dye (Weak)

	accurately.)		
Incrementalism From: Political Science – Political model PA policy view: Strong	Policy as variations on the past Conservative approach to policy change Why incrementalism is prevalent. Rationalism is inefficient Legitamacy of previous policies accepted due to uncertainty of consequences of radically different policies. Sunk costs in current policies. Politically expedient – no boat rocking Not thinking outside the box	Charles Lindblom "The Science of Muddling Through" Public Administration Review 19:79-88.	Lindblom (Main – Well defined) Lowi (Weak) Kingdon (Main – Well defined: Incremental, Mixed, & Garbage) Anderson (Moderate) Stone (Weak) Dye (Moderate)
Group Theory From: Political Science / Sociology (political model) PA policy view: Moderate (Pluralism)	Policy as group equilibrium Policy is outcome of group struggle Characteristics Bargaining Negotiation Compromising Competing interests		Stone (Main – Not well defined) Stone's theory is the polis model. She is against the market model. Kingdon (Moderate) Anderson (Moderate) Agenda setting. Lindblom (Moderate) Dye (Moderate) Lowi (Weak)
Elite Theory From: Political Science (political model) PA policy view: Moderate	Policy as elite preference Policy reflects the interests and value of elites (not general public) Change in policy results from change in elite values		Lowi (Main, Not well defined)– Lowi is concerned with the loss of authority from U.S. representative political elites but is more concerned with structure

			(institutionalism). Lowi talks of the market and polis as the 1st two republics. He suggests a return to the constitution. Stone (Moderate) From an anti-position Dye (Moderate)
Public Choice From: Economic PA policy view: Weak	Policy as collective decision making by self-interested individuals Govt. must provide public goods Externalities – imposition of some on many (air pollution) Market approach of selfish actors.	Ostrom, Buchanan	Stone (Weak) Dye (Weak)
Game Theory From: Political Science PA policy view: Weak	Policy as rational choice in competitive situations Choices portrayed in a matrix Payoff – the values each player places on each outcome Each player must try to calculate the values of the other (You must know the mindset – the culture – of the opponent) Strategy is key – "minimax" – to protect against the opponents best play		Kingdon (Weak) Stone (Moderate) From an anti position. Dye (Weak)
Systems Model From: Organization theory PA policy view: Weak	Policy as system output The concept of system implies Identifiable set of institutions and activities in society that function to transform demands into		Dye (Weak)

	authoritative decisions requiring the support of the whole society. Elements of the system are interrelated Model Input Black box (organization) Output Feedback Within the environment		
Mixed Scanning From: Political Science (political model - Political with attempt to explain itself to a rational public) PA policy view: Moderate	Policy as a combination of incrementalism and rationalism. This is not one of Dye's models Why is this different from incrementalism? Incrementalism requires limited rationality. So, mixed scanning highlights the limited rationality inherent. I believe I am starting from a too "rational" mindset and can't see this one. Incrementalism combined with other theories that are political would be just incrementalism, but if it had some rationality call it mixed scanning. I am getting punchy. Help me out here.	Etzioni (? Spelling) You must stress rational to me mixed as a main category. Lindblom comes close but does not make a strong case for rationality. His rationality is just an adoption of some rational practices into incrementalism.	Kingdon (Main – Well defined: Incremental, Mixed, & Garbage) Anderson (Moderate) Lowi (Weak) Stone (Moderate) Lindblom (Moderate) Lindblom comes close to stressing rationality but does not make a strong case for rationality. His rationality is just an adoption of some rational practices into incrementalism.
Garbage Can / Primordial Soup From: Organization theory PA policy view: Moderate (Political with attempt to	Policy as an incoherent mess: unclear goals, imperfect technology, history not understood, and participants wondering in and out. This is not one of Dye's models Garbage Can – Cohen and March Everything goes into a	Cohen and March	Kingdon (Main – Well defined: Incremental, Mixed, & Garbage) Kingdon has three policy streams that open up a policy window: problem, politics, and policy. Kingdon's solution

explain itself to a rational public)	garbage can and those things with political strength come out and are placed into policy. Primordial Soup – Kingdon Three streams guide what is born into policy These two theories differ because the Garbage Can theory does not have an optimistic perspective, while the Primordial Soup theory does. The Primordial Soup although a like goulash does have elements that make it more structured. Are these theories incoherent process theories? We did not put Kingdon down as a process theorist.		has two elements. One, it is patterned: technically feasible, researched, implementable, administratable). Two, it meets with societal values. Lindblom (Moderate) The negative tone toward decision making matches garbage can.

5.4 Definition of budget In "Public Policymaking"

In "Public Policymaking", by James E. Anderson, the definition of budget provided is: "A statement of estimated revenues and proposed expenditures; it is also a policy statement and a political document". With regard to question 1: "Explain how the budget can be described as an expression of preferences or conflicting values, what do we mean by the 'budget'?", the important points are that the budget is a "policy statement" and a "political document". In speaking about the federal budget, citizens, special interest groups, legislators, agencies and the executive branch all have preferences in terms of policies that they wish to be funded and included in the budget. Through a complex process of negotiations, pass-backs, and compromising, a set of policies that will be funded (the budget) is created. It is absolutely true that the budget document (at any level of government) is the most important document in public administration. The actors involved in budgetary activities within an agency or organization are usually perceived as highly-important and their offices considered repositories of great power in the organization. One of the biggest problems regarding the budget is that there is never enough money for every individual actor to get what they want. This is where it becomes evident that the budget is a "political document". The actors and committees involved in authorizing and appropriating funds hold immense political power because their influence can make or break a program, as well as significantly affect the operations of agencies throughout government. Congress held the lion's share of this power until 1921, when the federal budget process switched to "Presidential budgeting". Presidential control over the budget process dominated until the Nixon years, when the general feeling took hold that the budget was out of control. Even after the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, when the legislative committees were separated from the appropriations committees, political gaming of the system still dominated the budget process and remains so up to this day. I believe it is true that "there is no one document that contains "the budget". This is because, as we discussed in class, no matter how carefully the parties lay out the expected revenues and expenditures, there will always be surprises, emergencies, disasters and political maneuvers that change the budgetary figures and the programs funded in it. Therefore, there literally can be no "finished" document, because it is constantly changing and adapting to the political and real-world environment.

5.5 Public Policy in Detail

POLICY INSTRUMENTS: Forms of government intervention (as opposed to market-style actions).

REGULATORY INSTRUMENTS – Regulations

ECONOMIC INSTRUMENTS – Subsidies, grants

INFORMATION INSTRUMENTS – Used to persuade citizenry in a certain direction.

POLICY EVALUATION/PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

CRITERIA FOR GOOD GOVERNANCE (Bemelmans-Videc 1998):

- Criterion of DEMOCRACY – concerned with the degree to which public action is in line with accepted values and norms.
- Criterion of LEGALITY
    - o   EFFICIENCY
    - o   EFFECTIVENESS

PROBLEMS WITH POLICY ANALYSIS (RAAD I):

- Much of policy analysis focuses on **MEASURABLE CRITERIA**.
- Most policy analysis focuses on evaluating the realization of ***operational short-term goals***.
- Policy analysts claim to generate usable knowledge, but this is false since most policies and policy successes are short-term and one-sided (No long-term perspective = no generalizable usable knowledge).
- Policy evaluation excludes one important arena – POLITICS.

5.6   Public Policy Implementation

TOP-DOWN AUTHORS

PRESSMAN & WILDAVSKY – Followed a RATIONAL MODEL APPROACH. Studied implementation of a federal econ development proj in Oakland. Pessimistic in tone.

- Discovered that implementation goes thru numerous agencies – implementation becomes more difficult the more places it has to go thru. "Everyone is in charge, no one is in charge".
- Policy objectives are set by central policymakers.
- Implementation implied adequate bureaucratic procedures to execute policies accurately.

VAN METER & VAN HORN – Investigated relationship between outcomes and initial policy decisions.

- Big changes are difficult.
- Significant policy change is only possible if goal consensus is high.

SABATIER & MAZMANIAN – Top-Down.   Assumed a clear separation of policy formation from implementation.

- Established criteria for effective implementation.
- Objectives are clear and consistent
- Implementation process is structured adequately
- Officials are committed to program goals
- Interest groups are supportive.

BOTTOM-UP AUTHORS:

LIPSKY – STREET LEVEL BUREAUCRATS

- LIPSKY justified the fact that those who have direct contact with service delivery are important.

- Control should be with central command, but should INCLUDE input from street level bureaucrats.

ELMORE – Questioned how to study implementation. "Don't assume that policy makers control implementation."

- Don't bind the street-level bureaucrat. – Suggested BACKWARD MAPPING of policy thru system.
- The further away from street-level policy is made, the less chance for a successful outcome.
- Later became top-down and suggested FORWARD MAPPING along with Backward Mapping.

HJERN & HULL – First to introduce IMPLEMENTATION NETWORKS – Where policy execution takes place.

Analysis starts with identifying implementation networks and the way they solve problems.

WILDAVSKY – Previously Top-Down author.

Implementation starts with central policy makers but these inputs will be changed in their execution.

KINGDON'S MODEL OF POLICY MAKING:

John KINGDON (1984, 1995) –

- Multiple Decision Streams - Streams of problems, policies and politics coalesce at critical junctures, opening windows for solutions.
- Policies get made into law by capitalizing on "WINDOWS" of opportunity when the three streams (problems, policies and politics) come together. TIMING IS EVERYTHING.
- Policy agendas are affected by active participants, processes and alternatives becoming visible.
- Much of policy analysis has focused on the theoretical problem of agenda building and policy development.

- What moves social problems onto the political agenda?
  - Problem urgency
  - Policy expertise
  - Political situation:
    - If all three areas merge, there is a POLICY WINDOW where action can happen.
    - RAAD says Kingdon's model is limited because policy changes can only be evaluated after they happen and thus, this model is not useful for predicting what policies will go through.
    - Kingdon recognizes that once a social problem is being addressed there are a variety of factors that may prevent a solution: Procedures, interpretation, budget constraints, etc.

LINDBLOM (1959) – *The Science of "Muddling Through".*

- INCREMENTALISM

Aaron WILDAVSKY – The Politics of the Budgetary Process (HE APPLIES LINDBLOM'S IDEAS TO BUDGETING)

- The "best known expression of INCREMENTALISM IN BUDGETING – WILDAVSKY.
- Wildavsky says that KEY'S question is unanswerable without a comprehensive and specific NORMATIVE theory of politics – which he thinks is impossible.
- The budgetary process is human behavior in a government setting.
- The political environment of budgeting limits choices.
- Being a good politician is the best strategy
- Traditional budgeting (INCREMENTAL) is superior to rational budgeting.

WILDAVSKY & CAIDEN – Entitlement Budgeting

- Wildavsky & Caiden note that less than 20% of the federal budget is really up for debate, as well over half is entitlement spending.

PRESSMAN and WILDAVSKY (1973) Implementation.

- Classic study of federal programs in Oakland made implementation a new focus for PA.
- Earlier policy planning and analysis did not consider difficulties of implementation.
- Discovered that implementation goes thru numerous agencies – implementation becomes more difficult the more places it has to go thru. "Everyone is in charge, no one is in charge".
- Policy objectives are set by central policymakers.
- Implementation implied adequate bureaucratic procedures to execute policies accurately.

DROR – Policy Gambling: Every policy is a RISK and may not work, but it is important to TRY and Experiment.

SELZNICK – (1949) – *The Cooperative Mechanism.*

- Gave us the concept of COOPTATION in policy making and human relations in the study of the workplace.
- Studied cooptation processes at TVA – trying to gain community support – included them in everything.

SCHICK – Criticism of Incrementalism.

BACHRACH & BARATZ – FOUR BARRIERS that have to be overcome for any policy to be successful:

- Belief system of the population
- Procedures
- Implementation
- Administrative interpretation

LOWI – POLICIES DETERMINE POLITICS:

- Lowi's Four Types of Policies:
    - Distributive (e.g. health research, national parks)
    - Regulatory (e.g. criminal, business)

- o Redistributive (e.g. welfare, housing, health care)
- o Constituent (e.g. benefit govt or country as a whole – army, secret service)

MAZMANIAN & SABATIER (1983) –

- Focused on the Policy Implementation process. Considered the variables that affect the achievement of legal objectives, such concerns as the tractability of the problem, the ability to structure implementation, and other variables affecting support for a particular program.

Thomas DYE - "Public Policy is what governments choose to do or not to do."

- Decision making models help us clarify thinking. Models help us provide explanations for policy and predict consequences.

Thomas DYE & ZEIGLER – ELITE THEORY

- Public policy reflects the values of a governing elite.
- The masses do not determine public policy through their demands
- The masses are largely passive and ill-informed.

David EASTON – Code of Relevance

- Politicization of the Professions is inescapable and desirable because it drives the study of real current political problems.
- Research is NOT value-neutral. You look for the data to backup your position.
- Responsibility to protect human values.

Michael LIPSKY – (1980) Street-Level Bureaucracy.

- Lipsky first brought the term "street-level bureaucracy" to the attention of the field by pointing out that public policy is determined not merely by legislators and managers at high levels of government but by the police officer, the nurse, and the welfare worker (among others), who engage in the direct delivery of services.

- Lipsky writes that "the decisions of the street-level bureaucrats, the routines they establish, and the devices they invent to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out."
- Finding that systemic constraints on the professional practices of street-level bureaucrats result in confusion and conflicting demands, Lipsky offers several important suggestions for reform, suggestions addressed to the concerns of street-level bureaucrats but not without relevance to those at all levels of public agencies.

Paul LIGHT – (2000) in RAAD I p. 273-275– Light conducted research on the fifty greatest achievements of federal government in the second half of the twentieth century, based on a survey of professors of history and govt. Lessons learned:

- Most federal policies were the outcome of policy making over a long period of time (Lindblom – this supports the idea that most policy making is incremental by nature). Exceptions are breakthrough policies such as Medicare and Welfare reform.

- More than 80% of these achievements were the result of bipartisan commitment.

- Most of these achievements involved a mix of policy strategies (federal spending, regulatory policies, distributive).

Light argues that we are not likely to see such bold policies as those found in the analysis above. This is because the nation's leaders are so worried about losing their jobs that they will not take risks. Americans are so impatient for success that no program, however well designed and justified, can outlast the early difficulties that face so many innovative efforts. The media are so addicted to stories of government failure that no endeavor, however noble and well designed, can survive long enough to achieve results. Many of the most important problems addressed in the top ten policies above are still in need of a solution (health care, nuclear war, improving air and water quality, reducing hunger, etc.). To the extent that the nation's leaders avoid the risky issues in favor of safe rewards, the public demands instant gratification instead of long-term diligence, and the media punishes the trial and error so essential

to ultimate impact, the list of government's greatest achievements of the next half century will be short, indeed (Light, 2000).

Paul LIGHT – (1997) *The Tides of Reform.*

- The book is based on the notion that **there is not too little management reform in govt, but TOO MUCH**. Congress and the Presidency have moved effortlessly from one reform philosophy to another and back again, rarely questioning the contradictions and consequences of each separate act. Light used the Congressional Quarterly Almanac to identify and analyze 141 federal management statutes signed into law from 1945 to 1994.
- **Four separate philosophies or Tides of Reform**:
    - **Scientific Management** – **efficiency, principles of administration, experts, executive control** (Brownlow Committee & First Hoover Commission).
    - **War on Waste** – **economy, audits, investigations,** generally accepted practices (e.g. welfare fraud hearings).
    - **Watchful Eye** – **Goal: fairness, rights, information**, whistle-blowers, congress and the courts (e.g. Vietnam & Watergate).
    - **Liberation Management** – **Goal: Higher performance.** Standards, evaluation, outcomes, employees, teams (e.g. Gore's National Performance Review)

PETERS (1993) – PICKET-FENCE FEDERALISM.

KUYPER'S THREE-LEVEL POLICY ANALYSIS:

Ultimate Goals

Intermediate Goals

Instruments in the strict sense

- In his view, policy making and planning can be mapped as a GOAL TREE in which both travel up and down between pure instruments and the ultimate goals.

5.7 The Science of "Muddling Through"

1. There are two approaches public administrators use in the decision making process to compare and ultimately choose among policy alternatives.

    a. Rational-comprehensive model (Root Method)
        - More mechanical process of choosing means that best satisfy goals
        - Goals are ranked and clarified previous to choosing the means
        - The process is comprehensive, time-consuming, and exhaustive of resources
        - Assumes intellectual capacities that are impossible
        - Public administrators are told not to use this method, however the literature formalizes the Root method

    b. Successive limited comparisons (Branch Method)
        - One expects to only partially achieve their goals
        - Expect to repeat the process continually as conditions and accuracy of prediction improve
        - Administrators use the Branch Method, although they have no formal clarification -thus the purpose of this article

2. Clarification by contrast of the Successive Limited Comparisons Model (Branch Model)

    a. Selection of value goals and empirical analysis of the needed action are not distinct from one another but are closely intertwined
        - Clarifying values in advance is ideal, but when dealing with a complex social problem it is impossible
        - Even if an administrator can follow his/her own values as a criterion for decisions, they cannot rank them because some will conflict with each other
        - Social objectives do not always have the same relative values
        - The branch method has the administrator focus attention to the marginal or incremental values only

    b. Since means and ends are not distinct, means-end analysis is often inappropriate or limited

- Therefore, means-ends relationships are absent from the branch method
- In the branch method means and ends are simultaneously chosen

c. The test of a "good" policy is typically that various analysts find themselves directly agreeing on a policy (without their agreeing that it is the most appropriate means to an agreed objective)
- Agreement on policy thus becomes the only practicable test of the policy's correctness
- Agreement is the test of the "best" policy in both methods - the root method requires agreement on what elements in the decision constitute objectives and on which of these objectives should be sought.
- The branch method only relies on agreement, wherever it can be found

d. Analysis is drastically limited: Important possible outcomes are neglected; Important alternative potential policies are neglected; and important affected values are neglected
- The branch method uses simplification through limitation of policy comparisons to those policies that differ in relatively small degrees from policies presently in effect.
- Also, it is necessary only to study those respects in which the proposed alternative and its consequences differ from the status quo (branch method)
- Branch method ignores values attached to neglected consequences as well
- Achieving a degree of comprehensiveness comes with the use of watchdogs who protect the interests of their jurisdictions by redressing damage done by others, and by anticipating and heading off injury before it occurs

e. A succession of comparisons greatly reduces or eliminates reliance on theory

- In the branch method the comparisons, together with the policy choice, proceed in a chronological series
- Policy-making is a process of successive approximation to some desired objectives in which what is desired itself continues to change under reconsideration

3. Closing remarks regarding the branch method
   a. Description of the branch method explains why many administrators often feel more confident when "flying by the seat of their pants" than when following the advice of theorists
   b. Successive Limited Comparison (branch method) is indeed a method
   c. Branch method contains some imperfections
      - Method has no built in safe-guards for all   relevant values
      - May lead the decision-maker to overlook excellent policies for no other reason than that they are not suggested by the chain of successive policy steps leading up to the present
   d. With this in mind, policies will continue to be as foolish as they are wise (using this as well as a number of other methods)

5.8 "System Politics and Systems Budgeting"

1. Process and System

   a. Process Politics is the activity by which bargains are struck and allocations negotiated or rules of the game for the decision of budgetary matters

   b. System Politics, unlike Process Politics, is concerned with the outcome or results, not the activity of deciding

   c. Systems Budgeting manifests itself in the form of so-called PPBS budgeting systems which are concerned with results and outcomes more than anything else.

2. The Dominance of Process

   a. Process Politics dominated the academic literature during the early 50's and the mid 1960's

   b. This centered around the strong focus on pluralistic decision making

      ▪ It held that conflict was reduced by each competing party getting its share of the budget pie

      ▪ The process, while imperfect, was viewed to maximize a Pareto Model by assuming that if parts of society were not represented they would join a interest group that would represent their needs

      ▪ It posited that it was a winning sum game where everyone got something

   c. Concern was not focused on the best allocation of resources-theorists believed that if a decision was reached the process itself would have already made the right decision

   d. Schick argues that this was easy to do because resources were plentiful-eventually though this would not be so as resources became scarce

3. The Systems Challenge

   a. The move from process to systems requires two things

      - A dissatisfaction with the outcomes resulting from the budgetary process

      - a belief that better outcomes can be achieved through a systems approach

   b. New Deal and Great Society programs with their emphasis on new programs fostered an environment where a systems model could develop in light of the deficiencies of the process model in goal formation

   c. Conservatives and Liberals like PPB for opposite reasons-Conservatives lack faith in public expenditures, while Liberals want to show that government can work

4. Political Process Deficiencies

   a. Pluralistic processes are based on competition among interest groups. Therefore if the market is not purely competitive then the system is flawed. The other sections illustrate concepts where the market is flawed

   b. Public Goods must be based on the public will. The political process model assumes the opposite- private will is the determining factor through the power of interest groups. Therefore competition based on the collective will is not occurring

   c. Externalities create benefits that often go to the strongest power group. For example, Air polluters may get a tax credit, paid poorer people, who are hurt by the pollutants to clean up their discharge. The powerful group in this case get doesn't pay for its destructive output-the powerful group gets the benefit without the cost

   d. Income Distribution exemplifies how powerful groups have political power while the poorer segments of society do not. Therefore pure collective will impossible due to the lop-sided amounts of political power a few wealthy groups wield

e. During the 50's the affluent majority rose to power. This led to a tyranny of the majority where the relatively smaller amounts of poor people were excluded from political power

f. Ideology can be a hindrance to rational market choices since it creates a biased set of assumptions about the nature and potential of government programs. This can work negatively for both conservatives and liberals

g. Immobility of Political Resources hinders those seeking power from actually getting it. Voting district lines, seniority, bureaucratic patterns, committees, and balkanization of urban regions are examples of structural impediments

h. Representation may also block citizens from achieving power

5. The Status of Systems Budgeting

a. System Budgeting has met with considerable misfires and misinterpretation

b. It is a simple concept that has produced meager results

c. The political institutions are not willing to develop the model into practical capabilities

d. The continuing focus on process has stifled the intentions of PPB systems which is to concentrate on outcomes based on goals while examining possible alternatives

5.9 Policy Models

INSTITUTIONAL MODEL (Policy as Institutional Output)

- Public policy is authoritatively determined, implemented, and enforced by government institutions – Congress, Presidency, courts, bureaucracy, states, municipalities, etc. (Legitimacy)
- Only government policies have legal obligations (Universality)
- Only government policies extend to all persons
- Only government monopolizes coercion in society – imprisoning violators
- The U.S. Constitution establishes the fundamental institutional structure for policy making.

PROCESS MODEL (Anderson)

- One can view the policy process as a series of political activities
- Problem Identification
- Agenda Setting
- Policy Formulation
- Policy Legitimization
- Policy Evaluation – (a process)

RATIONAL MODEL (Dunn)

- Achieves "maximum social gain" – governments should choose policies resulting in gains to society that exceed costs by the greatest amount.
- Rationalism involves sacrificed by a public policy, not just those that can be measured in dollars.
- Efficiency is important

INCREMENTAL MODEL (Lindblom)

- Views public policy as a continuation of past government activities with only incremental modifications.
- Policy makers generally accept the legitimacy of established programs and tacitly agree to continue previous policies.

- Incrementalism is politically expedient – agreement comes easier
- People are pragmatic – they seldom search for the "one best way", but instead find a way that works.

GROUP THEORY (Stone)

- Interaction among groups is the central fact of politics
- Individuals are important in politics only when they act as part of, or behalf of, group interest.
- Politics are really the struggle among groups to influence public policy.
- Public policy at any given time is the equilibrium reached in the group struggle.

ELITE THEORY – Policy as Elite Preference (Lowi)

- The preferences and values of the elite
- Public officials and administrators merely carry out the policies decided on by the elite.
- In the U.S., the bases of elite consensus are the sanctity of private property, limited government, and individual liberty.
- Public policy does not reflect the demands of the masses, but rather the prevailing values of the elite.
- Elites desire to preserve the status quo.
- The stability of the system, and even its survival, depends on elite consensus on behalf of the fundamental values of the system, and only policy alterations that fall within the shared consensus are given consideration.

PUBLIC CHOICE MODEL – Policy as Collective Decision Making by Self Interested Individuals

- Assumes that all political actors – voters, taxpayers, candidates, legislators, bureaucrats, interest groups, parties, governments – seek to maximize their personal benefits in politics as well as in the marketplace.
- Individuals come together in politics for their own mutual benefit and even with selfish motives they can mutually benefit through collection decision making.

- Government must provide public goods – goods and services that must be supplied to everyone if they are supplied to anyone.

GAME THEORY

- Opponents must be rational – they must weigh he potential costs & benefits of their actions and choose an course of action that does not result in costs that exceed gains.
- The study of decisions in situations in which two or more rational participants (person, groups, government) have choices to make and the outcome depends on the choices made by each.
- Opponents must adjust their conduct to reflect not only their own desire & abilities, but also their expectations about what others will do

SYSTEM THEORY – Policy as System Output

- Organic system with input, throughput and output.
- Based on rationality (genuine rationality)

MIXED SCANNING (Etzioni)

- Combination of rationality and incrementalism

GARBAGE CAN MODEL (Kingdon)

- Unclear goals
- History not understood
- Participants in and out
- Imperfect technology
- Chaotic – not the same each time

MODELS OF PUBLIC DECISION MAKING (RAAD I p. 255-259)

- RATIONAL-COMPREHENSIVE MODEL – aka ECONOMIC MAN model. Assumes the decision maker has access to all needed information, ability, intellect, time, etc. and is able to select the ONE BEST solution. It presupposes that

individuals are out to maximize their self-interest. Values are separated from facts.

- SIMON - ADMINISTRATIVE MAN MODEL – SIMON criticized the Economic Man model. The reality of decision making is quite different because information is limited and human processing capabilities are limited. Simon's decision maker is an ADMINISTRATIVE MAN whose analysis is based on BOUNDED RATIONALITY and whose actions are aimed at SATISFICING rather than maximizing. In Simon's view, objectives and values cannot be separated.

- LINDBLOM - INCREMENTAL MODEL – LINDBLOM. "MUDDLING THROUGH". Decision making is a non-comprehensive process of successive and limited comparisons. The rational-comprehensive model is fallible, too slow and costly and can never resolve conflicts of values and interests. Lindblom's model provided the foundation for a more realistic analysis of BUDGETING that his student WILDAVSKY provided in The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Values rather than facts determine budgetary decisions (view shared by Guy PETERS).

- DROR - NORMATIVE-OPTIMUM MODEL – DROR – Dror argues that Lindblom's model is more realistic than Simon's model, but is still unsatisfactory. Dror's model enhances rationalization, uses extra-rational input via sensitivity sessions and brainstorming. Policy Gambling: Dror argues that every policy is a RISK and may not work, but it is important to TRY and Experiment.

- ETZIONI - MIXED-SCANNING MODEL – Amtai ETZIONI - Distinguishes between contextualizing decisions (which outline the basic directions of policy substance), and BIT-BY-BIT DECISIONS or incremental steps which prepare for or follow a contextualizing decision.

- WILDAVSKY - IRRATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS – WILDAVSKY – Argues that decision making is not very rational. It is very difficult to determine empirically the degree to which decision making processes are determined by RULE OF THUMB, perception (definition) of the situation, bias, emotion, the need for quick results, groupthink, stress, org and cultural history, the informal role and position of decision makers, and the physical messages (face, expressions of doubt, non-verbal cues, etc.) of decision makers.

- COHEN, MARCH & OLSEN - GARBAGE CAN MODEL – (Universities & hospitals) At the individual level, one has to work with conflicting groups of people. Organized anarchy. In this type of decision making, policies and goals are often vague and, when clear are often conflicting. Members of the org have little knowledge of the overall work of the organization, and decision making is erratic. This decision making model is good for professional orgs where individuals are highly educated, opinionated, and independent.

5.10 Bureaucracy and the Presidency

Riley and Baermann note that the President does have influence on the implementation activities of the bureaucracy. However, this influence is limited by a number of forces. The White House can affect the way agencies operate by attempting "to have an impact on the organizational, budgetary, and legal environments in which agencies make their decisions." The "political executives" or political appointees can have influence over the bureaucracy; however sometimes this backfires if the appointee "goes native". Over time, and as a result of interacting with agency personnel, appointees may develop loyalty to the agency as well as the President. In order to have influence, the appointees must have cooperation of the policy specialists (who influence congressional committees), in addition to balancing the pressures to be loyal to constituencies, professional associations and policy experts.

Regarding the influence of Congress on the bureaucracy, it is important to remember that the bureaucracy cannot operate without money, and no money can be spent unless the Congress decides to spend it. Committees and subcommittees magnify the individual power of representatives trying to push for issues that their particular constituency cares most deeply about. It helps to remember that subcommittees in the House and Senate are composed of members who are motivated to work for certain issues because they are either representing their constituency or trying to get reelected. As such, the bureaucracy can expect some interference and influence attempts from Congress as well as from the President and interest groups in attempts to shape regulations and bureaucratic action in their favor. Members of the Congress or Senate will also be interested in trying to influence regulation coming out of the agencies, because they affect constituents and interest groups that may pull their campaign contributions if they see increased regulations coming down. In the case that a particular piece of legislation or executive order is viewed as a "contract" to implement as expressed, it is important that the agency try to shape the administration of the legislation or order in the same fashion that it was expressed, without compromising the existing rules and mission of the agency.

The bureaucracy must also consider the oversight role of Congress, and how the "heat" may be turned up or down on their agency as a result of the regulations they

promulgate. The bureaucracy is able to handle these influences by keeping to their mission as administrator, while carefully balancing the influences coming from all the various forces in the environment. It is impossible for the bureaucracy to escape criticism because of the nature of their role and the place they occupy in our system of democracy. The processes bureaucracies employ in implementing programs and decision-making are not perfect in terms of the ideal democratic participation model, but these processes are a "work-in-progress" and we can expect to see much more "fine-tuning" of the systems in the future.

5.11 The concept of policy evaluation

The concept of policy evaluation involves investigation of a policy or program at some point in time after its inception, in order to assess if the policy or program is effective at delivering the goals, outputs and/or outcomes it was intended to deliver. In the past, some policy evaluations of particular policies and programs involved simple unscientific and intuitive judgments based on little evidence, that were strongly influenced by ideological and partisan interests.

A different form of policy evaluation centers on the process involved in administering a given policy or program. A newer type of policy evaluation, called systematic evaluation, uses social science methodology in an attempt to measure the effects on society of a given policy or program, and to gauge how effective they are at reaching their objectives. Today, we have several other scientific research methods and research designs that are commonly used in policy evaluation. One research design commonly used is "experimental design", which compares a treatment group with a control group. In the experimental design, both groups are randomly chosen. The "quasi-experiment" design compares a treatment group with a "comparison" group, one that is chosen because it has many aspects that are similar to the treatment group. The "before-and-after" study compares the results of a program with the conditions that existed in the policy environment prior to the adoption of the policy in question.

Who performs policy evaluations? Much of the work is done by non-governmental think-tanks, the media, university researchers, and interest (pressure) groups who wish to use the information to influence future policy. In government, some departments (Labor, HHS, Energy) use assistant secretaries who are responsible for program evaluation. Other governmental entities have full-time specialized staff devoted to program evaluation, and some departments and bureaus outsource evaluation to private research organizations or universities. There are several inherent factors in the policy process that make evaluations difficult. Determining whether a policy or program is "working" can be very difficult. Goals may be unclear, societal changes may have numerous causes other than the policy being evaluated, policies may have "externalities" that affect other populations than the ones intended, and evaluation data may be difficult to acquire. Also, agency officials may offer resistance

to evaluation efforts, and the completed evaluation may be ignored or attacked for various reasons.

Do policy evaluations really impact change? It depends on if and how the evaluation is used. As Anderson points out, sometimes evaluation studies are used as political tools to delay decision-making on a certain issue or to justify and legitimate a decision already made. Actors may also try to avoid confrontations or controversy by "passing the buck", and requesting that an evaluation be done. Evaluations are not likely to impact change if they are "institutionalized" as in some government grant processes where they are required. The reason for this is that they are required as part of the funding scenario. They may never be read or used to improve policies. The main purpose is that if an evaluation is done at the required intervals, the funding will continue, and that's the end of the evaluation's useful life. Also, if evaluations are used as ammunition for partisan or personal political tools, they may not accomplish or impact any change. The reason why these uses of evaluations are not likely to result in any change is that they are simply used for self-serving purposes, then discarded (as in the requirement for continued funding scenario). No further use of the information may be necessary if the primary goal is to evade criticism or to gain political advantage for a short moment in time.

5.12 Five-Step Method for Policy Analysis

(A postpositivist, postmodernist inspired, nonrational approach to a rational methodology.)

Step 1: Define the problem and determine its causes.

Step 2: Establish criteria to evaluate alternatives.

Step 3: Generate Policy Alternatives

Step 4: Evaluate and select Policies

Step 5: Evaluate adopted policy (evaluation research).

5.13 Important Comps Questions and Student Answers

Q – 1 What characterizes different policy arenas? Describe one typology and discuss how it might help to conduct public policy analysis.

Theodore J. Lowi , 4 "Arenas of Power"

1. Redistributive

2. Distributive

3. Constituent (Not singled-out)

4. Regulative

Two Dimension in these 4 policy arenas:

1. Probability of Coercion and

2. Target of Coercion

From these policy arenas, which are determined by target and probably of coercion, emerge certain identifiable types of political behavior.

Lowi's theory has an eye toward generating theoretical prediction.

Q – 2: Discuss two views about the proper way to study policy implementation.

Nicholas Henry, in Public Administration and Public Affairs (1991):

- The subfield of public policy is divided into 2 broad branches
  - Incrementalist paradigm: substantive and focuses on description (political scientist)
  - Rationalist Paradigm: theoretical and normative, dominated by Public Administrationists

Incrementalist:

- Charles Lindblom: described policy making as disjointed incrementalism and "muddling through"

- o Six Models
  - ▪ Elite/Mass – C. Wright Mills Power Elite
  - ▪ Group Model – Arthur F. Bentley The Process of Government
  - ▪ Systems Model – David Easton, The Political Model
  - ▪ Institutionalist Model – The 'org. chart' of government. Carl J. Friedrich Constitutional Government
  - ▪ Neo-Institutionalist – Lowi (4 arenas of power)
  - ▪ Organized Anarchy – John W. Kingdon, policy streams, open windows

Rationalist

- Yehezkel Dror, Metapolicy
- Public Choice
- Pareto optimality, making everyone better off, without making anyone worse off
  - o Exclusion/Consumption Model
  - o Technology Assessment Model

Nicholas Henry (1991) advocates Strategic Planning as a third approach.

- What is agency (principle – agent) theory and how can it be used to improve our understanding of public policy making?

Q – 3: **Some scholars have argued that "public policy is public administration." First, evaluate whether this statement accurately captures the field to date. Then examine if this statement – or a replacement – explains where the field appears to be heading for the foreseeable future.**

- According to Barrett & Fudge (Policy & Action, 1981) "policy doesn't implement itself." Implementation transforms policy into action, operationalizing often ambiguous policy.
- Thus, the study of "implementation theory" a terminology initially used by Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) to bridge the gulf between politics and

administration. Focus on the normative advice feeding back into policy design, researching lessons learned from implementation failures

- LJ O'Toole (1986, 1993)
  - Emphasizes the academic backwater into which implementation research has drifted; reviewed over 100 studies of public policy implementation
  - role of implementation research for policy recommendations
  - relying upon a linear model of implementation and ignores the ambiguous nature of political policy initiatives, mult-actor contingenices and conflict
- Kingdon
  - 1990 – Implementation studies used to show folly of government policy
- Lipsky (1980)
  - Emphasis on street bureaucrat, deviating from the linear, top-down policy process; bureaucratic discretion enters equation.
- Lester Salamon (Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Gov. Action, 1989) describes the traditional tools of policy implementation as the direct "command and control" tools such as public enterprises, regulatory agencies

Future

- O'Toole (2000) suggests that field is alive and contributions are indirect, framed in Ostrom's (1999) work on institutional analysis. A stronger focus on governance (Stone, 1989) and network analysis (Kikert et al, 1997; Rhodes, 1997)
- Schlager, (1999) Implementation studies need to reflect new and emerging political ideas which impact public service organizations: Changing views of citizenship, networks, governance.
- B. Guy Peters (1996) The Future of Governing: Four emerging Models & "Governance without Governing" (1998) shows that the hollow state needs tools and procedural instruments, such as the government-NGO partnership

- N. Henry (1991) Public Administration and Public Affairs, indicates that strategic planning has surfaced as a practical paradigm of public policymaking that reconciles the rational and incrementalist perspectives.

Globalization, terrorism, development, and modernity have changed the world in which we live. Dynamic environments have the potential of creating great uncertainty for individuals: should one invest in American corporations when it is unclear if your money goes to increasing infrastructure or a CEO's wallet? Is it safe for an Afghan mother to go to the morning market without a headscarf? Should the World Bank be allowed to "aid" failing economies by placing harsh conditions on loans that hurt local economies and forcing the privatization of industries (which are then sold to foreign multinationals)? All of these questions are difficult because it is unclear to individuals what the outcomes of human interaction will be. Public policy is the study of how we attempt to stabilize the ways we interact. From this perspective, public policy is not only formal legislation coming from Congress or cases from the courts; public policy encompasses both formal and informal human constructs that make the social world more understandable.