

The aim is to facilitate, widen and deepen understandings of the theoretical, empirical, and methodological ways in which relational approaches to policy analysis enable us to understand, intervene in, and transform our precarious world.

Policy Analysis Methods By Shane Hall ; Updated September 29, Public policy analysis applies the tools and methods of economics and other social sciences to the study of government actions. Policy analysts identify problems to be addressed by policy, examine a range of policy alternatives and recommend the best approach, based on empirical evidence. A variety of analytical methods exist for accomplishing these tasks. Types The two main classes of policy analysis methods are qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative methods refer to a range of statistical techniques, including descriptive statistics, forecasting methods, regression, analysis of variance and cost-benefit analysis. Qualitative methods include case studies, document analysis and interviews. It is worth pointing out, however, that many types of qualitative data can be coded for quantitative analysis. For example, content analysis is a method of analysis that applies quantitative analysis to data taken from written material. Features Quantitative methods of policy analysis require an in-depth knowledge of statistics, research design and the ability to use spreadsheets and other statistical software. Methods such as regression analysis, for example, estimate the effect of variables on outcomes. This type of analysis requires comprehension and application of such concepts as correlation, variance and statistical significance. Qualitative methods, meanwhile, require a careful eye for detail, as analysis often requires repeated reading of field notes and other written materials to uncover patterns and relationships within the data. Benefits Qualitative methods of policy analysis reveal rich, descriptive detail on policy operations as well as the experiences and perceptions of people involved in the policy, including program operators and intended beneficiaries. Quantitative methods allow for more precise, scientific analysis. Not surprisingly, many policy analysts and scholars prefer quantitative methods. Policy analysts use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to report on policy implementation, policy goals and objectives, assess the extent to which policies achieved their objectives, estimate the effects of proposed policies, and weigh the costs and benefits of various policies. A variety of factors, including type of policy, the time frame for conducting an analysis, and budget constraints, will limit the methods available for use. Another consideration is whether the analyst is analyzing an existing policy or conducting a prospective analysis for the purpose of recommending a policy action. Time Frame The amount of time available to complete a policy analysis will help determine the type of method or methods employed. University researchers, consultants, and analysts with research institutions, in contrast, often operate with longer time frames, enabling them to conduct more in-depth analysis. References Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction, William Dunn, About the Author Shane Hall is a writer and research analyst with more than 20 years of experience. Hall has a Doctor of Philosophy in political economy and is a former college instructor of economics and political science.

Chapter 2 : What Is an Analytical Approach?

Three Approaches to Policy Analysis Approach Primary Question Type of Information Empirical Does it and will it exist? (facts) Descriptive and predictive Valuative Of What worth is it? (values) Valuative Normative-Value Critical What should be done?

Study[edit] Foreign policy analysis involves the study of how a state makes foreign policy. As it analyzes the decision making process, FPA involves the study of both international and domestic politics. FPA also draws upon the study of diplomacy , war , intergovernmental organizations , and economic sanctions , each of which are means by which a state may implement foreign policy. In academia, foreign policy analysis is most commonly taught within the discipline of public policy within political science or political studies , and the study of international relations. FPA can also be considered a sub-field of the study of international relations, which aims to understand the processes behind foreign policy decision making. In the simplest terms, it is the study of the process, effects, causes, or outputs of foreign policy decision-making in either a comparative or case-specific manner. The underlying and often implicit argument theorizes that human beings, acting as a group or within a group, compose and cause change in international politics. Stages in decision making[edit] The making of foreign policy involves a number of stages: Assessment of the international and domestic political environment - Foreign policy is made and implemented within an international and domestic political context, which must be understood by a state in order to determine the best foreign policy option. For example, a state may need to respond to an international crisis. Goal setting - A state has multiple foreign policy goals. A state must determine which goal is affected by the international and domestic political environment at any given time. In addition, foreign policy goals may conflict, which will require the state to prioritize. Determination of policy options - A state must then determine what policy options are available to meet the goal or goals set in light of the political environment. Formal decision making action - A formal foreign policy decision will be taken at some level within a government. Foreign policy decisions are usually made by the executive branch of government. Common governmental actors or institutions which make foreign policy decisions include: Implementation of chosen policy option - Once a foreign policy option has been chosen, and a formal decision has been made, then the policy must be implemented. Foreign policy is most commonly implemented by specialist foreign policy arms of the state bureaucracy, such as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or State Department. Other departments may also have a role in implementing foreign policy, such as departments for: Key approaches[edit] as put forward by Graham T. The model adopts the state as the primary unit of analysis, and inter-state relations or international relations as the context for analysis. The state is seen as a monolithic unitary actor, capable of making rational decisions based on preference ranking and value maximization. According to the rational actor model, a rational decision making process is used by a state. Goal setting and ranking. In other words, it provides models for answering the question: In this theory, the underlying assumption is that governments are unified and rational , in this manner, they would seek for carefully planned and well-defined foreign policy goals. In this sense, rational choice model is primarily a realist perspective of foreign policy level of analysis. The model tends to neglect a range of political variables, of which Michael Clarke includes: Governmental Bargaining Model[edit] In this model the state is not seen as a monolithic unitary actor. Instead it is a collection of different bureaucracies vying for increasing their funding and size. Individual decision makers try to bargain and compete for influence with their own particular goal in mind. Here decisions are made by bureaucracies competing against each other and suggesting solutions to problems that would involve using their resources so as to increase their level of importance. Bureaucratic politics model, in keeping with its pluralistic connotation, can also refer to that inner state processes including no institutional actors, who with their informal channels would affect policy results. These procedures are made in order to allow day-to-day operations to be carried out. Often an order or decision will have to work around these standard procedures. It is often exceedingly difficult for a bureaucracy to do something "out of character" or contrary to their standard procedures. Multilevel and Multidimensional approach - In this model, scholars study particular aspects of foreign policy making by using various major

theories. Social constructivist approach - In this model, scholars focus on the role of ideas, discourse, and identity to make foreign policy analysis.

Chapter 3 : Foreign policy analysis - Wikipedia

Policy analysis is a technique used in public administration to enable civil servants, activists, and others to examine and evaluate the available options to implement the goals of laws and elected officials.

I suggest this simple outline: Overview - words 2. The policy for analysis - words 3. The rational approach theory - words 4. Application of the theory, including public impact - words 5. Analytical approach - words 6. Likely limitations of the analytical approach for issue analysis - words 7. Conclusion - words This should yield pages which should cover what you need. This however, is only among the many of its myriad of responsibly as the CBP also, "has a responsibility for securing and facilitating trade and travel while enforcing hundreds of U. Trade wise - the task is to secure that all the goods going in and out of America are legitimate, are not posing any dangers and threats to the US and have paid all appropriate fees and duties. Travel wise - the task is to ensure that the US continues its ability to let the flow of people into and out of America efficient while ensuring that individuals or elements, in particular terrorist, do not get access to or find their way into American territory. This means being able to patrol all borders and watch over all towns, cities and states, being on alert and keeping on training for the latest technologies and approaches to enable the watch over America effective. We safeguard the American homeland at and beyond our borders. We protect the American public against terrorists and instruments of terror. We serve the American public with vigilance, integrity and professionalism. This means we work with government policies and the American rule of law - these shape how we do our roles, how our organization is run, how we plan and function. In this paper, I will discuss a current policy that has made the public and concerned advocates question the way we handle a particular task - dealing with and processing illegal immigrants and suspected individuals being processed within our detention system. I am doing so once again so as to analyze the problem from another angle - that of policy analysis using particular approaches in public administration. In order for the organization to deliver on this task it has a security policy that determines the manner by which it will operate in the governance of the task. Because of the mammoth nature of the organization and the Solution Summary Rational approaches to policy analysis are given.

Chapter 4 : Policy analysis - Wikipedia

Foreign policy analysis allows us to better understand how political actors make policy decisions and how they relate to other foreign government and non-government entities. Foreign policy is a complex discipline wherein numerous actors work within structures both inside and outside the state to have an impact on the decision-making process.

See Article History Policy analysis, evaluation and study of the formulation, adoption, and implementation of a principle or course of action intended to ameliorate economic, social, or other public issues. Policy analysis is concerned primarily with policy alternatives that are expected to produce novel solutions. Policy analysis requires careful systematic and empirical study. The complexities of policy analysis have contributed to the development and growth of policy science, which applies a variety of theories and tools from the hard sciences e. Policy analysis is important in modern complex societies, which typically have vast numbers of public policies and sophisticated and often interconnected challenges, such that public policies have tremendous social, economic, and political implications. Moreover, public policy is a dynamic process, operating under changing social, political, and economic conditions. Policy analysis helps public officials understand how social, economic, and political conditions change and how public policies must evolve in order to meet the changing needs of a changing society. Formulating effective policies Policy analysis plays an important role in helping to define and outline the goals of a proposed policy and in identifying similarities and differences in expected outcomes and estimated costs with competing alternative policies. Many public policies are designed to solve both current and future problems, and thus policy analysis attempts to forecast future needs based on past and present conditions. Policy outcomes can be found in a variety of different forms—tangible outputs and less-tangible outputs for which the impacts are more difficult to measure. In many cases, it is difficult to determine if the policy itself resulted in desired change or if other exogenous or external factors were the most direct cause. Nevertheless, it is important to determine if policy is responsible for the desired change; otherwise, there would be no need for the policy. Policy analysts often use theoretically grounded statistical models to determine if the policy will have the desired impact. In a final stage of policy analysis, analysts collate the information gathered to determine which policy alternative will best meet present and future needs. Methods of analysis There are two types of empirical analysis: Qualitative studies involve a variety of different tools. For example, some qualitative studies involve archival analysis, studying policy history and determining what has been done in the past to solve certain policy problems. Qualitative studies might also involve personal interviews, asking individuals to describe in words a variety of issues surrounding the policy process—from policy agendas to formulation, implementation, and evaluation. Interviews with policy makers and with the clientele being served by a particular policy may provide valuable information about policy goals, processes, and outcomes. Archival analysis is particularly important in public policy analysis. Through studies of policy history, policy analysts can learn important lessons from earlier times and apply those lessons to current or future problems and goals. A new policy goal may sound highly innovative and cost-effective and promise to meet worthy goals, but archival research may illustrate the hidden costs and pitfalls that might result in policy failure. Personal interviews are also an important method of improving public policy. Public policy is formulated and implemented by professionals working in government, oftentimes for an entire career. Through their individual experiences in particular policy areas, the experiences of elected and appointed officials become key policy artifacts. When these individuals leave government service, their experience and wisdom are often lost. One way to prevent this is to document the informal lessons or experiences of senior elected and appointed officials. Personal interviews are perhaps the most effective method of accomplishing this goal, largely because a personal interview technique will allow for a high degree of flexibility in information collection. Quantitative studies are of tremendous value to policy analysts in their continual efforts to address important policy issues. Cost-benefit analysis is one of the most common forms of quantitative policy analysis. It is primarily concerned with comparing the amount of expected or known benefits produced from a particular policy choice with the expected or known costs associated with that choice. Of the two elements of the equation, the determination of costs is often more easily computed. Costs

are most often measured in monetary terms; labour and supplies are easily converted to dollar costs. While there are always hidden costs associated with any policy decision, those costs can be estimated given previous experiences in prior public policy endeavours. Opportunity costs—the costs associated with choosing a particular policy over an alternative policy—can also be estimated. Benefit calculation is oftentimes a difficult endeavour. In order to complete the cost-benefit calculation, benefits must be assigned a numeric value, and most frequently the numeric value is made in monetary terms. Yet, most aspects of public policy benefit are not easily measured in monetary terms. Individual clientele of a policy and individual officials fulfilling policy goals have a tremendous influence on the quality of a policy outcome or output, but the calculation of a benefit is often measured and aggregated in a manner that fails to capture those nuances. Despite limitations in estimation, benefits must be measured in monetary or unit output terms for a cost-benefit calculation to proceed. Policy makers may determine benefit estimates through survey research by asking clientele of a policy to indicate how the public policy has impacted their lives. Policy makers also view the benefit in terms of the output of a policy—that is, the number of individuals who were served. In higher education policy, for instance, policy makers may conduct surveys of alumni to determine the impact of their higher education experience on their salary level and to also inquire about their positive and negative experiences at the university or college. Additionally, policy makers may conduct a head count of the number of student credit hours generated and the number of university or college graduates to measure policy output and equate it to a benefit. Complexities of policy analysis Public policy is dynamic and requires that policy makers adjust policy to changing conditions and needs. When a change of policy direction or emphasis occurs, it usually requires increased resource expenditures. The goal would be to increase benefit as a result of increased expenditure on a particular facet of a public policy. The increased benefit is called a marginal benefit, while the increased cost is known as a marginal cost. In cost-benefit analysis, important marginal increases in cost are justifiable in terms of increased benefits. If a benefit does not increase at a rate greater than cost increases, then the marginal policy changes are economically inefficient. The dynamic quality of public policy is also considered in a procedure known as discounting. The value of a particular resource e . For example, money that is not spent may grow in value, simply by gaining interest or investment value. Once money is spent for a particular policy, that interest or investment value potential is lost. The longer the money remains invested, the greater the potential value that can be generated. Therefore, current resources frequently have greater potential value than resources collected or retained in future years; not all money is equal once time is factored into analysis. The discounting procedure allows policy makers to compare monetary values on an equal basis, thereby making the cost-benefit analyses more accurate in terms of both present and future costs associated with a policy. The ability to conduct accurate and complete cost-benefit analyses is often hampered by a variety of other factors that play a role in public policy. When one chooses to move or not to move in a particular policy direction, there is the risk of policy failures. Those risks might mean that resources that were spent with good intentions never produced an expected benefit. Oftentimes the risks of failure are so great that policy makers avoid potential political ire by simply not choosing to take on high-risk yet potentially valuable policy goals. Existing public policy often carries with it a lower level of risk than newer public policies. Frequently, there are unforeseen indirect start-up costs associated with new policies. Additionally, public policies are often vague and require the establishment of rules and procedures for day-to-day operations. The costs of implementation cannot always be determined before a public policy is put into place. However, they must be factored into cursory cost-benefit analysis to determine the feasibility of a particular prospective public policy. People migrate, economic and social conditions change, and the nature of public problems continually evolves. Demographic data helps policy analysts determine if social and economic change is occurring in an equitable manner. Demographic analysis played an important part in documenting the rise of economic and social inequality that arose in the post- World War II era. While the analyses were interpreted by political conservatives and liberals in different ways, the findings themselves played an important role in developing public policies intended to remedy the inequities, the impacts of which could be studied in future demographic analysis. Policy analysts use decision theory to plan for contingencies that arise in policy formulation and implementation. Decision theory is an attempt to explore all possible contingencies

extant in a particular policy. The approach is especially useful after a particular policy has been adopted by government. Following policy adoption, the details of policy practice must be explored in full. For the most part, policy adoption means that a particular set of general policy goals has been recognized as being a function of government. Government agencies in charge of meeting those goals frequently must determine how to deal with a variety of alternative decisions that will have to be made and what outcomes and the value of those outcomes are likely from each of those decisions. Decision theory involves determining the probability that various events will occur and factoring that probability into decision analysis. Experiments are one the most effective methods of determining a causal connection between the presence of a public policy and particular outcomes. Policy experiments, however, may face ethical challenges. For example, denying a policy benefit to those outside of the experiment may be harmful. Conversely, ethical challenges arise when individuals are subjected to a poor policy. Outcomes of policy analysis The outcomes of public policy analysis are highly varied. In one sense, policy analysis provides elected and nonelected government decision makers the opportunity to develop a greater understanding of a policy problem and possible solutions. Through policy analysis, it is possible to gain a greater understanding of the projected costs and possible benefits that will emerge from the adoption of a particular policy alternative. Decision makers often seek the most economical alternative possible—the alternative that offers the most in the way of benefit and the least in the way of cost. Government is asked to deal with a number of policy goals with limited resources; therefore, it is wise to stretch tax dollars. Policy analysis can help decision makers make rational decisions.

Chapter 5 : Policy Analysis Methods | Synonym

I need to identify a specific policy matter and analyze this policy matter via the rational approach. In terms of this analysis, I need to use appropriate peer-reviewed journals or any research products supported by the government of the public sector.

Although most of these approaches have not been developed specifically for the analysis of policy formation, they can readily be converted to that purpose. It may also depend on the nature of the policy under discussion or the level of analysis whether it is at the level of the state, national or international Abdusalumi, Equally worthy of note is that these approaches are useful in. What follows is a discussion of some of the approaches.

Institution Model Perhaps the oldest approach to the study of public policy, the institutional approach, focuses upon the formal institutions of government e. Also the behavioural connections between a department and the public policy emanating from it are of scant concern. Yet, the fact remains that an institution is a regularized pattern of human behaviour that persist over time some people mistakenly equate institutions with the physical structures in which they exist. It is their differing sets of behavioural patterns that really distinguish courts from legislatures, from administrative agencies, and so on. These regularized pattern of behaviour which we often call rules, structures and the like, can affect decision-making and the content of public policy Anderson, In summary, the institutional approach conceives public policy as often initiated, formed, decided and implemented by government institutions. Therefore, an understanding of how these institutions work is necessary before the public policy making process can be fully analyzed.

The Elite Model The elite model regards public policy as the values and preferences of a governing elite. In other words, public policy is the product of the elites, reflecting their values and serving their ends, one of which may be a desire to provide for the welfare of the masses. Policy flows downward from the elite to the mass. Society is divided according to those who have power and those who do not. Elites share common values that differentiate them from the mass, and prevailing public policies reflect elite values, which may be summed up as: Preserve the status quo. Using this approach, public policy analysis is largely an exercise primarily aimed at identifying which elite groups is or are benefiting from a particular public policy. A major defect of the elite theory is that it assumes the existence of a highly structured and stratified society, and by implication, elite values and identity. But as Abdulsalami In the particular case of Nigeria, ethnic and religious values rather than elite interests often influence elite preference, when certain policy issues are under consideration Abdulsalami, There have been instances when the elite identified more with the aspirations of the masses of their ethnic areas or religious groupings than with the aspirations of their fellow elite

The Group Model According to this model, public policy is the product of group struggle. This approach posits that individuals are important only when they act as a part of or on behalf of group interests Dye, It conceives society as a mosaic of numerous interest groups, with cross-cutting membership. A group is made up of individuals that may, on the basis of shared attitudes or interests, make claims upon other groups in society. The group approach sees interaction and struggle among groups as the central fact of political life. The policy makers act as referees, arranging a compromise among competing interests. The group approach contends that public policy usually reflect the interests of dominant groups. As groups gain and lose power and influence, public policy will be altered in favour of the interests of gaining influence against the interest of those losing influence. The group approach has been criticized for overstating importance of groups and for neglecting or understating 11 independent and creative roles that public officials play in policy process. Critics contend that many groups have generated by public policy, and that public officials may acquire stake in particular programs or policies and as a result act as I interest group in support of their continuance.

Political Systems Theory or Model The political system theory is most closely associated with the work of David Easton According to this model, public policy is the response of the political system to demands arising from its environment. The political system as defined by E composed of those identifiable and interrelated institutions a activities in a society that make authoritative decisions allocation of values that are binding on society. The environment consists of all those socio-cultural, economic, and political Conditions or factors within and outside the boundaries of the political system which

shape the political process, and whose activities are influenced by the political system. The political system receives inputs from the environment. Inputs consist of demands and supports. Demands are the claims made by individuals and groups on the political system for action to satisfy their interests. Support is rendered when groups and individuals abide by the rules or laws of the country, pay their taxes, and accept the decisions and actions of the authoritative political system made in response to demands. These authoritative allocations of values constitute public policy. The concept of feedback indicates that the political system receives information about the policy outcomes. The political systems theory has certain limitations. First, it does not explain the origin of public policies, nor is it concerned with how decisions are made and policies developed within the political system. Again, it is not concerned with evaluation of past and present policies. Nonetheless, systems theory is a useful aid in organizing our inquiry into policy formation. Systems theory draws our attention to the influence of environmental inputs on the content of public policy.

Class Theory or Model The class theory is most closely associated with the work of Marx and Engels. The main proposition of the class theory is that public policies in a capitalist society reflect the values and interests of the dominant and ruling class. It states that capitalist societies are characterized by the presence of classes that have opposing values and interests. According to Lenin Quoted in Afanasyer, Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation in most cases fixed and formulated in law to the means of production, by their role in social organizations of labour, and consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. The class theory argues that the mode of production and distribution in every society defines the character of the society. Thus, the class to which an individual belongs could be identified on the basis of his role in the social organization of labour, and his position to the means of production. Two broad classes have been identified by the class theory - the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie are the owners of the means of production, while the proletariat is the working class, whose labour is often exploited by the bourgeoisie. According to the class theory, conflict between these two classes is inherent in the capitalist society. According to Marx Quoted in Afanasyer, These conflicts often arise due to resistance of the proletariat to exploitation by the bourgeoisie. The class theory argues that the bourgeoisie due to their economic power also control political power and use it to protect their socio-economic interests. This is often reflected in the type of policies they make. Thus, public policies often reflect the interests of the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the proletariats attempt to influence public policies to their advantage through industrial conflict, such as strikes, work to rule, etcetera.

A systems approach to policy analysis and development planning: Construction sector in the Turkish 5-year development plans M. Atilla Onera,; Ozcan Saritasb,1 aPublic Policy and Strategies Research Group, Department of Business Administration, Yeditepe University.*

What are the effects of this policy on different population groups? Implementation Cost What is the financial cost of this policy some analysts also include tax credits in this analysis? Feasibility Acceptability [10] Do the relevant policy stakeholders view the policy as acceptable? The strategic effects dimensions can pose certain limitations due to data collection. However the analytical dimensions of effects directly influences acceptability. The degree of acceptability is based upon the plausible definitions of actors involved in feasibility. If the feasibility dimension is compromised, it will put the implementation at risk, which will entail additional costs. Five-E approach[edit] One model of policy analysis is the "five-E approach", which consists of examining a policy in terms of: Efficiency How much work does or will it entail? Are there significant costs associated with this solution, and are they worth it? Is it ethically and morally sound? Are there unintended consequences? Evaluations of alternatives How good is it compared to other approaches? Have all the relevant other approaches been considered? Establishment of recommendations for positive change What can actually be implemented? Is it better to amend, replace, remove, or add a policy? Framework[edit] Policies are considered as frameworks that can optimize the general well-being. These are commonly analyzed by legislative bodies and lobbyists. Every policy analysis is intended to bring an evaluative outcome. A systemic policy analysis is meant for in depth study for addressing a social problem. Following are steps in a policy analysis: Assessing policy objectives and its target populations. Studying effects of the policy. Evidence based models[edit] Many models exist to analyze the development and implementation of public policy. Analysts use these models to identify important aspects of policy, as well as explain and predict policy and its consequences. Each of these models are based upon the types of policies. Governments[edit] Public policy is determined by a range of political institutions, which give policy legitimacy to policy measures. In general, the government applies policy to all citizens and monopolizes the use of force in applying or implementing policy through government control of law enforcement , court systems, imprisonment and armed forces. The legislature , executive and judicial branches of government are examples of institutions that give policy legitimacy. These organizations may include government commissions , tribunals , regulatory agencies and electoral commissions. Policy cycle Policy creation is a process that typically follows a sequence of steps or stages: Identification of a problem also called "problem definition" and demand for government action. Different stakeholders may define the same issue as different problems. For example, if homeless people are using illegal drugs such as heroin in a city park, some stakeholders may define this as a law enforcement issue which, in their view, could be best solved if police presence in the park is stepped up and if the individuals using illegal drugs are arrested and punished ; on the other hand, other stakeholders may view this as a poverty and public health issue which, in their view, could be best solved if public health nurses and government medical doctors and substance abuse counsellors were sent to the park to do outreach with the drug-using individuals, and encourage them to voluntarily enter " detoxification " or rehabilitation programs. Agenda setting Formulation of policy proposals by various parties e. At this stage, policy legitimation is conferred upon the selected policy solution s. Policy implementation, which involves civil servants putting the selected policy option into practice. Depending on the choice made by the executive or legislative branch, this could involve creating new regulation or removing existing regulations , creating new laws, creating a new government program or service, creating a new subsidy or grant , etc. After the policy has been in place for a year or several years, civil servants or an independent consulting firm assesses the policy, to see if the goals were achieved, if the policy was implemented effectively, etc. This model, however, has been criticized for being overly linear and simplistic. Also, this model fails to take into account the multiple factors attempting to influence the process itself as well as each other, and the complexity this entails. For public institutions[edit] One of the most widely used model for public institutions are of Herbert A. Simon , the father of rational

models. It is also used by private corporations. However, many criticise the model due to characteristics of the model being impractical and relying on unrealistic assumptions. For instance, it is a difficult model to apply in the public sector because social problems can be very complex, ill-defined and interdependent. The problem lies in the thinking procedure implied by the model which is linear and can face difficulties in extraordinary problems or social problems which have no sequences of happenings. See Rational planning model for a fuller discussion

The rational model of decision-making is a process for making sound decisions in policy-making in the public sector. Furthermore, in the context of the public sector policy models are intended to achieve maximum social gain. Simon identifies an outline of a step by step mode of analysis to achieve rational decisions.

Intelligence gathering – A comprehensive organization of data; potential problems and opportunities are identified, collected and analyzed.

Identifying problems – Accounting for relevant factors.

Assessing the consequences of all options – Listing possible consequences and alternatives that could resolve the problem and ranking the probability that each potential factor could materialize in order to give a correct priority to said factor in the analysis.

Relating consequences to values – With all policies there will be a set of relevant dimensional values for example, economic feasibility and environmental protection and a set of criteria for appropriateness, against which performance or consequences of each option being responsive can be judged.

Further criticism of the rational model include: Dye, the president of the Lincoln Center for Public Service, states the rational model provides a good perspective since in modern society rationality plays a central role and everything that is rational tends to be prized.

Incrementalism An incremental policy model relies on features of incremental decision-making such as: Policy-makers are too short on time, resources, and brains to make totally new policies; as such, past policies are accepted as having some legitimacy. Such models necessarily struggle to improve the acceptability of public policy. Criticisms of such a policy approach include: For workplaces[edit] There are many contemporary policies relevant to gender and workplace issues. It is by the juxtaposition of a variety of research methodologies focused on a common theme the richness of understanding is gained. This integrates what are usually separate bodies of evaluation on the role of gender in welfare state developments, employment transformations, workplace policies, and work experience.

Group model[edit] This policy is formed as a result of forces and pressures from influential groups. Pressure groups are informally co-opted into the policy making process. Regulatory agencies are captured by those they are supposed to regulate. No one group is dominant all the time on all issues. The group is the bridge between the individual and the administration. The executive is thus pressured by interest groups. The task of the system is to: Establish the rules of the game Arrange compromises and balance interests Enact compromises in policy.

Chapter 7 : Approaches To Policy Analysis PPT | Xpowerpoint

View and Download PowerPoint Presentations on Approaches To Policy Analysis PPT. Find PowerPoint Presentations and Slides using the power of blog.quintoapp.com, find free presentations research about Approaches To Policy Analysis PPT.

Endemic political corruption Corporate dominance Every one of these problems is centuries or millennia old. There must be a reason all attempts at solution have failed, because every event has a cause. Reliance on an informal intuitive problem solving process is the main reason the environmental movement is failing to make the progress so urgently needed. Because of this fatal failure, and it cannot be called anything else, the movement is rapidly losing its credibility with the public, governments, and donors. But we cannot blame the opposition. Nor can we blame the problem for being so intractable. We can only blame ourselves for doing something terribly wrong. The process must center on root cause analysis. This is the central theme this website will be driving home time and time again, because an analytical approach is the only known method that works on difficult problems. Can you prove this? An analytical approach is the use of an appropriate process to break a problem down into the elements necessary to solve it. Each subelement becomes a smaller and easier problem to solve. It follows that a non-analytical approach is just the opposite: Because this is not done, the problem remains too big and complex to solve. Therefore an analytical approach is the only reliable way that will work on solving the global environmental sustainability problem, because that problem is too big and complex to solve any other way. This is a difficult problem. Unlike simple problems, difficult problems require an analysis to solve them, because finding the correct solution requires a rigorous analysis. A correct analysis requires reliable knowledge. And the only known way to produce reliable knowledge, knowledge that you know is true, is the Scientific Method. Therefore, because the Scientific Method is an analytical approach, an analytical approach is the only known way to solve difficult problems. Any proposition with "the only reliable way" in it is a huge claim. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. Each element becomes a smaller and easier problem to solve. That is one reason an analytical approach is the only reliable way that will work on solving the global environmental sustainability problem, because that problem is too big and complex to solve any other way. We will try to prove two things: The analytical approach is the only known approach that works consistently on difficult problems. The global environmental sustainability problem is a difficult problem. If both propositions are true, then it follows that an analytical approach is the best way to solve the global environmental sustainability problem. Proposition 1 - The analytical approach is the only known approach that works consistently on difficult problems. First we need to prove that the analytical approach is the only known approach that works consistently on difficult problems. The analytical approach is the formal use of reason to solve problems. The first rules to formal reasoning were invented by Aristotle to BC. Reasoning correctly involves representing the constituent elements of a argument with premises, intermediate conclusions, and final conclusions. Suppose you need to multiply two three digit numbers. Only a few geniuses can do it in their head, seemingly intuitively. The rest of us cannot no matter how hard we try. A multiplication problem is structured by writing the two numbers down as shown. Solving the problem then becomes as easy as falling off a log because it requires only multiplying or adding two one digit numbers at a time. We use hundreds of similar analytical approaches every day, like planning a driving route, composing a meal, and planning how to best approach an important conversation or project. These are done so often and so fast they seem intuitive. But in fact they are analytical. An analytical approach takes a problem, breaks it down into its constituent elements so as to understand the problem, and then adds elements that represent a solution. These elements form the formal argument that this is the problem and this is the solution. The reason an analytical approach is required for difficult problems is that all this becomes too complicated to do intuitively. Each element must be represented formally, such as with exact phrases in writing or with equations in a simulation model, so that the problem solver s can go over and over an evolving analysis to be certain it is correct. Complex problems have dozens or hundreds of elements, and hundreds or thousands of relationships between those elements. However the mind has only seven plus or minus two short

term memory banks. This causes the mind to overload quickly on any but the simplest of problems, or problems it has encountered before and memorized the solution. Before the invention of the Scientific Method in the 17th century, science was based on tradition and guesswork. Afterward it was based on an analytical approach. This momentous change caused science to shift into a whole new mode of thinking, one so productive it quickly led to the Industrial Revolution and all that science and technology have brought us today. Science knows of no other method that will work to produce reliable knowledge. This should be proof enough that an analytical approach is required to solve difficult problems. To summarize, difficult problems require analysis because finding the correct solution rationally instead of by guessing requires a rigorous structured approach. A correct analysis requires reliable understanding, i. Modern civilization is an analytical world. We live or die by our analytical ability. Proposition 2 - The global environmental sustainability problem is a difficult problem. Next we need to prove that the global environmental sustainability problem is a difficult problem. Difficult environmental problems have characteristics making them inherently difficult to solve. By contrast, easy environmental problems have the following fundamental factors that make them fairly easy to solve: Number of types of causes - Easy to solve problems are caused primarily by a single type of behavior, such as the way acid rain is caused mostly by the burning of sulfur-containing coal, or the way a river may be mostly polluted by a single group of chemicals, such as agricultural runoff or factory waste. Proof of cause and effect - For easy problems there is solid proof of cause and effect, such as the way accumulation of heavy metals in animals higher up in the food chain causes health problems, reproductive problems, or death. Displacement in time and space - Easy problems have a short displacement in time and space. This makes cause and effect more obvious. Displacement is the "distance" from cause to effect. For time this may be anywhere from minutes to years to centuries. For space the displacement may be local, regional, or global. Size of problem source - In easy problems the problem source typically involves a relatively small segment of society. Solution expense - The solution is relatively cheap. Solution complexity - The solution is relatively simple. Difficult problems are just the opposite. They usually have multiple types of behavior that cause them, tenuous proof of cause and effect, a long delay in time and space, the source involves a large segment of society, and the solution is relatively expensive and complicated. Each of these alone make a problem hard to solve. When combined they can make it close to impossible to even conceive of a solution that can be proven to have a high probability of working. The combination of the factors also causes the emergent problem of solution change resistance. This is clearly present. An outstanding example occurred in when the US Senate voted 95 to zero against the Kyoto Protocol treaty on climate change. The treaty has not been brought back to the floor since. The pieces of the puzzle of this problem were small in number and easy to find: The problem was caused by a single type of behavior. There was solid proof of cause and effect. The problem source involved a small segment of the system. There was a relatively easy cheap solution. So despite use of a traditional problem solving approach, the environmental movement solved the sustainability problem. The same cannot be said, however, for the other portions of the problem like climate change, fresh water shortages, deforestation, chemical pollution, natural resource depletion, and many more. An example of an easy problem was the ozone layer depletion problem. While it looked like a tremendously difficult problem at the time, it was not. It fit the pattern of easy environmental problems. It was caused mostly due to a single type of behavior: It had solid proof of cause and effect, after scientific studies were completed. The problem source involved a relatively small segment of society: And finally, it had a relatively easy and cheap solution: There was a medium delay in time and a large delay in space, but because the other four factors were present, the ozone layer depletion problem fit the pattern of a simple problem, despite its apparent size and complexity. As a result, by the s the ozone depletion problem was largely solved. But it was the only difficult global problem that was. The rest, such as climate change, groundwater depletion, topsoil loss, deforestation, and abnormally high species extinction rates, remain unsolved. The reason is they do not fit the pattern of an easy problem, and so are beyond the capabilities of the conventional problem solving approach. The global environmental sustainability problem falls into the difficult end of the spectrum for all of these factors:

Chapter 8 : Rational approaches to policy analysis

The chapters examine a wide range of current educational policy topics through different critical theoretical lenses, including critical race theory, critical discourse analysis, postmodernism, feminist poststructuralism, critical theories related to LGBTQ issues, and advocacy approaches.

Approaches to the Study of Public Policy Introduction Surprisingly, a generally accepted definition of public policy has been elusive. Some texts define public policy as simply what government does. Others say that it is the stated principles which guide the actions of government. Still others say that the discussion of a definition contributes little and move quickly to chapters of case studies in such issue areas as the economy, crime, environment, and health. The definitions reveal presumptions that fall into three general camps, which I will call here the nominalist, the realist, and the critical realist camps. For purposes of clarity and consistency, a fuller discussion follows.

Nominalism in Public Policy The nominalists, who came before the realists, took government and political officials at their word. Public policy was the logical and expected extension of articulated principles, consistently applied. What was stated as the official policy was therefore considered to be the actual policy, ending the discussion. The nominalist position naively took for granted that what the government and elected officials said they would do is what government actually did. The correct object of study, from this perspective, is the statement of principles which guided governmental action. Study the principle through the official document or spoken word and you have studied the policy-as-concept. Nominalists relegated such details as implementation to what was considered the less significant field of public administration. The original students of public policy examined policy making through the study of legislative history. They ended their investigation after a law or rule was promulgated, perhaps even an oration by a public official. What followed next, implementation, was simply a logical matter of proper public administration. Policy and administration were sharply divided but policy was considered vastly more interesting, intellectually challenging, and important. Today, the withdrawal of investigation in journalism, especially in short televised clips, allows political rhetoric to proliferate without the constraint of fact. A political leader, or even a surrogate, can simply utter a phrase with little concern for veracity. Short-term evasion, half-truths, or averting the topic thwarts accountability and transparency. Trust in government and politics erodes.

Realism in Public Policy Realists were more skeptical, refusing to take what was stated at face value. Rather, this approach views public policy as what was actually done, not merely what was said would be done. Realists were occupied with concrete actions and behaviors, rather than stated positions and principles. Study not the subjective, the stated idea but the objective action in the world, the real policy-in-action. Attorney General for President Nixon, John Mitchell had this in mind when he said to the American public, "Watch what we do, not what we say. Policy becomes deed, extends to the administration of the policy, now an essential part of the sequence of policy-making, and the whole endeavor becomes subject to systematic explanation and evaluation. The prior question of why an issue had become an instance of policy-making, formerly ignored, now begs the question of the consideration of agenda-construction. The legislative history is still included, but tells only a part of the story. However, merely calling attention to all actions of government does not get us very far. The definition expands too broadly, failing to distinguish among instances of routine acts of government, such as granting marriage licenses and inspecting buildings for violations of regulations. We need a more restrictive definition than to claim that public policy is the entirety of public affairs.

Critical Realism in Public Policy Critical Realists are even more skeptical, knowing that the stakes of public policy are high, that power comes to bear, that money changes hands, and that those involved have a compelling interest to disguise their actions. Hence, merely investigating the actions introduces a bias towards positivism, studying only that which reveals itself as observable fact. The Critical Realist tries to uncover the hidden truths. Public policy is not what is stated, but what is actually done, critically assessed. But this forces us to confront two inherent problems: A more comprehensive boundary must be constructed to include the domain of public policy, rather than merely claim that public policy is the entirety of what government does. We solve this problem with the use of the Public Policy Cycle. Next Steps The discussion

above points to the next steps: An extended definition of public policy , narrowed down and given focus. This is an attempt to synthesize qualities from a variety of definitions. I will offer both a simple and an elaborate definition. The explanation of the working model, the Public Policy Cycle. The distinctions among the Nominalist, the Realist, and the Critical Realist positions are fundamental to our working definition of public policy. This stance analytically distinguishes between thought and action, empiricism and criticism. Truth is not merely the correspondence of statement with observed practice, but the critical uncovering of meaning in the robust realm of action. June 16, Last Update:

Chapter 9 : Approaches to the Study of Public Policy

theoretical approaches to public policy study ADMINISTRATION Over the years, a variety of theoretical approaches have been developed by political scientists and policy analysts to assist their study and analysis of public policy.