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Those who limit their study of Public Policy to actions taken within political institutions miss much that is important. The battle over policy may well be decided in the preliminary stages of issue-emergence and agenda setting. William Solesbury summarizes what happens:

"An issue originates with the idea in someone’s mind that some real-world situation is unsatisfactory. But the vast majority of such ideas fail to become recognized as issues. The reason for responding to issues are relatively scarce, and this applies not only to the obvious resources of money and manpower but also to those of legislative time, political will, media coverage, and public concern. Nascent issues must compete for all these resources, and although some succeed in capturing a share of them, many more fail and never reach the stage of recognition which is the precursor to action. Political systems can cope with only a limited number of recognized issues at one time, and these are always subject to displacement by new emerging issues of greater appeal and force.¹"
2.1 INITIAL FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

(i) Perception and Definition

Imagine that you are riding in a subway car and witness a group of youngsters slashing seats and defacing the walls. The damage is obvious, the intent is clear. You may register the event in your mind but judge it so commonly that it makes no further impression. Three months later the transit authority announces its fare increase to pay the costs of repairing damage caused by vandals. The earlier event now has more direct and of personal relevance. What was initially perceived is now defined as a problem.²

"Witness to an event are likely to give differing accounts of what happened. Sometimes the accounts differ so much that is inconceivable that all the witnesses perceived the same event. Furthermore, the individual who by some objective measure, has misperceived an event may well consider that it has created "a human need for which relief is sought". (The definition of a problem). Of high relevance in relieving the need is that some one understands how those affected perceive the problem-causing event what is it that they see it troublesome ? This is no simple matter, but neither it is very important in most case, because we routinely tolerate discomfort and compromise and adopt half measures to solve our problems. The crucial point is reached when those affected decide that enough is enough that, for example, the destruction of public property can no longer be tolerated. Policy actors who want continuing support must be sensitive to such stress points.
"Perception is important in the policy process, therefore, because it conditions the definition of problems. As used here, perception simply means the reception and registering of an event through sight, hearing, touch and smell. Involved in that comprehension is an interpretation. The event is viewed in a particular way. Thus perception refers to an event. Definition refers to a problem. Something happens; someone perceives it in a particular way and defines it a problem.

People "define" problems for themselves and for others, that is, they bring into sharp relief the social effects of events, frequently with the result that a problem is defined. Our interest picks up of course, when the effect of events are defined as problems and efforts are made to resolve them.³

Of course, many of the problems that eventually get to government are created by the implementation of policy. That is, government itself causes the event that is perceived and defined as a problem for an individual or group. Government is thus a major actor in contributing its own agenda.

(ii) Representation

Representation can be the link between people, their problem, and Government. We do not expect it to work in a particular way for everyone who has a need; some people get represented, others do not, what does interest us in this inquiry is the particular manner in which representation occurs for a specific public problem. Involved are such considerations as the event and how it is perceived by the represented
and the representative; the effects of the event and whether these are defined as problems by the represented and the representative; the extent to which those affected are represented at all; and the impact of the process.⁴

Though this discussion is not confined to representation in any one institution, legislative representation, illustrates the complexity of the process. One may be represented at many points and in various ways by legislator representatives because they get involved in many of the functional activities of the policy process. Thus as you examine specific issue areas and public problems, consider that representation by and access to legislator may vary from issue to issue, among the activities involved in the formulation of a course of action, among the stages in the legislative process, among the problems, or among the many service activities of legislative office. The relationship among the several functional activities is important. For example, if representation forms a link between problem and action, it is critical to consider which perceptions, definitions and aggregations get represented. If events can result in various problems, and some public-men have more access than others to decision making, then obviously policy output is affected accordingly.⁵

(iii) Agenda setting

It is useful at this stage to point out to remember that these early stage policy activities are directed toward getting a problem to Government. Gaining agenda status
is therefore of special interest. In fact the study of perception, definition, representation typically stems from an interest in agenda setting. In other words, one begins with the current list of major issues being treated in Government and studies how they got these.

In his study of agenda setting strategies for Pollution policies, Layne D. Hoppe makes a fundamental point of interest to students of public policy.

"Agenda" to have meaning in terms of specific patterns of action in Government particularly those in the early stage of policy development. An Analysis of agenda setting processes becomes an analysis of how problems developed, how they were defined, the courses of action formulated to act on these problems, the legitimation of one course of action over another, the emergence of policy systems designed to act on such problems on a continuing basis. The result that it is most difficult to isolate an agenda setting process as an identifiable, one time, discrete process.  

This advisory step serves to warn the student not to conceptualize the policy process as being segmented, with each activity clearly issuably from the others. It also suggests the pitfalls in any effort to identify various types of agenda, as though each were a definite "thing" existing in some governmental office as a kind of schedule of events.

2.2 CRITERIA FOR FORMULATION OF POLICY

As brevity is the soul of wit, so also policy is the soul of development. Public Policy, in fact, is the photo projects of a Government whereupon depends its stability
and credibility. Sound Policies are precursor to sound programme planning and implementation policies are judiciously framed in order to command for-reaching positive impact. The key factors in policy-making exercise are the multidimensional academic knowledge and the store-house of experience. Although fundamental ground work has been done towards scientific research in the field of policy-making in India, yet much is left to be desired. The research in policy making have to be goal-directed and result-oriented so that policy perspectives on development, socio-economic problems, science and technology urban growth and on matters relating to personnel management could be objectively examined.

Yehzkel Dror opined that though public policies provide choice of clothes and suggest the Government to choose the most suitable and fashionable dress, yet the success or failure of a policy depends upon the degree of its acceptability by the public who have the right to evaluate, comment and criticize, admire, suggest and to show their expectation and willingness. Thus, public policy approach has emerged as an integrated concept of development in the faculty of social sciences. In the domain of political science and public Administration, the public policy perspective occupies central place in the analysis of political system, processes, structures and related issues. It is, therefore, to serve as a communication link between traditional political science and public Administration.

Development and providing Socio-economic justice to the teeming millions is the central goal of policy makers and academicians in the Indian Context. Therefore,
modern parameters are necessary to understand and to estimate the goals and directions of development. The political and administrative systems and institutions are supposed to undergo the process of modernisation in order to make them responsive, issue oriented, pragmatic and functional in the process of development.

This is not to allude that the old parameters were wholly insufficient. It would otherwise be a matter of indicating the prejudgments; preferences and ethnocentrism in the developmental model. The strength and weakness of our society; polity and other related institutions have to be carefully examined before reaching any hasty conclusions. India, actually speaking, remained under the yoke of colonial powers for so long a time that its economy became instable and was made to shed its inherent strength & independence. Our developmental model has come under increasing stresses and strains because it had its roots closely connected with only western concepts. The decade of 1980 came to be unexpectedly loaded with economic and political challenges and with caste and class conflicts and the government had to look back to change its policies, strategies, frameworks and process in the light of the global developments in the fields of technological breakthrough the policy makers were turned to assert and to go for a new indigenous model of development. This has been necessitated because of the fact that the assumptions of development laid down by the Western Social Sciences are inadequate and too narrow to meet our broad based goals and objectives. Although the issue of particularism versus universalism has not been finally clinched, yet it is a fact that developmental models have a long term and historical policy implications.
2.3 VARIOUS APPROACHES OF POLICY MAKING

Although we hear and use the word 'Policy' frequently in day-to-day routine, yet it is scientifically used for highly diverse sets of activities or decisions. According to Charles O. Jones, "The word policy is often used interchangeably with goals, programs, decisions, laws, standards, proposals and grand designs". Normally in administrative matters, the word is easily understandable. For example, Human Resource Development Ministry Officials may understand that NEP refers to New Education policy. But, instead of common references, the researcher is required to determine what to look for in "Policy".

The most convincing definition is offered by Heinz Eulau and Kenneth Prewitt. "Policy is defined as a 'standing decision' characterised by behavioural consistency and repetitiveness on the part of both those who make it and those who abide by it." This definition requires us to judge how long a decision must depend upon what is produced by planners and technicians, yet they tend to be critical of or impatient with them. The politicians see policy development and implementation as a, "serial process of constant adjustments to the outcomes (proximate and long run) of action".

On the basis of the following approaches, the framework & definitions of policy is stated as under:

The Incrementalists think that information and knowledge are never sufficient to produce a complete policy programme. So, they tend to be satisfied with increments,
with building on the base, with working at the margins because policy for them tends to be gradual infolding. Their operating style is that of a bargainer constantly hearing demands, testing intensities, and proposing compromises.

Reformists, by nature, want to see social change. They agree with the Incrementalists in saying that they need to accept the validity of addressing themselves directly to the problems of the day to obtain quick, short run answers with the information and knowledge currently available, however inadequate they may be. They emphasize on acting now because of the urgency of problems. Their operating style so often involves demonstrations and confrontations.

The Rationalist approach is in fact ideal model, so frequently away from the real world. The Rationalists have their limitations. First of all, they themselves are often ignorant and do not have right values and adequate knowledge. The second limitation relates to organisational aspect. The departments and ministries where policies are made have their own organisational culture which determines the policy responses. Lack of resources is yet another limitation of the rationalists. There is also the situational limitation, which means the policy-makers are guided by existing procedures and precedents. The incremental model is more practicable.

Charles Lindblom, its originator, firmly believed that policies change in small incremental steps; may be two steps forward and one step backward, or may be one step forward and two steps backward. The policy makers more or less choose the familiar, manageable and acceptable line of action. The incremental policies have certain
characteristics. They do not go away from status quo. These policies are reactive and, instead of anticipating the problems as they arise. There is no long term vision and the policies are only reaction to problems. The incremental policies are also means oriented i.e. the resources or organisation are taken into consideration. The incremental policies are not integrated whole, rather they are fragmentary. For example, in our country, these is a separate policy for the small scale sector, a different policy for large industries and quote a different for medium industries. Hence incremental policies are not unified or holistic but segmental. These two basic behavioural theories i.e. Rationalist and Incrementalist give us some insight into the reality. One emphasizes the necessity of large basic structural changes but the other says that, in the given system that we operate in, major changes are not possible. Therefore, a mid-path can perhaps be nearer to reality. By and large, the policies are incremental; but when the costs of status quo in any situation, become too large and the system crumbles, the policy makers have to make greater, more radical, structural adjustments. This is the analysis of the policy process i.e. how policies evolve and is called the descriptive aspect.

Thus a concern with policy is the common dominator in the writing of the classical political philosophers on the one had and the activities of Administrators on the other. Thus, public policy is defined in various ways.

A simple definition of policy states that it is "The important missions of Government." But, it does not clarify the meanings of 'important' and 'missions'. Following, therefore may be the components of policies as described by Autin Ranney:
"A particular object or set of objects; a desired course of events; a selected line of action; a declaration of intent; and an implementation of intent."\textsuperscript{10} Some Analysts expand the term policy to include the "effects that Government actions have on the populations", that they are designed to serve. Still others use the term policy to refer to broadly interrelated government decisions. One of the most important aspects of policy analysis is the impact of a policy on the problem. It is intended to ameliorate.

2.4 POLICY PROCESS

In the study of policy process, the style of the personalities involved in sufficiently important. One is naturally attracted to the study of Chief Ministers because they are very prominent political figures. And the differences between the personalities should encourage one to review the social and economic contact in which each served. This is not a step to ignore the Chief Ministers and personalities. This only attaches importance to the issues; how are the issues perceived and acted on and how these change over time. Hence there are different process approaches to the study of policy making.

Some social scientists are basically interested in the substance of issues. They concern themselves with the nature of problems and the procedures of solving them. For instance they try to understand the fundamental elements of inflation, unemployment or trade imbalances so that alternative process could be started to solve the problem.
But, these are other political scientist who are interested in process than in substance. They consider substance only as a way to study process. Their expertise comes out of knowledge about the organisation, routines and other decisions of Government and other public agencies. Such an attention to process encourages specialization e.g. on the Chief Minister as an institution as well a personality, the cabinet, the assembly and Budget making and bureaucracy. Process is generally defined as "a series of actions or operations definitely conducting to an end". Therefore process is associated with all forms of social behaviour.

The main area of interest for traditional political scientist is the institutional processes. They are interested in those 'series of actions or operations' associated with legislatures, executives, bureaucracies, courts, political parties and others political institutions. Group process is also a popular approach because groups are also crucial in political decisions making. It is a general belief that decisions are generally made by small groups that may or may not be on the public scene. Thus group process is an elite process.

In the policy process, main points are what goes to reflect behavioural consistency and repetitiveness and who are the policy makers and abiders. Thus policy is a highly dynamic term. As the purpose here is to analyse the policy making process, the investigator is concerned with policy questions as well as the basis of understanding the behavioural consistency and repetitiveness associated with efforts made by a machinery of a state to resolve public problems. The word 'policy' used in this manner
is not different from policy goals, policy intentions and policy choices.

Generally speaking there are four types of participants in a policy process: Rationalists, Technicians, Incremenatalists and Reformists. A Rationalist looks for reasonable choices about the desirability of adopting different courses of action to resolve public problems. In the process of reasonable choice, problems are identified; goals are defined; all policy alternatives are identified, consequences of each alternative are considered, consequences are compared in relationship with goals, and the best alternatives are chosen. The planners and policy analysts adopt this approach.

Technicians generally work on the projects defined by others. They play the role of a specialist or an expert. The operating style of technicians tends to be abstracted from that of the rationalist who tends to be comprehensive. The incrementalists are generally politicians in the policy system. Although politicians emphasis is laid on public problems and how these are acted on in Government by the elected representative. Hence there are several process approaches. But, the main area of emphasis for the investigator is to concentrate on the analysis of policy process.

2.5 POLICY EVALUATION MODELS

The other aspect is analysis for policy which means it evaluation, and it is called the normative aspect. This is heavily dependent on quantitative techniques. There are various kinds of models which can be used for this purpose. A model is an
approximation of reality. In a given situation, key variables are selected. Also, the key factors are selected and emphasis is given on 'the inter relationship' of these variables as a result of which the policy or the complexities of the policy problems are simplified.

Problem structuring is the start to policy analysis. The consistency, inter-relationship and the contradictions of a given set of objectives are assessed and the key objectives which need priority attention are identified as against those which can be left free. The various objectives are remarked in order of importance. The Interrelatedness have to be specified out of the hierarchy of objectives and evaluation is done with the help of a software programme which is often used in system analysis termed as the ISM (Interpretative Structural Modeling) technique.

Also there are other models like the Descriptive Models, normative models; deterministic models and probabilistic models. In descriptive models, the situation is described. It is usually employed in economic policy. Forecasting is the main area of operation of the descriptive models. The normative models, being complex in nature, do not only prescribe and predict, but they also tell about the preferred alternatives. Deterministic models are based on certain or definite outcomes.

In contrast to these, the probabilistic models infer large amount of uncertainty and probability. The analysis gives the outcomes, the trends. Then, there are the verbal models where in no mathematics is used. They are purely specified in symbolic terms and does not act upon it. The Government has limited capacity for introspection. The academic community too does not seem to be too much for policy analysis because it
knows such analysis will have no impact on the functioning of the Government. Then, attempts, when and where made at all for policy analysis, are not taken in the right spirit. The results are so often dubbed as pro this or pro that.

### 2.6 Issues Involved in Policy Analysis

Several basic issues are involved in policy analysis fundamentally, the masses and the elites invest their political resources to achieve changes in policy or to preserve the status quo. However, policy analysts have recently developed some basic conceptual tools for the analysis of policy and to bring them to bear on the process itself. Five such tools have been devised by the policy specialists:

1. **What choices are made and why?**

   The making of public policy involves choices among the available alternatives at a point of time and in a given situation. All choices involved include costs which are not only mortuary but social, psychological and political as well only few choices are free choices. Choosing among the alternatives is what really the National or state politics is all about. Each choice among policy alternatives consists of both the macro and micro features of policy environment. The limit of information and resources are a serious constraint on policy alternatives. The change in social and political environment also has its impact on policy making.
(ii) **Who benefits and who looses ?**

Public policies can make the rich richer and the poor poorer. They can also redress social and economic inequalities by giving advantages to the disadvantaged setting. For each policy alternative, we can ask as to who derives benefits from it and who actually looses. The policies, which are pure public goods, can be enjoyed by all members of a society equally. "Yet the definition of a public good is not precise, and economists use the concept even when they insist in that local Government produce no public goods in their pure form".¹¹ Some of the governmental policies come close to being pure public goods. Pollution control is the example and if one citizen gets cleaner air, another would get the same automatically.

(iii) **What difference does money make ?**

The matter of the total size of public budget and of desirable burdens are among the most critical issues in most political systems. Each substantive policy involves the question of finance.

(iv) **What is the impact of public policy ?**

Some impact on public life is deliberately planned and anticipated by policy makers. Unintended impacts also arise because the system consists of interrelated parts that influence one another.
(v) **How policies be evaluated?**

Policies can be evaluated in terms of two major issues: Are the goals pursued by the policy desirable for social ends? Do the policies actually accomplish the stated goals? Policy evaluation also depends upon - measurement. However, ultimately, policies are evaluated in terms of public goals or public support.

### 2.7 VARIOUS INDICATORS FOR GAUGING POLICY SUCCESS OR FAILURE

Linder and Peters deal with three types of policy failure: Implementation failure occurs, "when a programme or policy is sabotaged during implementation".\(^{12}\) Policy design as "the failure of those making policy to formulate a programme which had any possibility of being successful", and policy failure as, "...a programme may or may not achieve its goals, but creates or many negative side effects that the cure may be worse than disease." Suchman and Dunn have provided more elaborate frameworks in this respect.

Suchman proposes a five dimensional scheme for evaluating its success or failure. Effort refers to "the quantity and quality of activity that takes place".

Performance "measures the results of effort rather than effort itself". Adequately of performance measures "...degree to which effective performance is, adequate to the total amount of need". Efficiency concerns the question, "If there a better way to attain the same results? Process deals with the complex problem of,"
Dunn's six dimensional criteria for evaluation provides the following: Effectiveness concerns, "Has the valued outcome been achieved?" Efficiency measures, "How much effort was required to achieve a valued result?" Adequacy is, "to what extent does the achievement of a valued outcome resolve the problem?" Equity involves to question, "Are costs and benefits distributed equitably among different groups?" Responsiveness concerns the question, "Do policy satisfy the needs, preferences or values of particular groups?" Appropriation seeks on answer to, "Are desired outcomes (objectives) actually worthy and valuable?" 

A variety of criteria for judging policy success or failure exists. First, there is the criterion of the policy design which views the policy from the perspective of its appropriateness and agreement with its objectives and means.

A second criterion deals with policy process in terms of how the policy dealt with in the context of the policy arena. The third criterion relates to policy achievements and concerns the effectiveness and adequacy of the policy in achieving its goals. Also there are several sub criterion within each category. Policy design includes 'Appropriate perspective' and consensus and agreement. The Appropriate perspective answers the question, "Is the policy based upon an appropriate ideology and the acceptable values? Are there moral, political or theoretical grounds upon which the policy is accepted or rejected? Consensus and Agreement concern, To What extent are those involved in making and implementing it and are affected by the policy, are in agreement that it is a good policy will the policy lead to disruption, conflict and violence, or greeted with
agreement and acceptance by stakeholders? The policy process also includes 'Ratio of costs to benefits'. Implementability' and 'Sustainability' Ratio of cost to benefits judges whether the policy is an efficient one and whether there is value for money and effort in the policy. Implementability answers the feasibility in terms of implementation. Sustainability tells how well as the policy becomes institutionalised into the social, political and economic system of the community. Policy achievements includes. "Achievement of goals and objectives and the 'Adequacy and sufficiency. The first answer whether the policy is attaining the goals it was set out to achieve and the second answers whether there is a possibility that the policy will lead to solution of the problem to which the policy is addressed and whether the theoretical base of the policy is sound.

2.8 POLICY ANALYSIS AND THE INDIAN CONTEXT

It is well established contention that context (both historical and material) is the critical determinant of policy process. There is also a common assumption that policy analysis improves policy making. But this is one of many determinants. The other, more important determinants are (i) the context, (ii) the leadership, (iii) politics of bureaucracy, interest groups and legislatures, iv) public images, the media generates about the policy issues.

Policy Analysis in India has been undertaken in many ways. Our constitution and legislation make policy pronouncements. Analysis about resource allocation and investment decisions is also involved in our five year plan. Many Committees and government statements in the form of resolutions and white paper etc. make good deal
of analysis of different policies. Various kinds of methods are used for this purpose: Econometric modelling, optimisation studies, social cost-benefit analysis, Micro Economic Analysis, survey Research, Input output Models. So, Economics has the domination in such policy analysis and the planning commission and Ministry of Finance and naturally dominated in this area by the Economists. So, the impact of policy analysis in India is marginal. In some cases analysis has sharpened conflict and has not been conducive to resolution. The concentration of Economic power has been increasing. Policy analysis through replication of experiments and pilot projects has also not worked very well. One seems to agree with Dr. K.N. Dubey in saying "Everyone would agree that while democracy having struck deep roots in the country can be termed as India's highest achievement, rampant structural inequality and regional disparities are our gravest failures".15 Despite the statutory provisions in the constitution of India for equality and equal opportunity as fundamental rights of the people, with special safeguards for women, children scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and weaker sections of society, the maladies of inequality and regional disparities continue to be all pervasive and equitable distribution of gains of development are still a distant dream. It has been corroborated in the approach paper to eighth plan (1990-1995) as "...the kinds of development we have has led to growing disparities and inequalities, a felt sense of injustice and oppression" and that "a shift in investment allocation should be accompanied by more direct measures to bring about a more even distribution of income". Speaking at the 43rd National Development Council meeting on 23.12.1991, the prime minister, Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao called for the re-orientation of the role of
the planning commission. He said, "the role of the commission in future would largely be to facilitate the development of human faculty and building up of the institutional framework adequate to the needs and aspirations of the people". The Prime Minister called upon the states to play an active role in protecting the interests of the poor and neglected. According to him the foremost objective was to generate adequate employment, which would be a precondition for eradication of poverty. Mr. Rao called upon The Chief Ministers to evolve a mechanism for achieving a balanced population growth "This programme should not be treated as the centre's responsibility alone," said Mr. Rao while pleading for, "Achieving a high growth rate of income as early as possible in the interest of human development. The Prime Minister asked the chief Ministers not to see the planning process as an exercise imposed or directed from the centre. He emphasized, "It was a process in which the centre and the states were partners. The national priority must be determined together.

The centre and states would have together the identify the untapped potential for resource mobilisation". He observed that there were several areas where if the centre and states applied their minds jointly, innovative schemes for the mobilisation of resources would emerge.
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