CHAPTER 2
PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION:
A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Public policy, as a concept, exists both in political science and public administration, but policy symbolizes different notions for both of them. As a sub-field of political science, public policy has been concerned with the content of various policy issues such as environment, health, education etc i.e. it studies the substantive issues. Whereas, as a sub-field of public administration, public policy has been concerned with problems of research design, implementation, organization, program evaluation, efficiency, effectiveness and various kinds of public policy questions that are related to the substance and content of a policy i.e. it emphasizes the theoretical aspects. It impresses upon the study of “Knowledgeable questions” in contrast to “Intellectualized understanding” of public issues. While both the substantive and the theoretical branches of public policy are indispensable. The substantive concerns do not address the larger theoretical questions which can be utilized by public decision makers in diverse policy areas. Public administration, on the other hand, contributes to the theory of public policy formulation and implementation. It aims to study and strengthen the processes involved in policy making and implementation.

Public policy has emerged, as a new concept, in the beginning of 1950’s. It is broadly concerned with those spheres or domain of life that is not private; it belongs to all the citizens of a nation. Public administration refers to the activities and functions which are performed by government. Public policy refers to that domain of human activity which requires government intervention or common actions. It could broadly be defined as a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or representatives. However, policies, as a concept, are different from rules or laws. While law can compel or prohibit behaviors; policies guides or directs the actions to be undertaken to achieve the desired outcomes. Also, policy is a multi-layered process that involves contribution from number of disparate sources. Further, it may either have micro or macro perspectives. Micro policy is designed for a specific local area;
however, a macro policy has far wider application. It may be employed in the whole polity or whole country. Hence, it could be said that the concept of public policy is not a precise term

2.2 CONCEPT OF PUBLIC POLICY

Public policy, in simple words, denotes declaration of goals, courses of action, general purpose or authoritative decision. However, the concept of public policy is quite vast and complex. Various scholars have highlighted different dimensions of public policies in their writings. These writings, individually, address key components of public policy making process. Hence, a universally accepted definition of public policy has been absent. However, for greater comprehension definitions of various scholars have been analyzed.

In words of Sir Geoffrey Vickers policies are “decisions giving directions, coherence and continuity to courses of actions for which the decision making body is responsible”. Therefore, a policy delineates functions and activities which are adopted by an agency. Furthermore, Anderson defines public policy as “a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern........Public policies are those policies developed by governmental bodies and officials”. Thus, public policy is all about means and ends, where both are mutually related. On one hand, political functionaries defines the objectives (ends) while on the other hand, the administrators identifies the various instruments (means) for accomplishment of pre-defined objectives.²

According to Hogwood and Gunn, the following elements constitutes a policy:-

a) “Policies involve behavior as well as intentions and inaction as well as action.

b) Policies have outcomes that may or may not have been foreseen.

c) Policy refers to a purposive course of actions; this does not exclude the possibility that purpose may be defined retrospectively.

d) Policy arises from a process over time which may involve both intra and inter organizational relationship.

e) Public policy involves a key but not exclusive role for public agency”.³

---

1 Nicholas Henry (2002), Public Administration and Public Affairs, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, p. 271
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Hence, public policy is a dynamic process that occurs over a period of time. It contains a set of intentions of goals, a mix of instruments or means for accomplishing the intentions, a designation of governmental or non-governmental entities charged with carrying out the intentions and allocation of resources for requisite tasks. The policy intent is further indicated by the labeling of the policy, the language used to communicate policy goals and the particular mix of policy instruments. It is, therefore, a set of well-defined objectives that describes the desired course of action and roles of various agencies concerned with the attainment of identified objectives. Since public policy deals with those public issues that have direct implications on the citizens. Therefore, it is both a dependent and an independent variable. As a dependent variable, policies are very likely to be influenced by various environmental factors such as social characteristics, available economic resources, beliefs and ideas of the community. As an independent variable, we could assess the impact of policy on its environment.4

On the other hand, some scholars emphasized that the study of public policy analyses the activities and performance outcomes of the government. Thomas Dye regarded public policy as the “study of what government’s do, why they do it and what differences it makes”5 Likewise, B. Guy Peters deemed public policy as the “sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as it has an influence on the lives of citizens”6. Thus, they believed that public policy is the reflection of government’s intentions and objectives.

Further, public policy results from the interaction of politics and government. In true sense, values determine public policy. David Easton defines politics as “the authoritative allocation of values.” Thus, public policy is concerned with definition of prevailing values (politics) as well as with the definition of instruments for attaining those values. Besides politics, society too demonstrates its influence on public policy. The basic policy decisions, commitments and actions undertaken by the government are the resultant of the social demands made by the citizenry. Further, these decisions are subject to redirection in wake of pressures experienced outside the government as well as within the government. Thus, public policies are not an independent variable and are

5 Thomas Dye (2004), Understanding Public Policy, Pearson Publications, Singapore, p.1
highly influenced by various environmental factors.\textsuperscript{7} Thus, it is obvious that the concept of public policy is multi-dimensional in nature.

2.3 APPROACHES TO PUBLIC POLICY

There are two major approaches that facilitate the understanding of the concept of public policy: (i) Political science’s approach to public policy i.e. Incrementalist paradigm and (ii) Public Administration’s analytical approach to public policy i.e. Rationalist Approach. Various models, both descriptive and prescriptive in nature, illustrate the process based and output based thrust of public policy.

2.3.1 The Incrementalist Paradigm of Public Policy Making

It highlights the conservative tendency of administrative decision-making process. The public policy makers accept the policies of the past as legitimate and satisfying and they do not spend much time and money on carving out new policies. Further, the innovative actions have been discouraged, as “sunk costs” involved in existing policies couldn’t be retrieved. Also, they feel that it is difficult to define the new social goals, thus incremental approach is considered an easy alternative. From the standpoint of political economy, incrementalist model is more expedient, where modifications in existing policies facilitate formation of new policies.

Charles. E. Lindblom’s incrementalist idea got more academic legitimacy when termed “\textit{Disjointed Incrementalism}”. Here, Disjointed refers “to the disconnect between the assessment of conditions and the development of responses to them”. Incrementalism implies that “very few, and, in terms of their potential impact, very small, policy alternatives are considered by policy makers”. Also, incrementalist policies are more feasible in comparison to rationalist policies which call for fundamental redistribution of social values.

The paradigm has six emphases i.e. Elite model, Group model, Institutional model, Neo-institutional model and Organized anarchy model. These models illustrate the various forces that shape the public policy processes. It could be observed that, over a period of time, the processes involved in public policy making and implementation have become more institutionalized.

1. \textit{Elite/mass model}: According to this model, the elite formulates and implements public policies. This implies that policies flow downwards from the elite to the

masses. Such policies, generally, reflect elite values such as preserving status quo. and thereby maintain the gap between elite and masses. These policies, therefore, are prone to elite biasness.

2. **Group model:** According to this model, group aspirations are the basic input for policy formulation by the agency. The administrators accord priority to the interests of a group and assume that a policy which fulfills the aspirations of a group is also beneficial for the nation. Thus, policies are, mainly, manifestation of group interests and cast lopsided impact on the citizenry.

3. **Systems model:** David Easton is the foremost proponent of this system. According to this model, the process of public policy is based on the concept of information theory i.e. feedback, input and output. The process of policy making is essentially cyclical where feedback plays an important role in shaping future policies.

4. **Institutional model:** This model studies the organizational structure of the government. It describes the formal structure of departments and officials involved in policy making and the various functions performed by them. Further, the Constitutional provisions, administrative and common law and similar legalities formulate the major thrust. In recent times, the emergence of new inter-governmental patterns has impressed upon the need to understand the structures and functions of government in policy making process.

5. **Neo-institutional model:** This model focuses on polity, political institutions and policy types that relates to various branches of government. It also studies the types of political behavior associated with diverse policy arena. The advocates of neo-institutional model have, therefore, categorized public policies in accordance with policy making sub-systems. Lowi, for instance, has classified policies into four “arenas of power” i.e. redistributive, distributive, constituent and regulative.

6. **Organized anarchy model:** This model of policy making process has been put forth by John W. Kingdon. He identified three main streams which, though independent constitute the policy making process.

   - **Problem Stream:** This involves definition of the problem and drawing the attention of policy makers to a particular problem. Problem identification is possible through a variety of means such as “routine
monitoring of social data, focusing on certain events and feedback from existing programs”. According to Kingdon, problems are mainly defined in terms of values, comparison and categories.

- **Political Stream**: This involves formation of governmental agenda i.e. formation of list of issues or problems to be resolved. The governmental agendas are formed by various participants. Kingdon referred to them as “visible cluster” which consist of administration (including high level of political appointees and the president’s staff), members of Congress, media, interest groups, political parties and general public opinion.

- **Policy Stream**: This involves formation of decision agenda or “alternative specification” i.e. selection of public policy from among the enlisted alternatives in the decision agenda. It is formulated by public administrators, academics, researchers and consultants and interest groups. Kingdon referred to them as “hidden clusters”.

Thus, public policy is formulated, when the three streams i.e. problem, political and policy come together. Kingdon has called this occasion as “Windows”. According to him, whenever a window opens, it brings about restructuring of the governmental and decision agenda. However, for restructuring of decision agenda, all the three streams should come together and during the process the policy entrepreneur have to play a critical role. The policies, so formulated are released on trial basis that, in turn, generates large number of suggestions to resolve a particular problem. The participants weigh these suggestions or ideas in terms of technical feasibility, acceptability to broad social values, future constraints and in terms of political acceptability and public acquiescence. Hence, it could be observed that the Kingdon’s model of public policy as a process is tremendously comprehensive, systemic and empirical. It provides a complete analysis of public policy making process.

Ideally, the administration of urban planning should consist of all these models. This implies that urban planning administration should be based on well-define urban legislations and an integrated formal organizational structure should be established. Further, an urban plan should imbibe the social values and preferences of the stakeholders. In totality, an urban policy should be comprehensive and systematic.
2.3.2 The Rationalist Paradigm of Public Policy Making

Unlike incrementalism, rationalism aims at the construction of better public policies. It identifies all value preferences in a society, assigns each value a relative weight, discovers all available policy alternatives & know their consequences, calculates how the selection of any one policy will affect the remaining alternatives in terms of opportunity costs and ultimately selects the policy alternative which is most efficient in terms of costs and benefits of social values. It. Dror calls this concern “metapolicy i.e. policy for policy making procedure”. Rationalist paradigm is concerned with “the nature of public goods and services, the relationships between formal decision-making structures & human propensities for both individual action and collective action and the broad implications of technological innovation”.

The Rationalist paradigm considers public policy formulation as a linear process. It consists of three models: (i) Rationalist Choice Model ; (ii) Public Goods and Services Model i.e. “what kind of goods and services are delivered most efficiently and productively by the government and the other sectors”; (iii) Technology Assessment and Forecasting Model i.e. “evaluation of new technical and scientific innovations in terms of their current or future spillover effects.”

However, the rationalist model has been criticized on various grounds: (i) it consumes time and cost to develop a plan, thus there is a wide gap between planning and implementation; (ii) it ignores the role of the entrepreneur i.e. technical competence is not the same as leadership and (iii) it adopts a mechanical approach towards policy-making process whereas in reality, the administrative organization is more complex.

2.3.3 The Strategic Planning Model

This model combines the positive features of both incrementalism and rationalism. Strategic planning recognizes intangibles components such as human emotions and does not replace them with statistics. It uses quantification techniques to elucidate choices. Strategic planning, over the period of time, has assumed greater significance. It incorporates outward-looking, proactive factors that are sensitive to environment changes. For effectively responding to the environmental changes, it places line decision-makers in active rather than in passive positions. Thus, the top line officers, from chief executive officers through the middle management, are engaged in the process while the planners are excluded. Figure 2.1 describes the synthesis of the main features of the rationalist and instrumentalism approaches.
It must be noted that the strategic plans are not the personal vision of the officers. It is reconciliation of rationalist and incrementalist approaches to the problem of public policy formulation. It articulates implicit organizational objectives and issues, ranks them by priority and communicates these objectives and issues to members of the organization. This brings about uniformity in decision-making and improves organizational co-ordination and effectiveness. Also, it is a blend of economic and rational analyses, political values and the psychology of the participants of the organization. This participatory aspect of strategic planning enables the strategic planners to concentrate on the fate of the whole organization.
Practically, strategic planning has limited use in public sector than in private sector. This could be attributed to “pervasive vagueness” of objectives or goals; environmental constraints in the form of interest groups, media and other forces; time constraints such as budgetary processes and election cycles and coalition which are usually prone to disintegration, prior to the complete implementation of a strategic plan. All these impediments limit the use of strategic planning in the public sector.

Hence, in case of urban planning, the incrementalist model and the strategic planning model of public policy formulation and implementation have been found to be pertinent. In view of rapid urbanization and ‘metropolitanization’, urban planning is facing an array of urban challenges. This, therefore, calls for a shift from traditional planning to strategic planning. Strategic planning calls for developing a vision for city’s future that aims at creating such urban forms which are more compact, mixed used and sustainable.

2.4 FORMULATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

Policy formulation is both an art in identifying and working through feasible options and a science in analyzing the costs and impacts of different options. John Dryzek defines policy design as the “process of inventing, developing and fine-tuning a course of action with the amelioration of some problems.” The design mainly emphasizes on matching the content of a given policy to the political context in which the policy is formulated and implemented. This is so because public policy and public administration are two sides of the same coin. The decisions taken by the government to do something or not to do something are public policy decisions and these decisions are implemented by public administration. In simple words, public administration is inherently the instrument of implementation of public policy.

However, the public policy making is a complex process and policy implementation is just one phase of public policy making cycle. In words of Charles.E. Lindblom’s, “policy making is an extremely complex analytical and political process to which there is no beginning or end and the boundary of which are most uncertain.” The process of public policy making embraces various stages: (i) Agenda Setting (identification of a policy issue); (ii) Policy decision or non-decisions; (iii)

Implementation; (iv) Program evaluation and impact analysis and (v) Feedback. The public policy making cycle operates in the political environment which in turn determines as well as influences the policy decisions. (Figure 2.1)

**Figure 2.2**

**Public Policy Making Cycle**


i. **Agenda Setting:** It is the foremost stage of public policy making cycle. This involves identification of new ideas and issues for consideration by a political institution for legislation. Generally, these issues are those that have been pronounced by the executive for elective office. Agendas are often decided by public policy entrepreneurs and political actors. Besides this, there has been infinite sources/channels from which agenda items emanates. The policy agenda are mainly such public issues which received greater attention of common masses such as citizens groups, public interest law firms, interest groups and so on.

ii. **Policy Decisions:** Decision-making in public policy making is the process of deciding the desired policy actions and goals. There are two opposite and distinct theories that seek to explain the mechanism of public policy decisions.

   a. **The Rational Decision Making Approach by Harold D. Lasewell:** He put forth seven significant phases for every decisions: “(i) The intelligence
phase, involving an influx of information; (ii) the promoting or recommending phase, involving activities designed to influence the outcomes; (iii) the prescribing phase, involving the articulation of norms; (iv) the invoking phase, involving establishing correspondence between prescription and concrete circumstances; (v) the application phase, in which prescription is executed; (iv) the appraisal phase, assessing intent in relation to effect and (vii) the terminating phase, treating expectations (rights) established while the prescription was in force.”

b. *The Incrementalist Approach to Decision Making by Lindblom:* In his article “The Science of Muddling through” he rejected the idea that most decisions are made by rational (total information) processes. He advocated that events and circumstances exercises greater control over policy decisions making rather than the will of those responsible for policy making. Further, most policy decisions are the product of small incremental decisions made in response to short term political conditions.

iii. **Policy Implementation:** The next step in public policy making process is implementation. Implementation, as defined by Charles O. Jones, consists of “those activities directed towards putting a program into effect.” This involves the “translation of program language into acceptable and feasible directives as well as creating appropriate organizational structure and routines.” Hence, implementation of a policy refers to the doing part of public administration. However, during implementation certain “intentional changes” are made to a policy. This is done with the view to bring both policy implementation and policy goals in the same line and length. While emphasizing this view, Pressman and Wildavsky advocated that policy planning and analysis should take into account the difficulties of policy execution or implementation. In this light, they defined implementation as “a process of interaction between the setting of goals and actions geared to achieving them” as well as “an ability to forge subsequent links in the casual chain so as to obtain the desired results”. Through this definition they explained that administrators and other actors with whom they interact during implementation, like lawmakers, have the power to
influence program objectives, inputs and outcomes. Thus, for achieving the policy goals, a closer nexus between policy and implementation needed to be developed.

iv. **Policy Evaluation:** It is the “systematic examination of activities undertaken by the government to make a determination about their effects, both for the short term and long term”. There are two standard criteria for evaluating a policy i.e. efficiency and effectiveness. A policy is considered to be efficient if it comply with the pre-defined rules and regulations and utilize the available resources in just manner. However, efficiency alone is not enough, it should also be effective. This implies that it should provide desired and relevant outcomes. A policy program should have positive effect on problems and it should target the right problems at the right time.

v. **Feedback:** It is the final step in the policy cycle. The evaluation of policy highlights the merits and loopholes in a policy. This newly generated information creates a stir in policy cycle that results in formation of new agenda items for subsequent decisions. Thus, feedback rejuvenates the entire policy cycle and leads to formulation of more accurate and relevant public policies.

Thus, public policy making is a continuous process. In words of the British statesman **Lord Salisbury** that, “there is no such thing as a fixed policy, because policy like all organic entities is always in the making.”

2.5 IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

The formulation of public policy is followed by its implementation of public policy. Since the former consists of the content of public policy, the latter entails the various kinds of means and activities that are undertaken to operationalize the content. As rightly put by **Pressman and Wildavsky**, “….. A verb like ‘implement’ must have an object like ‘policy’. But policies normally contain both goals and means for achieving them…….”. Therefore, it is evident that implementation is preceded by a cognitive act i.e. act of making decisions or act of identifying the goals that needs to be achieved. Notwithstanding, whether the decisions have been taken ‘at the bottom’, implementation always follows. This is so because without implementation, the decisions do not yield consequences or outcomes. Thus, both formulation (goals) and implementation (actions) are complementary to each other. In context of public
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administration, implementation is always related to specific public policies. These policies generally respond to specific problems of a society. Also, the success and failure of a policy can be judged only when it is being implemented.

This, therefore, is evident that the process of implementation is separate from policy formulation. In words of Mazmanian and Sabatier, “Implementation is the carrying out of a basic policy decisions, usually incorporated in a statue but which can also take the form of important executive orders or court decisions. Ideally, that decision identifies the problem(s) to be addressed, stipulate the objective(s) to be pursued and in a variety of ways ‘structure’ the implementation process…….” In totality, implementation is a very complex process that involves numerous reciprocal relationships. Similarly, numerous scholars have different perspective on implementation. Pressman and Wildavsky rather considered implementation, “as a process of interaction and negotiation, taking place over time, between those seeking to put policy into effect and those upon whom action depends”. For Dunsire, policy implementation is “pragmatization”. John considered it as “post-legislative stage of decision-making” and also defined it as “the stage in the policy process concerned with turning policy intentions into action.” However, O'Toole concisely referred to policy implementation as, “the connection between the expression of governmental intention and actual results”. Thus, implementation is an instrument that turns policy intentions into actions. It brings out the impact of a policy to the surface. As DeLeon rightly says that the implementation study is “little more than a comparison of the expected versus the achieved. More precisely, the study of implementation, however, illustrates upon the interplay between ‘intellectual cognition’ and ‘social interaction’.11

2.5.1 Approaches to Implementation of Public Policy

Implementation research has evolved out of the evaluation research. Over the years, it has became an integral part of public policy analysis that studies different stages of public policy process such as agenda setting, policy formulation, policy design, implementation, evaluation and so on. It mainly studies the content, causes and consequences of public policies. In public administration, implementation research, studies the execution of legislations i.e. it studies the effects of public policies that have been enacted as law or authoritative statues. The scholars of implementation study

asserted that “if the term policy making stands for the policy process as a whole, then both implementation and policy formation refer to respectively ‘late’ and ‘early’ sub-processes in that process.” However, there has been no general theory of implementation research. Different approaches have been set forth highlighting different research strategies, evaluation standards, methodologies and concepts. Out of these, two approaches i.e. top-down approach and bottom-up approach has emerged as the most popular approaches of implementation study. The advocates of top-down focused on controlling the problem where as the advocates of bottom-up emphasized on studying the actors who are in close proximity to the problems for which policies are formulated. Further, Winter’s integrated implementation model analyzed the relationship between various factors and implementation process.

2.5.1.1 Top-Down Approach

The advocates of top-down approach illustrate upon different dimensions of implementation. They opined that large number of variables have existed in the policy making process that prevail upon the implementation process. Hence, the control over implementation flows from top to bottom. However, none of the levels exercise control in isolation. The views of key contributors to top-down approach have been discussed below.

1. Jeffery Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky: The Founding Fathers

They have been regarded as the founding fathers of the top-down approach. For them, “implementation is clearly defined in terms of a relationship to policy as laid down in the official document.” According to them, “a verb like ‘implement’ must have and object like ‘policy’ as policies normally contain both goals and the means for achieving them.” They put forth that implementation, in an organization, entails numerous linkages and relationships that existed between various organizations and departments and the success of implementation largely depended upon these linkages. Further, they introduced the concept of “implementation deficit.” This implies that during implementation process a number of small deficits cumulatively create a large shortfall.

2. Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn: System Building

According to them, “policy implementation encompasses those actions by public and private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions”. Van Meter and Van Horn argued that “it is vital that the
study of implementation be conducted longitudinally; relationships identified at one point in time must not extend casually to other time periods”. Thus, they provided a straightforward model of implementation that goes through series of stages. The model draws upon six basic variables:

* “Policy standards and objectives, which elaborate on the overall goals of the policy decisions.
* The resources and incentives made available.
* The quality of inter-organizational relationships.
* The characteristics of the implementation agencies including issues like organizational control or the agency’s formal and informal linkages with the policy enforcing body.
* The economic, social and political environment
* The ‘disposition’ and ‘response’ of the implementers, involving three elements; their cognition, their direction of their response to it and the intensity of that response.”

The model clearly shows the top-down relationship in formation and implementation of a policy. Further, they hypothesized that “implementation will be most successful where only marginal change is required and goal consensus is high.” Thus, activities of an individual or a group, during implementation should be converged towards the accomplishment of defined goals of a policy.

3. Eugene Bardach: Fixing the game

In his book ‘The Implementation Games’ published in 1977, Bardach put forth that interference with pre set goals is inevitable. According to him, “implementation is a ‘political process’ and that ‘successful’ implementation from top-down perspective must involve a very full ‘follow through’”. He suggested that implementation should be viewed as involving ‘games’. Thus, he made two sets of recommendations to the ‘top’. Firstly, emphasizes should be on ‘scenario writing’ i.e. games should be designed in such a way that they facilitate achievement of desired outcomes in the right way. Secondly, attention should be given to ‘fixing the games’ i.e. mending or amending the game so as to do away with the obstacles. Later in his studies, he advocated that both the ‘top’ and the ‘down’ should adopt a shared approach towards problem solving for better outcomes of policy implementation.
4. **Paul Sabatier and Daniel Mazmanian: Process Modelling**

The basic premises of their implementation studies have been:

* “To what extent were the actions of implementing officials and target groups consistent with...... that policy decisions?
* To what extent were the objectives attained over time, i.e. to what extent were the impacts consistent with the objectives?
* What were the principal factors affecting policy outputs and impacts, both those relevant to the officials policy as well as other politically significant ones?
* How was the policy reformulated over time on the basis of experience?”

Out of these, the fourth question, however, initiates an approach towards the new implementation studies. The scholar, therefore, have identified three factors that bears upon the implementation process: “(i) factors affecting tractability of problem; (ii) non statutory variables affecting implementation and (iii) ability of the statue to structure implementation.” Thus, according to Sabatier and Mazmanian, for successful implementation, it is essential to structure implementation process.

5. **Brian Hogwood and Lewis Gunn: Recommendation for policy maker**

In their book *‘Policy Analysis for the Real World, 1984’*, Hogwood and Gunn have made the following recommendations to policy makers; focusing on democratically elected policy makers. According to them, policy makers should ensure

* “That circumstances external to the implementing agency do not impose crippling constraint.
* That adequate time and sufficient resources are made available to the programme.
* That not only are there no constraints in terms of overall resources but also that, at each stage in the implementation process, the required combination of resources is actually available.
* That the policy to be implemented is based upon a valid theory of cause and effect.
* That the relationship between cause and effect is direct and that there are few, if any, intervening links.
* That there is a single implementing agency that need not depend upon other agencies for success, or, if other agencies must be involved, that the dependency relationships are minimal in number and importance.

* That there is complete understanding of and agreement upon, the objectives to be achieved and that these conditions persist throughout the implementation process.

* That in moving towards agreed objectives it is possible to specify, in complete detail and perfect sequence, the tasks to be performed by each participant.

* That there is perfect communication among, and co-ordination of, the various elements involved in the programme.

* That those in authority can demand and obtain perfect obedience.”

Thus, the above list has clearly spelt out the conditions that are necessary for the realization of implementation. Also, they suggested that ‘perfect implementation’ is unattainable.

Thus, the advocates of top-down approach emphasized that implementation process flows from top to bottom. Therefore, they focused on the top level of the organization and identified various variables, conditions and factors that influence the managerial level. They aimed at improving the efficiency of top level in implementation process. The scholars believed that the top level and other subsequent levels share a significant relationship and thus, collectively contributes towards successful implementation of public policy. However, they argued that perfect implementation is not possible.

2.5.1.2 Bottom-Up Approach

The advocates of bottom-up approach emphasized on line managers, involved directly in the implementation process. They put forth that policy formulation and implementation process is closely intertwined and therefore it is difficult to separate implementation from policy formulation. Also policy implementation involves policy modification or redefinition for the accomplishment of desired objectives. Further, they say that informal networks in bottom-up directions create such implementation structures that introduce flexibility in the implementation process.

13 Ibid, pp. 51-56
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1. **Michael Lipsky: Street level Bureaucracy**

He analyzed the behavior of street level bureaucracy i.e. front line staff in policy making process. For the development of “bottom-up” approach, he emphasized upon: (i) the crucial nature of the role of the street level bureaucrats who concentrate on methodological strategies which are adopted for performance of work rather than focusing upon the policy inputs. (ii) adoption of such approaches which feed in the expectations of people at the local levels and facilitates greater accountability of implementers. He put forth that street level policy making involves adoption of such practices which enables officials to cope with the emerging situations. According to him, “They often spend lives in a corrupted world of service. They believe themselves to be doing the best they can under adverse circumstances and they develop techniques to salvage service and decision-making values within the limits imposed upon them by the structure of work. They develop conceptions of their work and of their clients that narrow the gap between their personal and work limitations and the service ideals.”

2. **Benny Hjern: Implementation Structures**

Benny Hjern emphasized upon the importance of informal networks in a bottom-up direction. He writes that people actually construct such working relationships that show little or no respect for formal boundaries. Therefore, Hjern viewed “activities as within ‘implementation structures’ formed from ‘within pool of organizations’ and ‘formed through processes of consensual self-selection’. Further, he adds that effective implementation could not be ensured by exercising control over public administration through federal and state politicians. However, for effective implementation ‘policy output analyses should be involved. Also, effective study of implementation should be ‘organization theory inclined’ and it should not favor any specific actor or set of actors. Regarding the methodology for implementation, Hjern and Hull argued that, “Once we are clear about who participates, how and with what effect in policy processes, then we can begin to think about how politics and administration could and should be (re)combined in the policy process.”

3. **Susan Barret and Colin Fudge: Policy and Action**

According to them, in a single organization or related organizations, various activities that are undertaken draw upon the compromises between the people in various parts of the organization. In their book ‘Policy and Action’, emphasis has been laid on ‘action’ in relation to ‘policy’ because both are ‘dynamically’ linked. Thus,
according to them, “policy cannot be regarded as constant. It is mediated by actors who may be operating with different assumptive worlds from those formulating the policy and inevitably, it undergoes interpretation and modifications and in some cases subversion.”

Further, they assert that top-down approach depoliticize the policy-action relationship. However, they emphasize that political processes are an integral part of implementation and occur continuously. Therefore, it is difficult to separate implementation from policy formulation. They also reject the notion put forth by Pressman and Wildavsky i.e. “if implementation is defined as putting policy into effect then ‘compromise’ by the policy makers would be seen as policy failure.” On the contrary they opined that “if implementation is seen as “getting something done” then performance rather than conformance is the main objective and compromise a means of achieving it”. Thus, Barret and Fudge have rejected the normative assumptions embedded in the top-down approach.

In recent times, with the people-centered development and administration paradigm gaining currency, the concept of participatory urban planning has been considered vital for effective implementation of urban plans. Participation of people both in formulation and implementation stage is considered significant for developing peoples’ friendly urban plans. The adoption of ‘bottom-up’ approach in urban plan implementation introduces greater flexibility and optimum utilization of available resources.

### 2.5.2 An Integrated Implementation Model

The body of implementation research focuses on different variables and subject matters such as, “hierarchical structuring, tractability of problems, communication, commitment, political support, resources, inter-organizational relations and coordination problems, decision and veto points, discretion at various levels (including discretion of street level bureaucracy), contexts (including socio-economic conditions and target group characteristics), empowerment of target groups, the role of policy design and implementation in shaping implementation”. Winter, in his Integrated Implementation Model synthesized these variables in a common framework of analysis. The model analyzed the relationship of implementation process with various set of factors.

---

The first set of factors brings out the relationship of implementation results with policy formulation process and policy design. Policy design, ideally, is concerned with goal identification and selection of policy instruments for implementation. However, it has been found that conflicts among coalition partners results in ambiguous policy goals and disagreement over policy instruments. This lack of connection between goals and means in the policy design adversely affect the overall implementation structure and process.

The second set of factors focused on the effects of organizational and inter-organizational behaviors, behaviors of street level bureaucrats and target groups on implementation results. Inter-organizational implementation settings, though complex, have had an essential role to play. Pressman and Wildavsky while emphasizing the “complexity of joint action” imply that “successful implementation is likely to be negatively related to the number of actors, the diversity of their interests and perspectives and the number of decision and veto points.” Further, inter-organizational implementation settings depend upon the nature of resource-dependency of participating organizations. It has been observed “that the ‘complexity of joint action’ applies best to a chain of sequential relations where one organization depends on the outputs from another as input for its own contribution to implementation. Reciprocal relations where two organizations depend on each other for inputs can decrease the likelihood of veto points because both have incentives to cooperate. Pooled relations where multiple organizations can also produce and deliver implementation outputs independently of each other can produce relatively good implementation results even though the coordination may not be optimal.”
The model illustrates the views of Lipsky on “street level bureaucracy”. The street level bureaucrats have been the essential actors in the implementation of public policies. They need to fulfill numerous demands whereas they possess limited resources. As they have the discretion to make decisions therefore, they handle such situations by “rationing services, making biased priorities among cases and clients, controlling clients and modifying policy goals and client perceptions.” Such strategies resulted in development of systematic bias in the delivery of services declared by the policy mandates. In addition to this, the model accorded great importance to the role of targets...
of public policies i.e. citizens. They influence both the policy outcomes and the performance of street level bureaucrats.

Thus, Winter's model draws upon the key factors and mechanism, i.e. policy design, organizational and inter-organizational behavior and street level bureaucracy, that affect implementation outcomes. Further, the socio-economic context bears significant impact on the implementation process. Thus, it is evident that implementation process and outcome are not independent variables.

An integrated implementation model holds paramount significance for urban planning. For effective implementation, urban goals and means should be articulated in advance. Further, implementation of an urban plan calls for integration of various organizational agencies, inter-organizational co-ordination and synergy and line bureaucracy

2.6 PUBLIC POLICY AND URBAN PLANNING

Every urban area has its own specificity or constraints that are the by-products of its historical, geographical and economic factors. Policy strategies should, therefore, focus on important policy issues such as the identification of main policy constraints, identification of development strategies to overcome these constraints in future, establishment of institutions to meet the future economic challenges, the type of transportation systems that have to be set up and, finally, what kind of planning process is indispensable.

In urban areas, public policies are the response to the urban problems. It is also the focal point of urban politics since political resources are invested either to introduce changes in policy or to preserve the status quo. While formulating an urban policy, policy analysts primarily studies the five basic questions about public policy.

a) What choices are made and why?

Policy making involves choosing among alternatives. More often decision makers need to make tradeoffs between two policy alternatives. This implies that a part of ‘goal X’ has to be sacrificed to maximize ‘goal Y’ so as to bring about greater social utility. This choice among alternatives is, however, constraint by features (both micro and macro) of policy environment such as availability of human and economic resources, scarcity of desired information, social and economic values and so. Therefore, such choices are made which ensure greater social utility.
b) *Who benefits and who loses?*

Policies are generally redistributive in nature i.e. the benefits and burdens are distributed from one group to another. They are taken from one group and given to another. Thus, the question in urban policy that requires attention is whether, in aggregate, the benefits and burdens of all the groups divided equally.

c) *What impact public policy has?*

A public policy may have intended and unintended impact or spillover effect i.e. unanticipated products of public policy. The policy makers, thus, seek to ensure that such policy should be designed whose outcomes could be anticipated and whose spillover effects are precisely specified. However, the probable impact of a policy could barely be determined because limited information is available in this regard.

d) *What difference does money make?*

The monetary transactions facilitate the use of human and material resources for implementation of a public policy. In simple words, money determines the viability and number of activities which could be undertaken to accomplish the policy intents. Further, sheer expenditure of money does not ensure resolution of urban problems, unless expenditure is based on sound information and evaluation.

e) *How policies are evaluated?*

Policy evaluation aimed at measuring two principle issues. *Firstly*, it determines whether the policy has actually accomplished its goals or not. *Secondly*, it measures the cost-benefit ratios of public policies. For the latter purpose, two techniques i.e. Cost-Benefit analysis and Planning Programming Budgeting (PPB) are mainly used. These techniques, however, have failed to measure variables.

In nutshell, an urban public policy consists of four basic elements: -

i. “To spell out briefly the contours of the problem which make it an object of public policy.

ii. To describe the politics and structure of decision-making in problem area.

iii. To identify the policy contents of major national, state and local policies bearing on the problem.

iv. To assess the impact of the policy.”

---

2.6.1 Principles for Urban Policy

Urban planning administration is not a neutral process. An urban plan is the manifestation of inhabitants’ aspirations and is the desired model of urban organization. The spatial orientation bears a significant economic, financial, and social impact. However, urban planners and political decision-makers continue to follow the colonial principles of urban planning where a planner could prepare a physical plan without the actual social and economic content. Since an urban policy needs to translate economic and social objectives into a spatial policy framework. Thus, four major principles should be considered while formulating a spatial policy. These principles introduced the concept of ‘manageable towns’ i.e. self-contained urban towns, with limited population density, reduced urban congestion and green belts:

i. Market Forces and Real Estate Demand

Market economy and land markets i.e. supply and demand of land, its accessibility through transport and the availability of infrastructure play a significant role in urban development. Thus, urban planning should undertake development in line with overall urban areas functioning and the real estate demand. Land prices are good indicators of the trends and the use of Floor Area Ratio on graduated scale terms can support the formation of urban centers. Many urban areas have introduced decrease of FAR from the centre towards the periphery.

ii. Urban Economy Efficiency

An urban policy must enhance the economic efficiency of the urban areas by providing the desired physical and social infrastructure, transport systems along with balanced residential development. This implies that a lower transaction cost and efficient exchange in transaction become primary. Hence, an urban policy must be forward looking and guide development that matches with expectations through provision of necessary urban amenities: land, roads, electricity, water, public transport, etc. to areas which host economic activities.

iii. Preservation of Public Interest and Long Term Demands

This objective is based on the choice of sustainable development that necessitates the preservation of natural resources (water, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.), road systems, utilities right of way, etc., together forming areas of public interest. Specific urban areas such as heritage sites and risk
prone areas, open spaces also need to be factored. This is part of the responsibilities of public authorities.

iv. Social and Economic Integration of all the Sections of the Population

An urban policy must ensure social and economic integration of all section of the society. This means that the principle of social equity needs to assure access to public services to every citizen as per her entitlement. The social group access to the service delivery components includes urban social infrastructure (i.e. health, education, water & sanitation), social housing (i.e. housing for the underprivileged) and access to public transport\(^\text{16}\).

Thus, a spatial policy should be all-embracing and inclusive of aforesaid components of urban development. Thereby ensuring an all-round development of urban areas.

2.6.2 Status of Urban Policy in India

It is ironical to note that even after six decades the policy of urban development is still evolving in India. Since independence an adhoc and fragmented approach has been adopted towards urbanization and urban development. It has been found that piecemeal interventions have been made by the government with respect to various individual components of urban development. This could be attributed to the general perception of policy makers during 1950s and 1960s, who believed that being an agrarian economy, too much emphasizes on urbanization would adversely affect the rural economy structure.

An analysis of five year plans and subsequent policies has revealed that importance has been accorded to urbanization mainly from early 1990s. Prior to that the importance of cities as propellers of economic growth was discounted in policy circles and the problems arising out of the cities were treated more at par with social and welfare schemes, and it were treated as sectors of residual investment. However, rapid urbanization and globalization have impressed upon the need to evolve an integrated urban policy framework. Numerous factors, in recent years, have necessitated the development of a coherent national urban policy:

i. “The paradigm of development at macro levels has undergone a substantive change, involving structural adjustment and liberalization of industry and trade.

This has necessitated a review of the role of the State in the development process in general and in urban development in particular.

ii. The process of urbanization has reached a stage significant enough, in economic if not in demographic terms as well, to influence the growth of economy and this is going to assume greater importance as structural transformation of the economy gathers momentum in the future.

iii. There is growing appreciation of the role of urbanization as a positive force in the development process and a realization that the manner in which cities economies are running in conjunction with supporting services can have a significant effect on urban productivity and hence on the whole economy’s growth.

iv. At the same time there is a growing realization that urban growth has the ugly side too increasing poverty and a greater stress on the environment – raising fundamental issues of sustainability of the present urban development process.

v. The latest amendments to the Constitution call for greater devolution of powers to democratic units of local self-government which would mean a new delineation of functions and responsibilities and the need for measures to strengthen these bodies managerially and financially.“

Hence, the formulation of an urban policy is a complex task. Furthermore, unlike other sectors, policy for urban development encompasses an array of components and their activities such as housing, transportation, communication and so on. Thus, there are several factors which complicate the process of urban policy design:

i. “Unlike agriculture, industry, health etc. urban development is essentially a process of development involving various sectors and actors at different levels and hence the need for consultation with several agencies.

ii. The linkages of economics and spatial development both at micro and macro level, and their impact are not clearly understood.

iii. Urban development is essentially a state responsibility and hence the central government would have little hold on its implementation.

---

iv. Decisions taken in other sectors, both at macro and micro level, can have a significant impact on urban development but neither city governments nor development authorities are consulted before these decisions are taken.\textsuperscript{18}

Notwithstanding the aforementioned difficulties, it is imperative to formulate an urban policy. In this context, the Steering Committee’s Report on Urban Development for 11\textsuperscript{th} Five Years Plan pointed out that it is indispensable to think comprehensively for National Urbanization Policy which should embrace both the changing economic scenario and also the role of urban centers in globalization era. This would call for undertaking following initiatives:

i. “Formulating National Urbanization Policy, which would set an example for urban development at national level and similarly the states, would devise their own urbanization strategy.

ii. The Urbanization policy should have a long-term vision fully realizing that in next two to three decades nearly half of the population will live in urban centers and may contribute 75\% to the GDP.

iii. Within the National Urbanization Policy, a thought should emerge for the development of State Capital Regions, which should encourage decentralization of economic activities, development of satellite townships and development of hinterland thereby helping in uniform distribution of urban population instead of concentrating both population and investments at the selected metropolitan cities. Ultimately, the objective of balanced and sustainable development is to be achieved by reducing the spatial disparities.”\textsuperscript{19}

Thus, formulation of national urbanization policy has become indispensible for streamlining the development process of urban areas. An Approach paper to the 12\textsuperscript{th} Five Year plan too called for formulating national urbanization policy for streamlining future urban development processes.

2.6.3 Government's Initiative towards Urban Policy

The existence of such policy chasm in urban sector, however, could be attributed to the absence of any legal base in this regard. It must be noted that the subject of urban development finds no mention in any of the three lists of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution that provides for allocation of function responsibilities

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p. 170.
between the Centre and State Government. Only certain components of urban development such as water supply, public health and sanitation have been included in the State list. This clearly highlights an anti-urban bias of the government. This biased approach continued to dominate the intellectual thinking and policy environment for major part of the planned development of the nation. However, the exponential urban growth and the realization of role of cities in globalization era, has prodded the government to undertake concerted initiatives for systematic development of urban regions.

Thus, for articulating urban policy concerns various initiatives have been undertaken at national level. The Planning Commission appointed a Task Force on Housing and Urban Development in 1983 and National Commission on Urbanization (1987) has been appointed by the Centre Government. In its report, the Task Force made a serious observation with regard to the approach of government towards urban policy and programmes during sixties and seventies. It stated that “policy and programme interventions have been half-hearted, loosely coordinated, to say the least, and even counterproductive; spatial considerations have never received attention they deserve. Policy has been half-hearted in as much as a few of the points at which governments might intervene to manage urbanization and affect its course and directions have been properly tackled. It is uncoordinated in as much as national planning tends to be in terms of sectoral outlays, while urban planning has been mainly linked with physical outlays. It is counterproductive in as much as the effort has been to divert, retard or stop urban growth and in particular to inhibit the expansion of metropolitan cities.” Further, the National Commission on Urbanization, 1988 recommended that National Urbanization Policy should be formulated for balanced and sustainable development of urban centers in the country. However, the recommendations of the Commission were mainly advisory in nature and therefore have not been implemented till date.

Recently, certain substantive policy aspects have received due attention; these are (i) “formulation and approval of national housing policy in 1992; (ii) the 74th amendment of the Constitution in April, 1993 to provide long overdue constitutional status to urban local bodies and decentralization of urban development; (iii) high level
policy dialogue on urban land management and water supply and sanitation. However, the government both at Centre and State level never thought about articulating an integrated urban policy. The enactment of individual legislations for each component of urban development underlines the sporadic approach of the government.\textsuperscript{21}

In the earlier plans, urban development has been considered synonymous with housing. This is evident from the fact that plan outlays have been made mainly in housing sector, with respect to urban development.

Table 2.1

Plan Outlay in Housing and Urban Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Total Outlay</th>
<th>Housing and Urban Development</th>
<th>Percentage share in the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>First Plan</td>
<td>20,688</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Second Plan</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Third Plan</td>
<td>85,765</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fourth Plan</td>
<td>1,57,788</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fifth Plan</td>
<td>3,94,262</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sixth Plan</td>
<td>9,75,000</td>
<td>24,884</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Seventh Plan</td>
<td>18,00,000</td>
<td>42,295</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Eighth Plan</td>
<td>43,41,000</td>
<td>1,05,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97)\textsuperscript{22}

Table 2.1 clearly reveals that plan allocations from the First to the Eighth five year plans have been combined for urban and housing sector, irrespective of growing importance of urban sector. In addition, the allocations have, in fact declined significantly and they vary only between 2 and 2.9 percent of the total plan investment. Hence, this reflects the anti-urban development bias of government; this bias could be held responsible for non-formulation of national urban policy till date. Nevertheless, the Eighth Plan onwards, some policy initiatives have been taken by the government to streamline the process of urban development. In recent years, the Government of India

\textsuperscript{21} Dharmarajan & Dutta, op.cit, p.238
\textsuperscript{22} Government of India, Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97), Planning Commission, New Delhi, pp.545-549.
has undertaken few substantial policy initiatives with respect to certain components of urban development, however, initiatives in terms of an integrated urban policy is still missing. The following policy initiatives have been undertaken by the Central Government:

i. National Housing and Habitat Policy (2008)

The Policy intends to promote sustainable development of habitat in the country to suffice the existing housing needs. The Policy aims at (i) integration of housing and urban planning; (ii) creation of adequate housing stock both on rental and ownership basis; (iii) promotion of larger flow of funds from governmental and private sources for fulfilling housing and infrastructure needs; (iv) addressing the housing needs of SC/ST/OBC/Minorities/ disabled; (v) involving women in decision-making in relation to formulation and implementation of housing policies; (vi) forging strong partnership between public, private and cooperative sector for accelerated growth in housing sector. Thus, the Centre government along with State government should act as an enabler and facilitator for creating vibrant housing sector.


The MDGs enjoin upon the signatory nations to extend 100% access to improved sanitation by 2025. Thus, the National Urban Sanitation Policy (2008) envision to ensure and sustain healthy and livable environment for all its citizens with a special focus on hygienic and affordable sanitation facilities for the urban poor and women. The Policy aims to address the following issues: (i) poor awareness; (ii) social & occupational aspects of sanitation; (iii) fragmented institutional roles and responsibilities; (iv) lack of integrated city wide approach; (v) limited technological choices; (vi) reaching the unserved and poor; and (vii) lack of demand responsiveness. The Policy, therefore, envisions upgrading the existing sanitation conditions in the country.


In view of the vital importance of water for human and animal life, National Water Policy was enacted in 1987. The Policy has been reviewed periodically. Hence, the National Water Policy 2002 has been adopted. The Government aims at adopting an all-embracing water policy. The Policy, therefore, aims at addressing the following issues: (i) a well-developed information system; (ii) water resource & project planning; (iii) ground water development; (iv) provision of safe drinking
water; (v) irrigation planning; (vi) water zoning; (vii) conservation of water; (viii) flood control management; (ix) drought prone area development; (x) water sharing/distribution amongst states; (xi) participatory approach to water resource management; (xii) private sector participation; (xiii) maintenance and modernization of water systems and structures; (xiv) monitoring of water projects; (xv) improvement in water quality (xvi) legislation for safety of structures. Hence, the Policy ensures the optimum and economical utilization of water resources for future.


The National Urban Transport Policy has been enacted to address the mobility needs of urban population resulting from rapid urbanization. The Policy envisages the following objectives: (i) incorporation of urban transport as an important parameters at the urban planning stage; (ii) integration of land use and transport planning; (iii) equitable allocation of road space with people; (iv) greater use of public transport and non-motorized modes; (v) establishment of multi-modal public transport system; (vi) establishment of institutional mechanism for enhanced co-ordination in planning and management of transport systems; (vii) establishment of effective regulatory and enforcement mechanism for monitoring transport services; (viii) introducing intelligent transport systems for traffic management; (ix) addressing concerns of road safety; (x) reducing pollution by changing travelling practices and use of cleaner technologies. The Policy, therefore, adopts a multi-pronged approach for addressing the issues and problems relating to urban transport in urban areas.

However, the State of Punjab did not have any state urbanization policy, state urban sanitation policy, and state urban transport policy. More recently the State Government has adopted Punjab Housing and Habitat Policy (2008) with the objective to meet the growing housing needs in the state. Also, the Government has prepared the draft State Water Policy, 2008 with the aim to develop, plan, conserve, utilize and manage both surface and ground water resources in a judicious, equitable and economical manner.
2.7 CONCLUSION

It is, therefore, logical to deduce that the apparent neglect of urban policy initiatives would have grave consequences. The urban centers are the backbone of India’s globalizing economy and should provide opportunities for direct foreign investment and international financial institutions. However, the absence of requisite legislative base for development of urban areas has jeopardized their future role in the global economy. The subject of urban development falls within the purview of the State Government. However, the Centre Government has to develop some guidelines to be followed by the State Government. This is somewhat similar to what Coter stated, “just as countries will inevitably have to adjust their economies to global economic forces…the cities will also have to adjust to changing circumstances of the national economy”23. Thus it is imperative to call for increasing attention of national policy makers; as this would include the urban reforms in the national economic agenda.