

# American Journal of Public Policy and Administration (AJPPA)



Origins of Policy, Theories of Policy Cycle, Qualitative – Interpretive Methods in Policy Research, Deliberative Policy Analysis, Street Level Bureaucracy, Managing Policy Networks, Advocacy Coalition Framework, Managing the Commons and Policy Decision Making

Andrew Shangarai Jumanne, Stanley Motieri Ontiri and Dr. Wilson Muna (PhD)





---

**ISSUES, QUESTIONS AND COMMENTARIES IN;  
Origins of Policy, Theories of Policy Cycle, Qualitative – Interpretive Methods  
in Policy Research, Deliberative Policy Analysis, Street-Level Bureaucracy,  
Managing Policy Networks, Advocacy Coalition Framework, Managing the  
Commons and Policy Decision-Making**

Andrew Shangarai Jumanne,  
PhD. Candidate, (Public Policy and Management)  
Department of Public Policy and Administration  
Kenyatta University  
Email address; kakaasjumanne@gmail.com

**and**

Stanley Motieri Ontiri,  
PhD. Candidate, (Public Policy and Management)  
Department of Public Policy and Administration  
Kenyatta University  
Email address; stanleymotieri@gmail.com

Lecturer; Dr. Wilson Muna (PhD), Public Policy Analysis  
Department of Public Policy and Administration  
Kenyatta University  
Email address; muna.wilson@ku.ac.ke

**Key words:** Origins of Policy, Theories of Policy Cycle, Qualitative – Interpretive Methods in Policy Research, Deliberative Policy Analysis, Street-Level Bureaucracy, Managing Policy Networks, Advocacy Coalition Framework, Managing the Commons, Policy Decision-Making

---

## **Task: Analysis Origins of Policy.**

### **1.0 Issue: Measures.**

**1.1 Question one: How are policy measures effective to the consequences emanating from existing policies?**

**1.2 Question two: How does policy measures give clarity to existing policy lines?**

Measures become origin of policy due to the fact that existing policies leads to emergency of unanticipated problems or consequences that have to be mitigated by other policies (Page, 2006). Mitigation policies are what the neo-Marxist treat as response measures of state to the social reproduction requirements of advanced capitalism (Scopol & Amenta, 1986). Measures when formulated are crucial in giving effect to policies that are almost vague hence leading to further clarification of policy lines in which the distinct ones are developed. Therefore, developing measures for earlier policy lines can lead to initiation of new lines and a recognition that legislation is needed for the government to achieve its intentions (Page 2006).

For instance, high energy use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, adverse societal effects and uneasy way of developing policies, executing and assessment predicaments from the energy industry saw Tanaka (2011) survey 300 policies across countries and came up with 570 measures that governments later on implemented. This is due to the fact that climate change caused by emissions from industrialized North is a global problem requiring the cooperation of all countries to be addressed effectively (Winkler, Spalding-Fecher, mwakasonda & Davidson, 2002). These measures were strategies climate change was mitigated through enhancing energy efficiency and conservation in the energy industry (Tanaka, 2011). On the other hand, social policies in Greece resulted to financial crisis, unemployment, job security, income reduction, poverty and increase in mental disorders among other consequences (Ifanti, Argyriou, Kalofonou & Kalofonos, 2013). The aftermath austerity measures greatly improved social services, health care and health promotion. Such kind of measures from the government attempts to manage the scale of political and economic manoeuvres (Gamlen, 2006).

The European social policy which enumerates a number of social field (employment, labour law and working conditions; social security; vocational training; collective bargaining and right of association) in the treaty of Rome was termed to have a considerable ambiguity (Majone, 1993). This prompted for member cooperation and application of a number of principles among them the application of the principle that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work. German health care reform policies of 1970s were an illustration of how such kind of government design could exert a decisive impact on the structure of the policy field culminating in unexpected legislative success for the federal government (Dohler, 1995).

Fundamental policy lines issues can develop from the attempt to formulate policy measures through details of the whole legislation framework and comparing practices from among different

jurisdictions (Page, 2006). The European Union found out that quasi-legal measures contributed to the development of legislation and aided in the understanding of the complex antitrust rules developed through individual decisions and case laws (Cosma & Whish, 2003).

## **2.0 Issue: Principles.**

### **2.1 Question one: How does cross-national spreaders contributes to the origins of policy? 2.2 Question two: How does cross-sectoral spreaders contributes to the origins of policy?**

As cross-sectoral and cross-national spreaders and generalizers of policy initiatives, principles emerge to be a powerful origin of policies (Page, 2006). Originating from the US and UK, NPM model of governance has not only spread to other capitalist states but has also been embraced by developing and transitional countries. In various degrees, the principles of market competition, business management, customer orientation and value-for-money can be observed in these countries (Haque, 2004). Policies are spread through policy transfer or learning from another jurisdiction in which the policy is working (Page, 2006). Here, an understanding of how the policy works is needed, lessons drawing, highlighting requirements through prospective evaluation of the policy to work and possibly apply the lessons. Managed care in US that was in response to spiraling healthcare costs and dysfunctional fragmented services attracted attention in Europe (Fairfield, Hunter, Mechanic & Rosleff, 1997). In this concept, parallels have been drawn in United State and Britain especially in limiting costs without compromising quality besides apparent differences in health policies between the two jurisdictions and growing similarities.

Cross-national spreader is crucial in the origin of policies through labels which tend to travel best across jurisdictions (Page, 2006). For instance, the concept of sustainability has received much attention around the world since the publication of “Our Common Future” by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987. Since then countries have institutionalized sustainability principles and policy with the view of implementing sustainable development actions (Page, 2006).

Cross-sectoral spreader plays crucial role in the development of policies particularly in sending powerful signals to policy makers and officials involved in drafting policies especially in the scenario of policy lines, practices and measures are in tandem with those principles that have a political support (Page, 2006). Political competition and particularly the extent to which active social policy can be used for credit claiming purposes help us understand the peculiar cross-national pattern of social policy reorientation (Bonoli, 2013).

A principle that is linked well with the political class is able to marshal necessary support of parliamentary time and resources hence in due process giving cue to the drafters at lower levels in the hierarchy (Page, 2006). Party groups in the European Parliament have identifiable and differentiated positions on multiple issues that range from legislative activity to decision-making hence the assembly playing the role of gatekeepers to legislative amendments and the vast bulk of interruptive and procedural motions (McElroy and Benoit, 2007). The labour government’s theme

of modernization in UK was decisive in securing its place on the parliament timetable (Page, 2006). A number of European countries have adopted paid child care leaves and allowances policies since they were politically attractive to center-right governments seeking to fight unemployment and containing child spending (Morgan and Zippel, 2003)

### **3.0 Activities: Policies Without Agendas**

#### **3.1 Question one: How does non-decision activities lead to origin of policies?**

#### **3.2 Question two: How does Street-level bureaucracy enhance policy making?**

Policies could be emerging without ever being consciously deliberated on (Page, 2006). The reason could be what the Elitist theorists' term as actors in the process have a capacity to keep issues off the agenda that they control therefore manipulating the dominant community values, myths and political institutions and procedures (Kamuzora, 2006). Activities can be sources of policy through club regulation, non-decision and street level bureaucracy (Page, 2006). Non-decision manifests in four broad forms: inaction or quashing of such initiatives; exercise of power; appeal to the existing bias of the system; and prevailing dominant ideology (Kamuzora, 2006). Power exercise activities – real or anticipated power of an individual, organization or a group - can be an origin of policy in the sense that they have the capability to determine the possibility of what item see the light of the political agenda (Page, 2006). The powerful may exercise power through weakening of organized groups by intimidation and cooptation and threats of sanctions against any initiator hence suffocating the demands (Kamuzora, 2006).

Policy can emerge out of inaction a situation which implies to the absence of policies or failure to correct misguided actions hence leading to societal and economic policies (Braat, and Ten Brink, 2010). External factors such as cooperate powers and the performance of the economy leads to inaction form of activities that translates to policy making (Page, 2006). When by chance given demands gain admission into the political agenda, they are destroyed in the implementation stage through bureaucratic and procedural delays, underfunding or passing laws but not rolling them out (Kamuzora, 2006). Although the reproductive health of young Indonesian was known to be at risk and a remedy policy quickly passed, having faced with the risk of regional separatism and competing politico-religious influences, the Indonesian government retreated to the safety of inaction in this area of policy (Utomo, and McDonald, 2009).

Policies can originate outside the spheres of deliberative and legitimacy policy making bodies through street level bureaucrats – decision rules (Page, 2006). Street level bureaucrats have a considerable amount of power and autonomy to formulate policies (Hudson, 1989). According to Hudson, street level technocrats having power via discretion at hand will end up making policies in circumstances which are not of their own choosing and which impel them to devise strategies to protect their working environment.

Street level bureaucrats have a considerable autonomy from their employing agency that enable them to formulate rule and regulations to navigate through the dilemma of working at the sharp end of resource allocation in a situation where demand exceeds supply (Hudson, 1989). Activities of policy making by street level bureaucrats are high in situations of minimum organizational control as it plays an influential role in deciding the awarding of benefits and services to clients seeking public assistance (Scott, 1997). Activities which tended to portray public bureaucrats as villains, resistant to managerial and political control and at fault for frustrating policy goals also form the basis of the origins of policies (Brodkin, 2012).

## References

- Bonoli, G. (2013). *The origins of active social policy: Labour market and childcare policies in a comparative perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Braat, L., & Ten Brink, P. (2010). The cost of policy inaction. In *The case of not meeting the*.
- Brodkin, E. Z. (2012). Reflections on street-level bureaucracy: past, present, and future. *Public Administration Review*, 72(6), 940-949.
- Cosma, H.A., & Whish, R. (2003). Soft law in the field of EU competition policy. *Eur. Bus. L. R.*, 14, 25.
- Dohler, M. (1995). The state of architect of political order: political dynamics in German health care. *Governance*, 8(3), 380-404.
- Engelstein, L. (1995). Soviet policy toward male homosexuality: Its origins and historical roots. *Journal of homosexuality*, 29(2-3), 155-178.
- Fairfield, G., Hunter, D. J., Mechanic, D., & Rosleff, F. (1997). Managed care: origins, principles, and evolution. *Bmj*, 314(7097), 1823.
- Gamlén, A. (2006). Diaspora engagement policies: what are they and what kinds of state that use them?
- Haque, M. S. (2004). New public management: Origins, dimensions, and critical implications. *Public administration and public policy*, 1, 126.
- Harding, R. (2006). Ecologically sustainable development: origins, implementation and challenges. *Desalination*, 187(1-3), 229-239.
- Hudson, B. (1989). Michael Lipsky and street level bureaucracy: a neglected perspective. *Disability and dependency*, 41-52.
- Ifanti, A.A., Argyriou, A.A., Kalofonou, F. H., & Kalofonos, H. P. (2013). Financial crisis and austerity measures in Greece: their impact on health promotion policies and public health care. *Public Health* 113(1-2), 8-12.

---

Kamuzora, P. (2006). Non-decision making in occupational health policies in developing countries. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 12(1), 65-71.

Majone, G. (1993). The European Community between social policy and social regulation. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31(2), 153-170.

Morgan, K. J., & Zippel, K. (2003). Paid to care: The origins and effects of care leave policies in Western Europe. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 10(1), 49-85.

Nash, G. D (1960). Franklin D. Roosevelt and labor the world war 1 origins of early new policy. *Labor and History*, 1(1), 39-52.

Page, E. C. (2006). The origins of policy. *The Oxford handbook of public policy*, 207-227.

Scocpol, T. & Amenta, E. (1986). States and social policies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 131-157.

Scott, P. G. (1997). Assessing determinants of bureaucratic discretion: An experiment in street-level decision making. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(1), 35-58.

Utomo, I. D., & McDonald, P. (2009). Adolescent reproductive health in Indonesia: contested values and policy inaction. *Studies in family planning*, 40(2), 133-146.

Tanaka, K. (2011). Review of policies and measures of energy efficiency in industry sector. *Energy policy*, 39(10), 6532-6550.

Winkler, H., Spalding-Fecher, R., mwakasonda, S., & Davidson, O. (2002). Sustainable development policies and measures. Options for Protecting the Climate; *World Resource Institute*: Washington, DC, USA.

---

## **Task: Analysis of the Theories of Policy Cycle**

### **1.0 Issue: Implementation**

#### **1.1 Question one: How does policy encounter failure at the implementation cycle?**

#### **1.2 Question two: How does policy instruments determine the effectiveness of policy implementation?**

Intra- and inter-organizational co-ordination problems and the interaction of field agencies with the target group are ranked as the most prominent variables account for implementation failures (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). Policy failure rests on the resistance it receives, the understanding on the policy's message or mismatch between policy and the agendas and interests of local implementers (Spillane, Reiser and Gomez, 2006). Reasonable and potentially effective programs or policies are sabotaged intentionally or accidentally or meets resistance from individuals or groups charged with its implementation hence outcome of policymaking is determined at the lowest level in the public organization (Linder and Peters, 1987).

Explanation of policy failure ranges from poor design to cognitive level of street-level bureaucrats responsible for its roll out (Spillane, Reiser and Gomez, 2006). The scholars further argue that implementation failure could be as a result of poor policy clarity or deliberate attempts to ignore or sabotage policy. Jann and Wegrich, (2007) on the other hand acknowledge that unsuccessful policy implementation could not only be the result of bad implementation, but also bad policy design based on wrong assumption about cause effect relationship. A policy is crippled at birth by ignoring to formulate a program which has any possibilities of being successful (Linder and Peters, 1987). Linder and Peters (1987) lists these causes of failure to be excessive ambition, misunderstanding of the nature of the problem hence to whatever reason the solution chosen simply do not correspond with the problems ostensibly being addressed.

It is important for policy makers to consider policy instruments that can be employed to meet targets that may eventually be forthcoming (Starvins, 1997). Policies work by bringing together the resources of government – money, rules and authority – into the service of political objectives and also using those resources to influence the actions of individuals and institutions (McDonnell and Elmore, 1987). Instruments also are more effective in carrying out a policy in some contexts than others due to their varying degrees of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, legitimacy and partisan support, and changes in a particular situation affects their appropriateness (Howlett, 1991). Therefore, need to pay attention to the relationship between tool selection and policy implementation as different policy instruments are vulnerable to specific types of implementation problems with regulatory policies being aligned with control problems and subsidies with windfall gains on the side of the target group (Jann and Wegrich, 2007).

Government instruments are co-owned by many actors, various actors should be consulted at the actual formulation, choice, policy design, policy implementation and consequently in the actual



handling of a policy instrument as their discretion to interpret the instrument will shape its actual contents and effects (Skjærseth and Wettestad, 2016). Rentier (2002) contends that political-institutional capacity is expected to be high, that is, the willingness of involved actors to participate in a decision-making process that shapes the instrument and to politically support the introduction of the instrument.

## **2.0 Issue: Problem recognition and problem definitions.**

### **2.1 Question one: How is agenda setting a political process?**

### **2.2 Question two: How does a given regime influence agenda-setting?**

Actors within and outside the government constantly seek to influence and collectively shape the agenda (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). They compete fiercely and fight to earn their issues' places among all other issues sharing the limited space on the agenda or to prepare for the time when a crisis makes their issues more likely to occupy a more prominent space on the agenda (Birkland, 2017). Some actors are capable of managing to keep off items from the political agenda Page (2006) while others through public support are able to force the governments to place an issue on the systemic agenda (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). Even after an issue has gained attention, the actors must fight to ensure that their depiction of the issue remains in the forefront and that their preferred approaches to the problem are those that are most actively considered (Birkland, 2017).

The most crucial step in the process of agenda-setting is the move of an issue from its recognition up to the formal political agenda (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). This is due to the fact that political power has the ability to prevent some types of issues from ever becoming issues and also in obstructing the growth of emergent issues especially those that threaten the status quo (Kessler, 1990). Some issues are likely to reach the agenda because of bias of the political system allows them to be raised while others are according to the bias of the system are unfit for political consideration (Birkland, 2017). Therefore, seeking to influence the policies and above all agendas, have to convince one audience above all which has disproportionate influence on the policy process – the political members of the core executive (Page, 2006).

In liberal democracies, the actual agenda-setting is characterized by different patterns in terms of actor composition and the role of the public for instance specific professional communities with the help of the media (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). The power of the news media to set the nation's agenda to focus public attention on a few key public issues, is an immense and well documented influence (McCombs, 2002). McCombs further argues that, not only do the members of the public acquire factual information about public affairs, but also learn how importance to attach to the topic on the basis of the emphasis placed on it in the news. In setting the public agenda, the news media influence the salience or prominence of that small number of issues that come to command public attention (McCombs, 1997). The repeated media exposure causes the public to deem a topic important and allows it to transfer from media agenda to public agenda (Fortunato and Martin,

2016). Therefore, elements prominent on the media agenda become prominent in the public mind (McCombs, 2002).

Knowledge from key expertise is a key commodity in agenda setting whereby knowledge underpins the new understandings that can play a central role in (re)framing both old and new issues hence enabling actors to expand and contract issues by using epistemic goods to define the alternative that matter (Dunlop, 2016). A reason agenda setting in the recent past is stressing on the role of ideas expressed in public and professional discourses in shaping the perception a particular problem (Jann and Wegrich, 2007). In USA, commissions of experts are formed to produce reports geared towards diagnosing problems and prescribing remedies (Tepper, 2004).

### **3.0 Issue: Policy Formulation and Decision-Making.**

#### **3.1 Question one: How does policy networks enhance policy formulation?**

#### **3.2 Question two: How does multiple actors contribute towards policy stability?**

Network approach recognizes the over-lapping and simultaneous manner in which different issues within the one policy community can be addressed by different networks operating at different scales and over time (Dredge, 2006). This explains therefore the view of Jann and Wegrich (2007) that governments and higher civil servants are inseparable from the wider society when formulating policies hence constantly interacting with social actors that results to the formation of rather staple relationship commonly known as policy networks. Through policy networks, the policy entrepreneurs find an appropriate avenue to manipulate police networks resources to achieve their objective of selling their policy ideas (Mintrom and Vergari, 1998).

A policy network consists of a group of actors who share an interest in some policy area and who are linked by their direct and indirect contacts who form a milieu from which policy ideas emerge and gain attention (Mintrom and Vergari, 1998). As Fowler (2000) argues they are loose national organizations which coordinate a wide range of efforts to influence policy. Policy network theory recognizes that different levels of political support can exist for different policy issues, a reason some issues receive more or less attention (Dredge, 2006). The attention issues receive, depends on the policy network's beliefs and motivations, their judgments on feasibility and their perception of the political context goes a long way toward explaining the public policies that take shape (Sidney, 2017).

Multiplicity of approaches in policy formulation is crucial in the sense that the set decision rules may routinely fail to achieve the optimal choice (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk and Clerkin, 2009). Policy makers are required to employ multiple approaches as a way of providing basic facts to draw both practical and explanatory conclusion in formulating policies (Hunter and Schmidt, 1996). Therefore, this stage of policy formulation and decision-making cycle is theory oriented to for the purpose of giving account for different styles, patterns and outcomes of a given policy development (Jann & Wegrich, 2007).

The garbage Can approach – is characterized by lack of structure and absence of clear immediate goals - policies emerge from pre-established solutions to problems located in a “garbage can” (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin and Cardy, 2008). Kingdom argues that the model is superior as it explains non-incremental policy change through a classification scheme of problems and solutions that are logically related to political and institutional variables so that middle-level propositions is achieved (Mucciaroni, 1992). Charles Lindblom posits that policymaking inevitably proceeds incrementally (Coglianese and D'Ambrosio, 2007). The model dictates that administrative decision making should involve public participation, public administration should be based on the development of political coalitions and political consensus and should allow non-expert political officials to give direction and exert pressure on them (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk and Clerkin, 2009). The strength of this approach is that it allows higher levels of predictability and flexibility of the already formulated policy (Timothy and Tosun, 2003).

## References

- Birkland, T. A. (2017). Agenda setting in public policy. In *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 89-104). Routledge
- Coglianese, C., & D'Ambrosio, J. (2007). Policymaking under pressure: the perils of incremental responses to climate change. *Conn. L. Rev.*, 40, 1411.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism management*, 27(2), 269-280.
- Dunlop, C. A. (2016). Knowledge, epistemic communities, and agenda setting. In *Handbook of Public Policy Agenda Setting*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fortunato, J., & Martin, S. (2016). The Intersection of Agenda-Setting, the Media Environment, and Election Campaign Laws. *Journal of Information Policy*, 6, 129-153. doi:10.5325/jinfopoli.6.2016.0129.
- Fowler, F. C. (2000). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Gomez-Mejia, D. H., Balkin, R. S., & Cardy, R. M. (2008). *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*. McGraw Hill Education
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Cumulative research knowledge and social policy formulation: The critical role of meta-analysis. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2(2), 324.
- Jann, W., & Wegrich, K. (2007). Theories of the policy cycle. *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods*, 125, 43-62.
- Kessler, M. (1990). Legal Mobilization for Social Reform: Power and the Politics of Agenda Setting. *Law & Society Review*, 24(1), 121-143. doi:10.2307/3053789.

Linder, S. H., & Peters, B. G. (1987). A design perspective on policy implementation: The fallacies of misplaced prescription. *Review of Policy Research*, 6(3), 459-475.

McCombs, M. (2002, June). The agenda-setting role of the mass media in the shaping of public opinion. In *Mass Media Economics 2002 Conference, London School of Economics*: <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/extra/McCombs.pdf>.

McCombs, M. (1997). Building consensus: The news media's agenda-setting roles. *Political Communication*, 14(4), 433-443.

McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 9(2), 133-152.

Mintrom, M., & Vergari, S. (1998). Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms. *The Journal of Politics*, 60(1), 126-148.

Mucciaroni, G. (1992). The garbage can model & the study of policy making: A critique. *Polity*, 24(3), 459-482.

Sidney, M. S. (2017). Policy formulation: design and tools. In *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 105-114). Routledge.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Gomez, L. M. (2006). Policy implementation and cognition. *New directions in educational policy implementation*, 47-64.

Skjærseth, J. B., & Wettestad, J. (2016). *EU emissions trading: initiation, decision-making and implementation*. Routledge.

Stavins, R. N. (1997). Policy instruments for climate change: how can national governments address a global problem. *U. Chi. Legal F.*, 293.

Tepper, S. J. (2004). Setting Agendas and Designing Alternatives: Policymaking and the Strategic Role of Meetings 1. *Review of Policy Research*, 21(4), 523-542.

Timothy, D. J., & Tosun, C. (2003). Appropriate planning for tourism in destination communities: Participation, incremental growth and collaboration. *Tourism in destination communities*, 181-204.

---

## **Task: Analysis of The Qualitative – Interpretive Methods in Policy Research.**

### **1.0 Issue: Reading Documents**

#### **1.1 Question one: How does document reading provide prior background information?**

#### **1.2 Question two: How does documents reading enrich the process of policy formulation?**

Documents of all types can help the researcher to uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem (Bowen, 2009). This is because all documentary sources are as a result of human activity, produced on the basis of certain ideas, theories or taken-for-granted principles and these are always located within the constraints of particular social, historical or administrative conditions and structures (Punch, 2009). Therefore, documents need to be interpreted in the right of specific factors involved in their production and context - personal, social, political and historical relationships (McCulloch, 2004). This is normally reflected when reading and analyzing these documents yields excerpts, quotations, or entire passages from records, correspondence, official reports and open-ended surveys (Labuschagne, 2003).

Document reading can provide data on the context within which research participants operate as they bear witness to the past event through the background information and historical insight they provide (Bowen, 2009). Strauss and Corbin (1990) holds similar opinion that intensive reading of documents produce rich description of a single phenomenon, event, organization or program. They provide supplementary research data thereby becoming valuable additions to a knowledge base (Bowen, 2009). It is more usual to find that new data are collected in the process of reading the documents available (Ritchie and Spencer, 2002). Reading of documents provide a means of tracking change and development hence getting a clear picture of how an organization or a program fared over time (Bowen, 2009). An argument by Payne and Payne (2004) reading of newspaper for instance helps to explore various issues as well as throwing light on the connections between coverage and public perceptions like popular misconceptions about women's roles; rising crime rates or the size of ethnic minorities.

Policy makers read documents specially to grasp the first accounts of an individual's actions, experiences, beliefs and official ongoing activities of an organization (O'Leary, 2014). The policy researcher is able to understand what transpired to the creation of a given policy, contributions from a myriad of actors, subsequent behaviors and activities after the implementation of the knowledge. Bowen (2005) document reviews is key especially in providing information on history, goals, objectives, enrolments, and substantive content.

According to Percy, Kostere and Kostere (2015) sometimes, the other more focused approaches (ethnography, case study, grounded theory, or phenomenology) are not appropriate for one reason or another in getting people's attitudes, opinions, or beliefs about a particular issue or experience.

This compels the researcher to seek for pre-knowledge or pre-understanding on the topic or program that was long rolled out (Percy, Kostere and Kostere, 2015). The documentary interpretation presupposes a change in analytic stance which is different from common sense. It is the change from the question of what social reality is in the perspective of the actors, to the question how this reality is produced or accomplished in these actors' everyday practice (Bohnsack, 2010).

## **1.0 Issue: Interviews**

### **1.1 Question one: what are the concerns of the interviewer in policy research?**

### **1.2 Question two: By use of interviews, what are the contributions of elite and non-elite actors in policy research?**

Much of the research carried out in the policy field has a strategic component as in most cases policy-makers research into attitudes, behaviours and experiences because they wish to inform their policy decisions (Ritchie and Spencer, 2002). The interpretive interviewer is interested in understanding how those he is talking to make sense their lived experiences (Yanow, 2006). Interviews are crucial in any research because they offer information into actions of which we know little about such as policy decisions that are out of the media and public eye (Richards, 1996). The interview offers further insight into the inner webs of politics and into the roles, views, interactions and responses of political heavyweights. Evidence shows that interviews are valuable means of eliciting views from participants if given an appropriate question (Heary and Hennessy, 2002).

Interviews are important and often essential tools for understanding contemporary political actions and outcomes from which public policies emerge (Mosley, 2013). Interviews form the basis of obtaining expert knowledge or elite opinions and political positions, as far as a given policy is concerned (Fedyuk and Zentai, 2018). Interviews form a platform for the policy-makers Heary and Hennessy (2002) to employ interviews to see the world from the participant's perspective hence subsequently understanding their opinions of a program, event, or service, to explore the rationale behind people's thoughts or behaviors, or to facilitate the expression of people's perceptions of a certain phenomenon in an open, free and relaxed format. This forms the basis upon which the policy-makers identify underlying motivations, patterns and explanations that will enable them to develop strategies for change (Ritchie and Spencer, 2002).

Elite interviews offer a rich, cost-effective vehicle for generating unique data to investigate the complexities of policy and politics (Beamer, 2002). Elite interviews can give substance and meaning to prior analyses of institutions, structures, rule-making, or procedural controls (Hochschild, 2009). Richards (1996) holds same views that elite interviews are often the most effective way to obtain information about decision-makers and the decision-making process. Interviewing the elites is crucial due to the fact that they form agents of different rationality who in most cases succeed to influence the public awareness through the media (Littig, 2009)

Through interviews, essential data is gathered on the informal behaviors that lead to political outcomes (Mosley, 2013). Interviewees are considered to be experts and therefore their input are useful in the development of programs and services (Heary and Hennessy, 2002). Interviews with non-elite factors provide information that benefit policy-makers hence positioning them to make relevant decisions (Lavis, Davies, Oxman, Denis, Golden-Biddle and Ferlie, 2005). From an interpretive research perspective, especially informed by critical theory, non-elite actors have been identified to be playing a critical role in shaping policies (Yanow, 2006).

### **3.0 Issue: Action research.**

#### **3.1 Question one: How does action research become an avenue for understanding policy research?**

#### **3.2 Question two: What does action research comprise of in public policy?**

An increase use of action research has been orchestrated by the expansion of policy and program evaluation in order to provide an understanding how programs and policies work in practice and the processes and factors that lead to success or failure (Ritchie, Lewis Nicholls and Ormston, 2013). This approach according to Comfort (1985) may prove more useful since it takes into account the dynamic nature of organization, emphasizing the production of valid information, the element of free and informed choice by organization members, and the goal of engendering commitment to action by those involved.

According to Yanow (2006) action research is employed particularly to discover what works and what does not work in public policy. The presentation of information in the form consequences is an effective technique for aiding policy-makers in the formulation of policy, and for helping the man in the street to choose between different policy alternative (Cochrane, 1949). Therefore, this approach is used more often to provide an enlightenment or knowledge for understanding what is needed for nature of the problem, social policy concerns and appraisal of those policies once implemented (Ritchie, Lewis Nicholls and Ormston, 2013).

Action research is a collaborative, critical and self-inquiry by practitioners into a major problem or issue or concern in their own practice (Zuber-Skerritt, 2003). This method involves consumers of the policy throughout the research process across problem identification, design, data collection, analysis, and application of the research findings (Ozanne, Saatcioglu and Deighton (2008). The approach forges research alliances with relevant stakeholders in the community to explore and develop solutions to local problems (Ozanne and Anderson, 2010). Therefore, public policy issues need more than the platitudes of politicians, more than the prejudicial arguments of special interests, and more than the informed opinions of the public-spirited individuals (Cochrane, 1949). This justifies the arguments of Comfort (1985) that in the action research model, the objectives are very clear as the motive is to produce valid information; to create the opportunity for free and

informed choice by the participants in the process; and to foster an internal commitment to action by the participants.

Cochrane (1949) it is imperative for a given policy or program may be good in one context and a positive evil in another or may have beneficial effects in one period and work havoc in another. Further Zuber-Skerritt (2003) posits that these practitioners own the problem and feel responsible and accountable for solving it in teamwork through strategic planning, action, observation and evaluation. Lewin (1946) on the other hand contends that there should exist a greater amount of good-will, readiness to face the problem squarely and the urge of seeking the solution among the said practitioners. This is the reason Comfort (1985) insist the use of action research to create opportunities for individual participants to engage in reexamination of their basic assumptions so that they may invent new meanings more congruent to actual conditions.

## References

- Beamer, G. (2002). Elite Interviews and State Politics Research. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 2(1), 86-96. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40421450>
- Bohnsack, R. (2010). Documentary Method and Group Discussions. In Bohnsack R., Pfaff N., & Weller W. (Eds.), *Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method: In International Educational Research* (pp. 99-124). Opladen; Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvbkjvmn.7>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Cochrane, W. (1949). Research in Public Policy. *Journal of Farm Economics*, 31(1), 700-711. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1232894>.
- Fedyuk, O., & Zentai, V. (2018). The Interview in Migration Studies: A Step towards a Dialogue and Knowledge Co-production? In *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies* (pp. 171-188). Springer, Cham.
- Heary, C. M., & Hennessy, E. (2002). The use of focus group interviews in pediatric health care research. *Journal of pediatric psychology*, 27(1), 47-57
- Hochschild, J. L. (2009). Conducting intensive interviews and elite interviews. In *Workshop on interdisciplinary standards for systematic qualitative research*. National Science Foundation.
- Lavis, J., Davies, H., Oxman, A., Denis, J. L., Golden-Biddle, K., & Ferlie, E. (2005). Towards systematic reviews that inform health care management and policy-making. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 10(1\_suppl), 35-48.



Littig, B. (2009). Interviewing the elite—Interviewing experts: Is there a difference? In *Interviewing experts* (pp. 98-113). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative research-airy fairy or fundamental? *The qualitative report*, 8(1), 100-103.

Mosley, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Interview research in political science*. Cornell University Press.

Ozanne, J., & Anderson, L. (2010). Community Action Research. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 29(1), 123-137. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20798402>.

Ozanne, J., Saatcioglu, B., & John Deighton (2008). Participatory Action Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(3), 423-439. doi:10.1086/586911

Payne, G., & Payne, J. (2004). *Key concepts in social research*. Sage.

Percy, W. H., Kostere, K., & Kostere, S. (2015). Generic qualitative research in psychology. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(2), 76-85.

Punch, K. F., (2009). *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Richards, D. (1996). Elite interviewing: Approaches and pitfalls. *Politics*, 16(3), 199-204.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. sage.

Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (2002). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. *The qualitative researcher's companion*, 573(2002), 305-29.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Sage publications.

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (Ed.). (2003). *New directions in action research*. Routledge.

---

## **Task: Analysis of Deliberative Policy Analysis.**

### **1.0 Issue: Policy as argument.**

**1.1 Question one: How does a policy analyst work in complex organizations structured by political processes?**

**1.2 Question two: How does policy analyst forge a working relationship in the course of policy making?**

The civil service may shape and influence policy, but they cannot be described as policy-makers since this is the domain of the political heads of civil service departments, cabinet ministers individually and the legislature and political executive collectively (Thakur and Weiss, 2009). In these circumstances policy analysts are or have to become political actors whether they wish or not since the act of confronting messy issues involving diverse populations with multiple and conflicting interests demands such a balance in the technical and the political components for the successful accomplishment of any policy assignment (Fischer, 2006).

Hajer (2003) argue that politics and policy making are not simply about finding solutions for pressing problems, but are as much about finding formats that generate trust among mutually interdependent actors. According to Fischer (2003) Policy ideas form the arguments that favor different ways of seeing and relating to social problems therefore their evaluation must include an assessment of their transformational impact on the thought and deliberations of the political community. The call for their evaluation could therefore justify Aninat, Londregan, Navia and Vial (2006) argument that a large number of public policies carry very heavy political costs in the short term which in the long-term yield enormous benefits.

Organizational networking is worth of paying into account if at all the policy analyst wants to build a good rapport with other actors in matters to do with policy (Fischer, 2006). O'Toole, (1997) is of the same perspective that successful program implementation, at least in some fields, requires a recognition that networks are important but do not inevitably develop to fulfill implementation requirements. For instance, in the European community, the policy network framework helped to recognize the role of actor interdependencies and chains that allowed environmental NGOs to play an influential role in the context of the Regional Fund reforms. On the other hand, in Korea and Taiwan, personal and institutional networking was identified to be a powerful tool for expatriating experts who preferred working overseas (Song, 2003). Song further noticed that a well-designed and properly maintained network provides a forum and helps to foster a sense of belonging among these innovators hence reinforcing their loyalty to their homeland.

Multilevel governance and partnership in policy formulation and implementation is a priority to European Union which not only enabled it to operationalize European Regional Development Fund, but also gave subnational governmental institutions and other societal actors a say in the formulation and implementation of regional policy schemes that were co-financed by EU's

structural funds (Conzelmann, 1995). Hence according to Hajer, Hajer, Wagenaar, Goodin and Barry (2003) stakeholder in a policy dialogue must be diverse in order to take full advantage of the creativity that can come from trying to find actions that can respond to a wide set of competing interests.

## **2.0 Issue: Technocratic policy analysis.**

### **2.1 Question one: How does technocratic policy analysis exhibit some limitation?**

### **2.2 Question two: How does technocratic policy analysis has successfully sidestepped the partisan goal and value conflicts associated with policy issues?**

Fischer (2006) argues that despite the devotion of a large amount of time, money, and energy to technocratic policy analysis, it has confronted considerable difficulty in supplying policy decision makers with the kinds of problem-oriented knowledge that was expected from policy analysis. Similarly, this concedes with Dryzek (2006) argument that technocratic policy analysis often proceeds from its own frame of reference which may embody values different from those of policy makers. Further Dryzek argues that the model assumes that the key contribution to analysis is to improve the condition of the world is by enlightening those in positions of power for them to better manipulate social systems. These sentiments are in contrast to critical analysis which specifies that the key task of analysis is to enlighten those suffering at the hands of power in the interests of actions on their part to escape suffering (Dryzek, 2006).

The model also implicitly assumes an omniscient and benevolent decision maker untroubled by politics (Majone, 1989). Contends that technocratic regimes privilege the elite while marginalizing those of the general public (McKenna and Graham, 2000). The general public in this model lacks technical knowledge and also face an inability to communicate in the formalized jargon-heavy language of the technocrats (Longly, 2001). Policy-analytic techniques in technocratic analysis are not detached or neutral devices but indeed they are imbedded in a political process therefore in choosing any technique, it is imperative to consider in influencing the wider political life (Torgerson, 1986).

Technocratic analysis seeks to translate political and social issues into technically defined ends to be accomplished through administrative ends (Fischer, 2007). Therefore, the culmination of a dialectical process of organizational rationalization, technocracy transcends and integrates earlier forms of organizational control, particularly technical control, bureaucratic control, and professional control (Burris, 1989). This will lead to a good rapport among the participants and therefore reaching into a consensus.

Generally, technocratic organizations have been characterized by a flattening of bureaucratic hierarchies, a substitution of expertise for rank position as the primary basis of authority, a de-emphasis on internal job ladders in favour of external credentialing and credential barriers, flexible configurations of centralization/decentralization and among other organizational changes (Burris,

1989). This is in pursuit to bring about flexibility and harmony among the actors that are involved in the formulation of public policies.

### **3.0 Issue: The argumentative turn.**

#### **3.1 Question one: What is the role of language in policy formulation?**

#### **3.2 Question two: Why deliberative interaction is emphasized in policy making process?**

The argumentative turn begins with the realization public policy, constructed through language, is the product of argumentation (Hajer, Hoppe and Jennings, 1993). Argumentative analysis holds that language is a key feature of any policy process and thus as a necessary key component of policy analysis (Gottweis, 2006). They further argue that language does more than reflecting what is taken to be reality, constitute reality and shape what we understand to be reality. In both oral and written form, Majone (1989) argues argument is central in all stages of the policy process.

This is because policy making is fundamentally an ongoing discursive struggle over the definition and conceptual framing of frames, the public understanding of the issues, the shared meanings that motivate public responses and criteria for evaluation (Stone, 2002). Language is recognized as a medium, a system signification through which the actors not simply describe but create the world (Hajer, Hoppe and Jennings, 1993). The linguistic turn has potentially provided the policy analyst with useful new tools to analyze how certain relations of dominance are structured and reproduced (Hajer, Hoppe and Jennings, 1993). Argumentative analysis focuses on the crucial role of language, rhetorical argument and stories in framing debate as well as on structuring the deliberative context in which policy is made (Fischer, 2007).

Deliberative policy analysis has proved to be appropriate especially in the contemporary networked forms of governance that downplay the role of sovereign authority in policy making (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003). Deliberative practitioner seeks to represent a wider range of interests, arguments and discourses in the analytical process thereby helping decision makers and citizens develop alternatives that speak to their own needs and interests rather than those defined and shaped for them by others (Fischer, 2007). Policy initiatives now form the basis of a truly political debate in which people reflect on their identities, exchange views with others and can indeed come to some sort of collective will formation (Hajer, 2003).

Deliberative interaction focuses on the way people and even their opponents reach and justify mutually acceptable decisions (Hajer, Hoppe and Jennings, 1993). This is in line with Torgerson (1986) that policy deliberation is an exchange of pros and cons of particular solutions and is concerned with understanding the different viewpoints from which the various claims are made. Hajer (2003) posits that deliberation policy analysis contains a negotiation of the rules of the game and a “string of moments at which people discuss and negotiate value commitments, and either discover or develop shared understandings and adherences or not. On the other hand, Fischer and Gottweis, 2012) note that for sound policy making to be affected, there should be minimal

restrictions as possible on competent participation in policy discourse and the kinds of arguments that can be advanced, normative as well as empirical.

## References

Aninat, C., Londregan, J., Navia, P., & Vial, J. (2006). Political institutions, policymaking processes, and policy outcomes in Chile. *Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank*, 1-64.

Burris, B. H. (1989). Technocratic Organization and Control. *Organization Studies*, 10(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068901000101>

Conzelmann, T. (1995). Networking and the politics of EU regional policy: Lessons from north Rhine-Westphalia, Nord-Pas de Calais and North West England. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 5(2), 134-172.

Dryzek, J. S. (2006). Policy analysis as critique. *The Oxford handbook of public policy*, 190-203.

Dryzek, J. S. (2002). Policy analysis and planning: From science to argument. In *Argument Turn Policy Anal Plan* (pp. 221-240). Routledge.

Gottweis, H. (2006). Argumentative policy analysis. *Handbook of public policy*, 461-479.

Fischer, F., & Gottweis, H. (Eds.). (2012). The argumentative turn revisited: Public policy as communicative practice. Duke University Press.

Hajer, M. A., Hoppe, R., & Jennings, B. (1993). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*. Duke University Press.

Fischer, F. (2003). Beyond empiricism: policy analysis as deliberative practice. *Deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society*, 209-227.

Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy sciences*, 36(2), 175-195.

Hajer, M., Hajer, M. A., Wagenaar, H., Goodin, R. E., & Barry, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Deliberative policy analysis: understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge University Press.

McKenna, B., J., & Graham, P. (2000). Technocratic discourse: A primer, *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 30(3), 219-247.

O'Toole, L. J. (1997). Networking requirements, institutional capacity, and implementation gaps in transitional regimes: the case of acidification policy in Hungary. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4(1), 1-17.

Song, H. Z. (2003). Networking Lessons from Taiwan and South Korea. *United Nations Public Administration Network (UNPAC)*. Url: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/apcity/unpan022359.pdf>.



Thakur, R., & Weiss, T. G. (2009). United Nations “Policy”: An argument with three illustrations. *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(1), 18-35.

Torgerson, D. (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy sciences*, 19(1), 33-59.

---

## **Task: Analysis of Street-Level Bureaucracy.**

### **1.0 Implementation of policy.**

#### **1.2 Question one: How does street-level bureaucrats mold policy?**

#### **1.3 Question two: Why should policy formulation be centered on implementation?**

Organizations do not innovate or implement change, individuals do (McLaughlin, 1987). Street-level bureaucrats with their knowledge and power enables them to act autonomously and mold policy outcomes (Sutton, 1999). Through their interactions with citizens, utilizing discretion, they have the capacity to shape public policy on the spot (Lipsky, 2010). Large and small, street-level bureaucrats may slowly mold their culture, routines, and authority relations around the exigencies of a particular policy (Moynihan and Soss, 2014). This explains why policy cannot always mandate what matters to outcomes at the local level since street-level bureaucrats' incentives and beliefs are central (McLaughlin, 1987). Moynihan and Soss (2014) reinforces these sentiments by suggesting that actors at all levels of administration use their discretion in ways that remake policy and help explain policy effects.

As the policy becomes more explicit, existing actors become aware of threats to their turf and they act to limit the scope and range of proposed policy changes to maintain existing patterns of bureaucratic power and structure (Midland, 1995). And fact that central actors do not act in detail or intervene in most cases (Midland, 1995) institutional structure, the available resources and the access to implementing arena affect policy outcomes. Policy implementation process creates a new reality and changes the system leading to unanticipated problems or counter-cyclical consequences end up emerging (McLaughlin, 1987). Linder and Peters (1987) are of similar opinion that much of the literature seemingly has tacitly accepted the proposition that the outcome of policymaking is determined at the lowest - street level – in public organizations.

Policy is effectively determined by the interaction of the formulation and implementation machineries (Linder and Peters, 1987). In fact, when the goals of policy formulators and implementers greatly differ, flexibility and autonomy associated with street-level bureaucrats may lead to policies which result in lower performance on official goals (Midland, 1995). Something Weatherly and Lipsky (1977) contends that the lowest levels of policy chain are regarded as the makers of the policy while the higher level of decision making is perceived as circumscribing policy. This corresponds to Lipsky (2010) exposure of difficulties associated in implementing public policy and disconnect between the legislature's intended goals and eventual policy outcomes.

Policy formulation becomes disciplined by the prospects of failure (Linder and Peters, 1987). The logic of policy implementation has been extended to say that policy formulation should be oriented around implementation due to the fact that the practice is used to explain the success or failure of a number of policy interventions (Linder and Peters, 1987). This justifies Midland (1995) views that the implementation process not only provides an opportunity to learn new methods, it also an

opportunity to reach new goals. As Linder and Peters (1987) argues, implementation cannot be taken for granted in a complex policymaking environment as the ease of implementation is the best criterion for judging good policy. Something that Midland (1995) sheds lighter by postulating that implementation should be a phase where principles and visions as well as technological knowledge are tested.

## **2.0 Issue: Work environment**

### **2.1 Question one: How does street-level bureaucrats and citizen interaction change policy?**

### **2.2 Question two: How does work environment lead to policy change by street-level workers?**

Street-level officials are the ones who have to deal with ordinary members of the public on a daily basis in offering public services hence these citizen-official interactions take place outside the formal and protective environment of an office that is difficult to monitor (Crook and Aye, 2006). It is from this backdrop street-level bureaucrats through their interaction with citizens, utilizing discretion, they have the capacity to shape public policy on the spot, which can directly impact the lives of citizens (Lipsky, 2010). This is the reason street-level bureaucrats are conceived as inventive strategists seeking technical, social, and moral capacity and sophistication as well as strategic success in negotiating ambiguous work settings (Moore, 1987). To achieve this, they will end up routinizing procedures, modifying goals, rationing services, asserting priorities, and limiting or controlling clientele in pursuit of accommodating the demands placed upon them and also as on way of confronting limited resources (Weatherly and Lipsky, 1977).

McLaughlin (1987) the environment as the most serious source of difficulties as it is deemed to exert a direct influence over policy determination. Implementers at all levels of the system effectively negotiate their response, fitting their action to the multiple demands, priorities, and values operating in their environment and the effective authority of the policy itself (Linder and Peters, 1987). Upon recruitment, street-level bureaucrats find the work environment overwhelming and therefore conditions them the way they perceive problems and also in framing their solutions (Lipsky, 2010). Lipsky arguments concurs Evans & Harris (2004) that perception of these bureaucrats could be informed by important professional attributes, an opportunity for professional abuse of power and a cloak for political decision-makers to hide behind.

Frontline workers have been labeled as policy makers not policy takers (Vedung, 2015) argues that the decisions of street-level bureaucrats, the routines the routines, and the devices they invent to cope up with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out. It is not always the laws written by legislatures, rather the daily decisions of street-level bureaucrats through their interactions with clients, which become public policy (Lipsky, 2010). This is evidenced in accommodations and coping mechanisms whereby street-level bureaucrats are free to develop patterns of behavior which become the government program that is delivered to the public (Weatherly and Lipsky, 1977). For instance, Fineman (1998) observed that while on social construction of environmental control, inspectors constructed their own ethical orders of practice that were either reflecting or not reflecting on the official line.



The art of reshaping policy by front-line workers is what makes Erasmus (2014) to conclude that street-level are those workers with some discretion over which services are offered, how they are offered and the benefits and sanctions allocated to citizens. Meyers, Vorsanger, Peters and Pierre (2007) observes that some literature describe street-level bureaucrats as self-interested individuals whose coping mechanisms frustrate the will of elected officials. This attribute was reflected in the efforts by US state bureaucrats to adapt and entrench a science policy innovation for wetland management into regulatory practice (Arnold, 2015).

## **2.0 Complexity of policy:**

### **2.1 Why policy making is viewed as a complex endeavor?**

### **2.2 Question two: Why is it important for policy makers to involve street-level bureaucrats in policy formulation?**

Policy-making from the national level to its implementation at the local level is long and uneasy (Skill, 2008). Policy effects are complex, sometimes hidden or invisible, often unanticipated (McLaughlin, 1987). Personal interactions between clients and street-level bureaucrats are significant in explaining why street-level bureaucrats behave as they do (Keiser, 2010). Public policy is not best understood as made in legislatures or top-floor suites of high-ranking administrators rather public policy is best studied in the crowded offices and daily encounters of street level workers who represent complete picture (Bureaucracy, 1980; Lipsky, 2010). Focusing on lower-level routines through which they create policy at the point of delivery, it is possible to give greater transparency to policies that are otherwise opaque and provide a full picture of how policy is produced and experienced every day (Brodkin, 2003). Street-level leadership is useful in stressing the importance of values, relies on skills and expertise, encompasses a wide range of discretionary behaviors, and provides a framework for evaluating the appropriateness and legitimacy of discretionary choices (Vinzant and Crothers, 1996).

Bureaucrats do not gather of the necessary information to reach rational decisions, but instead make decisions when they have gathered adequate information (Keiser, 2010). This position is reinforced by Hill (2003) who argues that policy as written often fails to teach implementers what they need to know to do policy. Therefore, to understand how and why these street-level bureaucrats sometimes perform contrary to their own rules and goals, we need to know how the rules are experienced by workers in the organization, what latitude workers have in acting on their preferences, and what other pressures they experience (Bureaucracy, 1980). This could be the reason Skill (2008) argues that another way of approaching the problem, is to take the grassroots level as the point of departure.

Policy-makers find themselves under intense pressure to ensure that policy impact reflects the intended direction of change (Hudson, 1989). The burden has been transferred to street-level bureaucrats who are now under siege as their critics accuse them of being insensitive, unprepared to work, incompetent, racist and resistant to change surprisingly they insist being free of all these accusation Lipsky (1971). Something Evans and Harris (2004) are quick to locate the difficult at

the structural level specifically in defining characteristics of street-level bureaucrats work. They distance themselves from this blame on the account that they deal with resource quagmire and also in working out the practical versions of public policy that can often quite look unlike official pronouncements (Hudson, 1989).

The broad problem confronting policy makers is that they formulate policy alone and it is rarely applied directly to the external world, but is mediated through other institutions and actors hence policy impact being at risk of distortion by these mediators (Hudson, 1989). Therefore policy-makers should engage frontline workers due to differences recorded on how policy-makers are focusing on beliefs about desire for and ability to secure control and on one hand workers' ability to resist control and seek discretion (Evans and Harris, 2004).

### References.

Arnold, G. (2015). Street-level policy entrepreneurship. *Public Management Review*, 17, (3), 307-327.

Brodkin, E. Z. (2003). Street-level research: Policy at the front lines. *Policy into action: Implementation research and welfare reform*, 145-164.

Crook, R., & Ayee, J. (2006). Urban service partnership, 'street-level' and environmental sanitation in Kumasi and Accra, Ghana: coping with organizational change in the public bureaucracy. *Development Policy Review*, 24(1), 51-73

Erasmus, E. (2014). The use of street-level bureaucracy theory in health policy analysis in low-and-middle-income countries: a meta-ethnographic synthesis. *Health policy and planning*, 29(3) 70-78

Evans, T., & Harris, J. (2004). Street-level bureaucracy, social work and the (exaggerated) death of discretion. *The British Journal Social Work*, 34(6), 871-895.

Fineman, S. (1998). Street-level bureaucrats and the social construction of environmental control. *Organization Studies*, 19(6), 953-974.

Hill, H.C. (2003). Understanding implementation: Street-level bureaucrat' resources for reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(3), 265-282.

Hudson, B. (1989). Michael Lipsky and street level bureaucracy: a neglected perspective. *Disability and dependency*, 41-52.

Keiser, L. R., (2010). Understanding street-level bureaucrats' decision making: Determine eligibility in the social security disability program. *Public Administrative Review*, 70(2), 247-257.

Linder, S.H & Peters, B. G. (1987). A design perspective on policy implementation: The fallacies of misplaced prescription. *Review of Policy Research*, 6(3), 459-475.

Lipsky, M. (1971). Street-level bureaucracy and the analysis of urban reform. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 6(4), 391-409.

Midland, R. E (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 5(2), 145-147.

Meyers, M. K., Vorsanger, S., Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (2007). Street-level bureaucrats and implementation of public policy. *The handbook of public administration*, 153-163.

McLaughlin, M.W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 9(2), 171-178.

Moynihan & Soss (2014). Policy feedback and the politics of administration. *Public Administration Review*, 74(3), 320-332.

Moore, S. T. (1989). The theory of street-level bureaucracy: a positive critique. *Administrative & Society*, 19(1), 74-94

Skill, E. E., (2008). Understanding sport clubs as sport policy implementers: a theoretical framework for the analysis of the implementation of central sport policy through local and voluntary sport organization. *International review for sociology of sports*, 43(2), 181-200.

Sutton, R. (1999). *The policy process: an overview* (p. 35). London: Overseas Development Institute.

Vinzant, J., & Crothers, L. (1996). Street-level leadership: rethinking the role of public servants in contemporary governance. *The American review of public administration*, 26(4), 457-476.

Weatherly, R. & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform, *Harvard education review*, 47 (2), 171-197.

---

## **Task: Analysis of Managing Policy Networks.**

### **1.0 Issue: Constant Recruitment.**

#### **1.1 Questions 1. Why is it necessary to expand the involvement base?**

#### **1.2 Question 2. Why is it essential to share information in the networks?**

For achieving programs goals, there is need to expand network base - expertise, legal authority or funding (McGuire, 2002). These program objectives are unlikely to be achieved if the resources possessed by other actors are not incorporated in the network (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2000). It is from this backdrop Klijn (1996) argues that resources possessed by other organizations are crucial for the survival of another agency. On the other hand, Rhodes (2006) is in agreement that an organization look forward to exchange another organization's resources to be in a position to achieve its objectives. It is believed that when numerous participants come together in the form of policy networks, there is exclusive exchange of potential solutions, agency policies and programs and technologies (Agranoff, 2006). Similar sentiments are shared by Howlett (2000) that government aims and initiatives are to be successful if at all various actors are interacted to ensure general support.

Participant broadening not only educates and informs, but this kind of inclusivity helps to make adjustments to lost interagency potential, acquire potential resources and help to eliminate support and information gaps (Agranoff & Emeritus, 2003). The argument above are in line with Koppenjan & Klijn (2004) that greater dependencies have thrived among organizations as a result of an increase in specialization and dynamics in knowledge and product enhancement. Strategies from different players determine a given policy or outcome and demonstrates why dependence among actors is crucial (Klijn, Koppenjan & Termeer, 1995).

Firms are not solely responsible in solving some issues but needs input from other organizations, a reason government agency nowadays are seeking other outside firms to share the burden of cost, expertise and also in spreading risks (Koppenjan & Klijn, 2004). Many agencies strategically foresee many stumbling blocks and opportunities available within the network hence an attempt made to foster the conditions through joint actions or creating common products (Klijn, Koppenjan & Termeer, 1995). Klijn (1996) perspective that there is no single actor in the world who has amble steering prowess to determine strategic actions of the other actors (Klijn, 1996). Therefore, the links between network actors serve as communication channels and particularly for the exchange of expertise, policy resources, information and trust (Rhodes, 2006).

Governments across the world have encountered a paradox whereby despite the rich expertise, knowledge, personnel human resource among their technocrats, they have been adversely affected by trending issues like globalization democratization hence reaching out other actors to control the social outcomes that otherwise seem out of hand (Howlett, 2000). Therefore, networks not only provide a platform for acquire information as a shared resource, but also, they create an opportunity

to turn information into learning and adaption arena, extra competency development and is a commitment to a new effort brought about by mutual information processing (Agranoff, 2007).

## **2.0 Issue: Agenda Setting.**

### **2.1 Question 1: Why is it crucial to manage agenda in policy networks?**

### **2.2 Question 2: How helpful agenda setting is to the policy networks?**

Policy networks do affect policy outcomes (Marsh and Smith, 2000). Agenda setting in policy networks therefore opens an avenue for a selection between diverse problems and issues (Jann and Wegrich, 2003). Ghanem (1997) argues that agenda setting is more than object or issue salience as it tackles specific attributes and how they influence public opinion. Same arguments are held by Weaver (2007) that agenda setting revolves around relative salience of issues or subjects and examination of relative salience of attributes of issues. Policy networks enhance serious discussions of issues that are related to problems in a particular policy domain (Fowler, 2000). Periodical setting of action agenda is integral for the proper functioning of any policy network (Struyk, 2002).

Through agenda setting, salient problems have an opportunity to catch the attention of the polity (Cook et al, 2006). Policy network does affect the range of problems and their solutions on the agenda setting stage (Marsh and Smith, 2000). This confirms the arguments by Jann and Wegrich (2003) that agenda setting is important in the sense that no policy emerges out of the vacuum. Agenda is a show of commitment that various participants involved in the discussions are devoted to the objectives (Agranoff, 2000). Agenda setting is achieved through balanced consultation and in the quest of delivering objectives (Struyk, 2002). An issue can only become actual policy when it has been deliberated in the agenda stage in the policy network (Fowler, 2000).

The government and the general public are pressed in a huge way by a myriad of issues and surprisingly, the attention to these issues is constrained (Jones and Baumgartner, 2004). However much these issues and pressing are at a given time, only a few are relevant to be attended by people (Jones and Baumgartner, 2004). Agenda setting help in prioritizing public issues according to their importance on the basis of their seriousness and active consideration (Wang, 2008). The scholar further argues that, listing of controversies or incipient issues command the attention and concern of authoritative decision maker within the political system (Wang, 2008). Agenda setting help to earn an issue a place among other issues sharing limited space and continues having the issue remain at the forefront always (Birkland, 1998).

Agenda setting help to give priority to some issues from among boundless pressing ones (Wang, 2008). Agenda setting brings to the attention of members of the public and their government bureaucrats the collection of problems, understanding of causes, symbols, solutions and other elements of the problem (Birkland, 1998). Agenda setting is used to explore strategies for keeping an issue on the list and possible ways of moving it up the list of policy priorities (Pralle, 2009). This help to channel available limited resources – time, information, personnel and money – to

address issues of dire need (Wang, 2008). Therefore, agenda setting among the policy network is vital as they help define the alternative issues, problems and solutions and thereafter establish what gets the attention of the policy maker (Birkland, 1998).

### **3.0 Issue: Creativity**

#### **3.1 Question 1: Why is it important to manage creativity in the policy network?**

#### **3.2 Question 2: How does creativity help build capacity in the policy network?**

Creativity is a prerequisite for innovation (Ohly, Kase and Skerlavaj, 2010). It is actually out of creative application of knowledge that innovation springs (Lubell and Fulton, 2008). Creativity is viewed as something that will foster the understanding of network participants by drawing their attention to a myriad of related phenomena, levels of actions and social mechanisms (Belussi and Staber, 2012). At the center of creativity, is the ability of a manager to tap knowledge, resources and skills from others (Agranoff and McGuire, 1999). An individual within the network is able to share knowledge with others and also receive new knowledge from others therefore leading to the development of ideas that are creative in nature (Ohly, Kase and Skerlavaj, 2010). This idea is enhanced by Amabile (1988) that through creativity model, which is very pivotal in problem identification, idea generation, preparation, idea validation and outcomes are achieved.

Creativity is intimately tied to knowledge, which emerges out of knowledge-based social interactions among innovation-oriented individuals in a tightly bounded communities of non-specialists and specialists (Belussi and Staber, 2012). These views are echoed by Marin and Mayntz (1991) that policy network is a manifestation of concrete mixture of different logics. Therefore, policy networks that are properly managed serves as a platform through which the communication of innovations is actualized (Lubell and Fulton, 2008). Scholars from across disciplines have come into agreement that social and professional networks play a very crucial in diffusing innovations and therefore need for them to be given a proper attention (Mintrom and Vergari, 1998).

Increasingly, the capacities needed to steer successfully in the network settings are peculiar from the capacities required to succeed at managing a single organization (Agranoff and McGuire, 2001). Participants are therefore required to utilize the availed information to the optimum in order to generate a new group-based direction that is grounded on joint-learning experience (Agranoff, 2007). Joint-learning as Agranoff and McGuire (2001) contends is a critical pillar in the groupware. Creativity of involved individuals is the starting point of innovations that will help to solve the problem in place (Belussi and Staber, 2012). This is due to the fact that these individuals bring with them rich knowledge pertaining administrative arrangements, ideas on political settings, policies and institution (Stone, 2004).

Creativity offers an opportunity for development at the personal level and at the local level (Boren and Young, 2013). Creative thinking in the policy network has proved to pave way for expertise and skill crafting through individuals who possess experience and knowledge from a myriad of

domains (Bilton, 2014). On the other hand, Karlsson (2011) is of the opinion that creativity possess the ability of bringing together incompatible ideas and also help to combine them in a way that gives deep insights. Creativity is crucial to the understanding of a policy gap and in the development of artistic interventions (Boren and Young, 2013)

### References.

Agranoff, R. (2006). Inside collaborative networks: Ten lessons for public managers. *Public administration review*, 66, 56-65.

Agranoff, R. (2007). *Managing within networks: Adding value to public organizations*. Georgetown University Press.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2001). Big questions in public network management research. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 11(3), 295-326.

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (1999). Managing in network settings. *Review of Policy Research*, 16(1), 18-41. †

Belussi, F., & Staber, U. H. (Eds.). (2012). *Managing networks of creativity* (Vol. 19). Routledge.

Howlett, M. (2000). Managing the “hollow state”: Procedural policy instruments and modern governance. *Canadian Public Administration*, 43(4), 412-431.

Klijin, E. H., Koppenjan, J., & Termeer, K. (1995). Managing networks in the public sector: a theoretical study of management strategies in policy networks. *Public administration*, 73(3), 437-454.

Klijin, E. H. (1996). Analyzing and managing policy processes in complex networks: A theoretical examination of the concept policy network and its problems. *Administration & Society*, 28(1), 90-119.

Klijin, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. (2000). Public management and policy networks: foundations of a network approach to governance. *Public Management an International Journal of Research and Theory*, 2(2), 135-158.

Koppenjan, J. F. M., & Klijin, E. H. (2004). *Managing uncertainties in networks: a network approach to problem solving and decision making* (Vol. 40). London: Routledge.

Lubell, M., & Fulton, A. (2008). Local Policy Networks and Agricultural Watershed Management. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 18(4), 673-696. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25096389>

McGuire, M. (2002). Managing networks: Propositions on what managers do and why they do it. *Public administration review*, 62(5), 599-609.

Rhodes, R. A. (2006). Policy network analysis. *The Oxford handbook of public policy*, 423-445.

Struyk, R. (2002). Management of Transnational Think Tank Networks. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 15(4), 625-638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20020140>. Fowler, F. C. (2000). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Cook, F. L., Tyler, T. R., Goetz, E. G., Gordon, M. T., Protess, D., Leff, D. R., & Molotch, H. L. (1983). Media and agenda setting: Effects on the public, interest group leaders, policy makers, and policy. *Public opinion quarterly*, 47(1), 16-

Mintrom, M., & Vergari, S. (1998). Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms. *The Journal of Politics*, 60(1), 126-148.

Stone, D. (2004). Transfer agents and global networks in the 'transnationalization' of policy. *Journal of European public policy*, 11(3), 545-566.

Marin, B., & Mayntz, R. (1991). *Policy networks: Empirical evidence and theoretical considerations*. Campus Verlag

Ohly, S., Kase, R., & Škerlavaj, M. (2010). Networks for generating and for validating ideas: The social side of creativity. *Innovation*, 12(1), 41-52.

Bilton, C. (2014). Manageable creativity. In *Creativity and Cultural Policy* (pp. 31-46). Routledge.

Borén, T., & Young, C. (2013). Getting creative with the 'creative city'? Towards new perspectives on creativity in urban policy. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(5), 1799-1815.

Karlsson, C. (2011). Clusters, networks and creativity. *Handbook of Creative Cities*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 85-114.

Ghanem, S. (1997). Filling in the tapestry: The second level of agenda setting. *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*, 3-14.

Weaver, D. H. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing, and priming. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 142-147.

Marsh, D., & Smith, M. (2000). Understanding policy networks: towards a dialectical approach. *Political studies*, 48(1), 4-21.

Wang, S. (2008). Changing models of China's policy agenda setting. *Modern China*, 34(1), 56-87.

Birkland, T. A. (1998). Focusing events, mobilization, and agenda setting. *Journal of public policy*, 18(1), 53-74.

Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner, F. R. (2004). Representation and agenda setting. *Policy Studies Journal*, 32(1), 1-24.



---

Pralle, S. B. (2009). Agenda-setting and climate change. *Environmental Politics*, 18(5), 781-799.

## **Task: The Advocacy Coalition Framework Analysis.**

### **1.0 Issue: Policy Venue**

#### **1.1 Question: How does venues contribute to policy change?**

#### **1.2 Question: How does venue shifting lead to policy change?**

Policy venues are locations of strategic issue control in which stabilization and destabilization of a policy monopoly takes place (Timmermans and Scholten, 2006). Venues become integral platforms to policy coalitions for intervening and pushing forward their own image of policy problem (Littoz-Monnet, 2013). Waible (2008) is of the idea that most coalitions scramble for two or more amiable venues purposely to influence decisions. For coalitions to influence policy in a particular subsystem, they need to exploit various political venues and resources (Sloboda, Szabo-Gilinger, Vigers and Simicic, 2010). Therefore, a major characteristic of policy coalition is their endeavor to realize policy-oriented beliefs through their constant engagement of venue shopping activities (Nohrstedt, 2011).

Venues are crucial platforms that stakeholders employ in order to influence beliefs or policy (Weible and Sabatier, 2007). According to Weible (2006) potential policy venues comprise of chief executives, public referenda and decisions in the legislatures, agencies, elections, research institutions, advisory councils, think-tanks, expert committees, courts, the stock market and media used by policy coalitions to shape policies (Timmermans and Scholten, 2006). Opening or closing of policy venues is a lee way for authoritative policy change (Nohrstedt, 2011). Strategic actors take advantage of venues to establish and also influence images of problems and solutions (Timmermans and Scholten, 2006). Coalitions utilize venues to launch several offences that are geared towards safeguarding their interests (Nohrstedt, 2011).

Decision making authority is regularly being transferred to different institutional setting due to minority coalitions subordinating themselves to major coalitions as a result of resource constrain (Nohrstedt, 2011). Shifting venues in itself is a remedy on the account traditional venues have been found of locking out participation from among affected and interested actors and by extension their much reliance on the testimonies and hearings (Kübler, 2000). This is the reason coalitions opt to extensively go for resource utilization as one way of laying a foundation for proper influence of venues that are based on the attainment of policy benefits per incurred costs (Weible, 2006).

Nohrstedt (2011) is of the opinion that a scenario of venue shifting prepares a conducive atmosphere of major policy changes. Events of venue shifting results to disintegration of the existing policies and therefore emergence of changes in policy paradigm (Wison, 2000). These arguments are in line with Timmermans and Scholten (2006) that policy actors who had failed

previously to have an imprint on the image of a given policy may opt for scientific venues for supporting evidence to strengthen their claims and persuasive power of alternative policy advocacy. Shifts in national governance, transitions and individuals questioning leadership have provided an opportunity and impetus for shaping policy agendas, change and development across the globe (Huitema and Meijerink, 2010).

## **2.0 Issue: Resources**

### **2.1 Question: How does policy coalitions use resources to influence policy change?**

### **2.2 Question: How does strategic leadership is a crucial resource to a policy coalition?**

Strategic use and redistribution of resources leads to alterations of political power that is embedded in the policy coalitions therefore giving access especially to minor policy coalitions to influence formulation and change of policies (Nohrstedt, 2011). Individuals adequately employ resources to invent a myriad of strategies in order to influence policies (Weible and Sabatier, 2007). For instance, expert-information as a resource is very crucial when it comes to mobilizing arguments during deliberation with opponents as it provides rich evidence that reinforces arguments (Weible, 2008). Therefore, the presence of expert information is important especially in gaining and spreading knowledge about experience and events at the subsystem, national and international context (Sloboda, Szabo-Gilinger, Vigers and Simicic, 2010).

Policy coalitions should seek to have deep pockets as financial resources is a tool for purchasing think tanks and finance research to generate information that they will be using to mobilize their supporters and sway public opinion and convince sympathetic candidates in order to gain entry to legislators and political appointees (Weible, 2006). Coalitions periodically require their supporters to engage themselves in activities – demonstrations, campaigns, fundraising - that will enable them to subdue threats targeting them and also in realizing their objectives (Weible, 2006). This is due to the fact that individuals are part and parcel of social networks, social organizations, group setting, who are affected by the problem being fronted by the coalition hence influencing collective decisions (Kübler, 2001).

According to Mizrahi and Rosenthal (2001) competent leadership is the only factor identified with the success of policy coalitions. Therefore, at the center of policy coalitions' navigation to policy victories is skillful leadership who are crucial in attracting resources, strengthening focus, offering more strategic choices and articulation of coherent beliefs in the system that leads to actual changes in the policy (Weible, 2006). They align advocacy and policy goals with core beliefs of the coalition (Reisman, Gienapp and Stachowiak, 2007). Skillful leadership attain these by ensuring a setting in which participants develop political efficacy, organizational resources for translation of grievances into action are acquired and solidarity incentives are realized hence triggering collective action (Kübler, 2001).

Weible and Sabatier (2007) are of opinion that major coalition commonly strategically plant their participants in various positions of formal authority via political appointees and elections. Strategic

leadership reach out for experts as allies to the coalition as one way of ensuring legitimacy through the use of expert-based information and also in matching coalition's beliefs and those of scientists for effective making and implementation of decisions (Weible, 2008). They resolve problems through the use of resources and skills by maintaining internal cohesiveness, agenda setting and policy initiation and policy implementation (Dziengel, 2010). Suggests that strategic leadership plays a key role enhancing and strengthening member participation by recognizing their efforts, respect for all opinions, input and incorporation of feedback (Metzger, Alexander and Weiner, 2005)

### **3.0 Issue: Policy beliefs**

#### **3.1 Question: How does advocacy coalitions' beliefs translated into policies?**

#### **3.3 Question: How does advocacy coalition beliefs find their way into the political class?**

Deep core beliefs held by members of a given advocacy coalition acts as a glue that holds them together (Bennett and Howlett, 1992). This is because stakeholders are fundamentally motivated to convert their beliefs into actual policy thereby seeking allies to form advocacy coalitions to accomplish this objective (Weible, 2006). This perspective is held also by Sabatier and Weible (2014) that policy participants hold strong beliefs and are motivated to see these beliefs translated into actual government programs. Decent decision-making process is greatly influenced by the core beliefs of a coalition members on a particular area of a policy domain (Wolsink, 2004). Weible (2005) while looking at beliefs and perceived influence in a natural resource found that policy network relationships were as a result of beliefs that were shared among advocacy coalitions. The shared beliefs according to Sabatier (1998) results into reduction of transaction costs among members of an advocacy coalition. Beliefs that are of deep core in nature turns to be relatively impermeable to change explaining the reason behind resistance of alteration of these beliefs (Bennett and Howlett, 1992).

Weible and Sabatier (2007) posits that core beliefs span from multiple systems and that they are very resistance for change. They are difficult to be changed because information and events are interpreted using these core beliefs (Weible, 2005). Weible (2006) on the other hand has a corresponding argument that individual identities themselves closely to tied beliefs, they therefore opt to quickly receive information that bolsters their beliefs and ignore or filter information that is contrary to their beliefs. After sharing beliefs for a considerable amount of time, these advocacy coalitions seek to translate them into public policies or programs (Mintrom and Vergari, 1996).

Advocacy coalitions' beliefs and actions in the subsystem serve as the lens by which the politicians use to interpret the changes at the level of mass politics hence leading to creation of new policies (Mintrom and Vergari, 1996). The huge number of members of advocacy coalitions harbors also a substantive number of policy makers, therefore making it easy for their beliefs to reach at the political class and also get rolled as policies (Sabatier and Weible, 2014). The presence of politicians in these advocacy coalitions justifies Smith (2000) arguments that the beliefs were

prevented from getting transformed into practices due to long periods of exclusion political resources witnessed previously.

Sabatier and Weible (2014) observes that in developing democracies, the beliefs of the advocacy coalitions are easily translated into programs due to instability of wider political system and lack of trained personnel in these systems. In addition, most advocacy coalitions have a huge number of members who in most cases possess superior lobbying and mobilization skills that are combined with their conversing resources and easiness of accessing resources places them at a very advanced position to capture the attention of the politicians (Mintrom and Vergari, 1996).

### References.

Nohrstedt, D. (2011). Shifting resources and venues producing policy change in contested subsystems: a case study of Swedish signals intelligence policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(3), 461-484.

Weible, C. M. (2006). An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California marine protected area policy. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 17(1), 95-117.

Kübler, D. (2001). Understanding policy change with the advocacy coalition framework: an application to Swiss drug policy. *Journal of European public policy*, 8(4), 623-641.

Weible, C. M. (2008). Expert-based information and policy subsystems: a review and synthesis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(4), 615-635.

Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Theories of the policy process*. Westview Press.

Smith, A. (2000). Policy networks and advocacy coalitions: explaining policy change and stability in UK industrial pollution policy. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 18(1), 95-114.

Timmermans, A., & Scholten, P. (2006). The political flow of wisdom: science institutions as policy venues in The Netherlands. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(7), 1104-1118.

Weible, C. M. (2008). Expert-based information and policy subsystems: a review and synthesis. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(4), 615-635.

Littoz-Monnet, A. (2013). Explaining Policy Conflict across Institutional Venues: European Union-Level Struggles over the Memory of the Holocaust. *JCMS: Journal of common market studies*, 51(3), 489-504.

Sloboda, M., Szabó-Gilinger, E., Vigers, D., & Šimičić, L. (2010). Carrying out a language policy change: Advocacy coalitions and the management of linguistic landscape. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(2), 95-113.

- Huitema, D., & Meijerink, S. V. (2010). Realizing water transitions: the role of policy entrepreneurs in water policy change-*www-publicatie*.
- Wilson, C. A. (2000). Policy regimes and policy change. *Journal of public policy*, 20(3), 247-274.
- Mizrachi, T., & Rosenthal, B. B. (2001). Complexities of coalition building: Leaders' successes, strategies, struggles, and solutions. *Social work*, 46(1), 63-78.
- Reisman, J., Gienapp, A., & Stachowiak, S. (2007). A guide to measuring advocacy and policy. *Baltimore: Organisational Research Services (www. organizational research.com/publications/a\_guide\_to\_measuring\_advocacy\_and\_policy.pdf)*.
- Dziengel, L. (2010). Advocacy coalitions and punctuated equilibrium in the same-sex marriage debate: Learning from pro-LGBT policy changes in Minneapolis and Minnesota. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 22(1-2), 165-182.
- Metzger, M. E., Alexander, J. A., & Weiner, B. J. (2005). The effects of leadership and governance processes on member participation in community health coalitions. *Health Education & Behavior*, 32(4), 455-473.
- Bennett, C. J., & Howlett, M. (1992). The lessons of learning: Reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy sciences*, 25(3), 275-294.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1988). An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein. *Policy sciences*, 21(2-3), 129-168.
- Weible, C. M. (2005). Beliefs and perceived influence in a natural resource conflict: An advocacy coalition approach to policy networks. *Political Research Quarterly*, 58(3), 461-475.
- Weible, C. M. (2006). An advocacy coalition framework approach to stakeholder analysis: Understanding the political context of California marine protected area policy. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 17(1), 95-117.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1998). The advocacy coalition framework: revisions and relevance for Europe. *Journal of European public policy*, 5(1), 98-130.
- Mintrom, M., & Vergari, S. (1996). Advocacy coalitions, policy entrepreneurs, and policy change. *Policy studies journal*, 24(3), 420-434.
- Wolsink, M. (2004). Policy beliefs in spatial decisions: contrasting core beliefs concerning space-making for waste infrastructure. *Urban studies*, 41(13), 2669-2690.

---

## **TASK: Analysis on Managing the Commons.**

### **1.0 Issue: Achieving accurate and relevant information**

#### **1.1 Question one: How is information crucial in the management of commons?**

#### **1.2 Question two: How is information important to policy making for the commons?**

Initially technology was perceived to be the driver of change but that notion has changed with time with the recognition that strategic use of information - exploitation and maximization – is the real driver for change (Mithas, Ramasubbu and Sambamurthy, 2011). Technology is a means to the end as Ostrom (2008) puts it therefore, the provision of a more accurate information via technology to the localities fosters better decision making. The quality of information at the disposal determines the quality of decisions made (Zawislak, 1992). The ability of relevant agencies and stakeholders to receive timely, accurate and reliable information can provide an avenue for configuring and aligning other organizational synergies to ensure performance (Mithas, Ramasubbu and Sambamurthy, 2011). The above sentiments are echoed by Gething, Noor, Gikandi, Ogara, Hay, Nixon and Atkinson (2006) who argue that timely and reliable information not only supports evidence-based decision-making, but also a crucial component in the planning and monitoring of service provision. A reason that makes Marcella, Carcary and Baxter (1999) to crown it all that the tragedy of the commons is as a result of information or understanding.

Effective governance of common resources at a given level or time depend on good, trustworthy information concerning stocks, processes and flows within the entities being governed (Hess and Ostrom, 2006). Therefore, an opportunity to interact with accurate, reliable and comprehensive information devoid of bias facilitates selection of options by decision makers from the current diverse ones (Marcella, Carcary and Baxter, 1999). This is due to the fact that the performance of a given commons regime is affected by a myriad of factors among them - technological, ecological, social and economic - that bring change over time prompting for up-to-date information by decision makers on resources and its users (Kallock and Smith, 1996).

The entire process of utilizing information has proven to make a huge difference in the realms of policy (Oh and Rich, 1996). To manage the commons, information pertaining them is core in formulating compatible policies. What is most essential now is to put mechanisms in place of gathering, communicating, storing and exploiting information in an organization (Feldman and March, 1981). The available information should conform to decision-makers' needs in terms of content, timing and form of presentation (Hess and Ostrom, 2006). Policy makers are advised to seek insights in time through available information about the impending tragedy of commons in order to give a lasting solution.

Firms are consumers, purveyors and managers of information (Feldman and March, 1981). Therefore, policy makers need to be heavily informed by the information for better management of the common resources. Information ought to manifest the requirements of intelligibility, accessibility, usability and assessability (Manswell, 2013). This justifies Feldman and March

(1981) that intelligence reputations of most firm are enhanced by their capabilities of securing, analyzing and retrieving information in a timely manner. Outstanding policy makers across the world are those who possess the abilities securing, breaking down and retrieving information in a timely way in their endeavor of managing common resources.

## **2.0 Issue: Dealing with conflict.**

### **2.1 Question two: Why should the governance system anticipate for the possibility of a conflict while managing the commons?**

### **2.2 Question two: How does resource competition result to conflict?**

Scarcity of resources brought about by structural imbalance could be the source of acute conflicts or common tragedy (Ayling and Kelly, 1997). Any governance system that gives a blind eye to diversity of issues increases the likelihood of a conflict over the management of common resources to escalate into major problems (Ostrom, 2008). Therefore building an appealing collaboration between scientific experts, local users and government officials is pivotal component in the adaptive governance of common resources (Ostrom, 2008). Ayling and Kelly (1997) are in agreement that adaptive governance has a greater chance of success when we have processes of adaptive resolution in place.

Manswell (2013) argues that the commons imply the notion of shared responsibility, ownership and participation. Conflicts over natural resources have ignited a very extensive negative effects on ecological, social, spatial and economic development especially in the transitional and third world countries (Wehrmann, 2008). Therefore, potential crisis is likely to erupt in the event of competition in accessing the common resources especially those with immediate repercussions such as water and forest (Ayling and Kelly, 1997). A conflict is inevitable in the event of competition over resources whose supply do not satisfy the demand coming from the participants (Pondy, 1967). It is essential therefore to design myriad tiers of platforms whose focus is rapid identification of conflicts and their amicable resolution (Ostrom, 2008). These conflicts could be manifested in the form of military actions, simple arguments, legal actions, civil violence or disobedience and non-violent protest (Ayling and Kelly, 1997).

The global affairs for sometimes has been shaped by conflict and competition over essential and valuable materials – gold, water, timber, spices, land, gem among others (Klare, 2011). The history of armed conflicts could be explained by the conspicuous role played by natural resources (Le Billon, 2001). Appropriative competition is a function of resource scarcity (Grossman and Mendoza, 2003). According to Njiru (2012) resource competition and conflict among pastoral communities in Kenya coupled with environmental effects such as famine and drought could lead to resource base competition as well as mass migration of inhabitants caused by resource-based conflict.

Violent activities involving a number of belligerents are as a result of motivation emanating from competition for natural resources (Le Billon, 2001). This is as a result of an ever-increasing rate

of human consumption of the common resources characterized by intolerable pressures directed to the stockpile of these natural resources (Klare, 2011). For instance, in Bangladesh authorities and communities have been pressed to creatively formulate regulations over the exploitation of ground water due to competition witnessed between manual hand users and mechanically powered deep tube wells users (Sadeque, 2000). Competition over natural resources not only subjects' countries to armed conflicts but also weakens political institutions to amicably resolve conflicts (Le Billon, 2001).

### **3.0 Issue: Rule compliance.**

#### **3.1 Question one: What role do rules play in the management of common pool resources?**

#### **3.2 Question two: Why are external rules ineffective in the management of commons?**

The losses associated with the common pool are so glaring that calls for effective rules to fix the problem (Libecap, 2008). The use and management of common pool resources encompass rules that define what are some of the actions must, must not or maybe employed in a given context (Schlager and Heikkila, 2011). Aspects of destruction and overuse has been attributed to open-access of valuable resources (Ostrom, 1994). Across the world, local people experience time and again losses and gains emerging from the consequences of actions and inactions associated with the management of common pool resources (Fisher, Kulindwa, Mwanyoka, Turner and Burgess, 2010). Effective common pool resource management dictates that governance rules should be naturally clear and deem to be perceived as appropriate by local stakeholders (Fisher, Kulindwa, Mwanyoka, Turner and Burgess, 2010).

Arrangement for common pool management demands for sanctioned rules as the necessary ingredient of ensuring people comply with something, they are hesitant to do (Wade, 1987). For instance, among the irrigation communities of Kyrgyzstan Baerlein, Kasymov and Zikos (2015) found out that self-crafted and self-administered rules brought order in the management of common pool resources. The absence of rules from informal community and the state, opens the avenues for people to competitively engage in activities of wasteful and excessive extraction of common pool resources (Libecap, 2008)

Across the board, communities are at the forefront in finding solution to problems facing the environment in which they reside therefore becoming co-producers of rules or policy (Hindy and Theo, 2010). Locally successful devised regulations on the management of the commons demonstrates that there is no need of fetching regulations from outside (Wade, 1987). Ostrom (2008) who observes that external arrangements are not sufficient enough in and themselves in the effective monitoring of the commons. Wolsink (2012) provides similar insights having witnessed implementation predicaments that emerged from deployment of renewables as common pool concluded that broad social acceptance of issues was crucial determinant. The explanation given could be in their ineffectiveness to deal with maddening diversity that do exist at the local level (Hindy and Theo, 2010).



Self-organization of operational-choice rules manifested in sanctions and monitoring are crucial in the reduction of costs, increasing collective utility and also in ensuring marginalization of non-compliance (Pitt and Schaumeier, 2012). Schlager and Heikkila (2011) equally important is the capability of these rules to mirror critical practices and social norms especially on the allocation of benefits and burdens of governing common pool resources. Baerlein, Kasymov and Zikos (2015) asserts that self-governance arrangement among resource users in Kyrgyzstan is a remedy in solving social dilemmas and cooperation in the management of common resources.

### References.

Mithas, S., Ramasubbu, N., & Sambamurthy, V. (2011). How information management capability influences firm performance. *MIS quarterly*, 35(1), 237.

Pitt, J., & Schaumeier, J. (2012, September). Provision and appropriation of common-pool resources without full disclosure. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Multi-Agent Systems* (pp. 199-213). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Baerlein, T., Kasymov, U., & Zikos, D. (2015). Self-governance and sustainable common pool resource management in Kyrgyzstan. *Sustainability*, 7(1), 496-521.

Wolsink, M. (2012). The research agenda on social acceptance of distributed generation in smart grids: Renewable as common pool resources. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 16(1), 822-835.

Wade, R. (1987). The management of common property resources: collective action as an alternative to privatisation or state regulation. *Cambridge journal of economics*, 11(2), 95-106.

Fisher, B., Kulindwa, K., Mwanyoka, I., Turner, R. K., & Burgess, N. D. (2010). Common pool resource management and PES: lessons and constraints for water PES in Tanzania. *Ecological Economics*, 69(6), 1253-1261.

Sadeque, S. Z. (2000). Nature's bounty or scarce commodity: Competition and consensus over groundwater use in rural Bangladesh. *Negotiating water rights*, 269-291.

Klare, M. T. (2011). Resource competition and world politics in the twenty-first century. In *Warfare Ecology* (pp. 27-31). Springer, Dordrecht.

Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. *Administrative science quarterly*, 296-320.

Libecap, G. D. (2008). State regulation of open-access, common-pool resources. In *Handbook of new institutional economics* (pp. 545-572). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Njiru, B. N. (2012). Climate change, resource competition, and conflict amongst pastoral communities in Kenya. In *Climate change, human security and violent conflict* (pp. 513-527). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Grossman, H. I., & Mendoza, J. (2003). Scarcity and appropriative competition. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 19(4), 747-758.

Schlager, E., & Heikkila, T. (2011). Left high and dry? Climate change, common-pool resource theory, and the adaptability of western water compacts. *Public Administration Review*, 71(3), 461-470.

Baerlein, T., Kasymov, U., & Zikos, D. (2015). Self-governance and sustainable common pool resource management in Kyrgyzstan. *Sustainability*, 7(1), 496-521.

Le Billon, P. (2001). The political ecology of war: natural resources and armed conflicts. *Political geography*, 20(5), 561-584.

Gething, P. W., Noor, A. M., Gikandi, P. W., Ogara, E. A., Hay, S. I., Nixon, M. S., ... & Atkinson, P. M. (2006). Improving imperfect data from health management information systems in Africa using space-time geostatistics. *PLoS Medicine*, 3(6), e271.

Ostrom, E. (2008). The challenge of common-pool resources. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 50(4), 8-21.

Ostrom, E. (1994). *Neither market nor state: Governance of common-pool resources in the twenty-first century*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Wehrmann, B. (2008). *Land Conflicts: A practical guide to dealing with land disputes*. Eschborn: GTZ.

Ayling, R. D., & Kelly, K. (1997). Dealing with conflict: natural resources and dispute resolution. *The Commonwealth Forestry Review*, 182-185.

Mansell, R. (2013). Employing digital crowdsourced information resources: Managing the emerging information commons. *International Journal of the Commons*, 7(2), 255-277.

Hess, C., & Ostrom, E. (2006). A framework for analysing the microbiological commons. *International Social Science Journal*, 58(188), 335-349.

Kollock, P., & Smith, M. (1996). Managing the virtual commons. *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives*, 109-128.

Marcella, R., Carcary and, I., & Baxter, G. (1999). The information needs of United Kingdom members of the European Parliament (MEPs). *Library Management*, 20(3), 168-178.

Oh, C. H., & Rich, R. F. (1996). Explaining use of information in public policymaking. *Knowledge and Policy*, 9(1), 3-35.

Feldman, M. S., & March, J. G. (1981). Information in organizations as signal and symbol. *Administrative science quarterly*, 171-186.

---

## **Task: Analysis on Policy Decision-Making.**

### **1.1 Issue: Persuasion in decision-making.**

### **1.2 Question one: How does persuasion lead to behavior change among individuals?**

### **1.3 Question two: How is persuasion useful in the presence of many alternatives?**

It should be recognized that in an organizational setting, individuals possess different opinions and despite that they are required to reach a common decision (El-Shinnawy and Vinze, 1998). For the decision to be made, the decision maker has to employ influencing strategies among them; expert, bargaining, legitimate, impression management, reward/referent and emotional influence in order to have a decision in place (Spiro, 1983). The crucial part then is the influential force exerted through persuasion (Simon, 1965). Persuasion plays a pivotal role in organizational decision making as it changes individuals' behavior by operating on their perceptions and minds on their view of the world rather than using rewards and punishments (McDonnell, 1994). Reinforcing and change of an individual's behavior is of necessary to avoid backsliding (Garvin and Roberto, 2005). This makes El-Shinnawy and Vinze (1998) to conclude that the formulation of a decision is a function of persuasiveness of arguments of which individuals are exposed to.

Central to decision making in complex organizations such the schools, is the argumentation, interpretation and persuasion (Coburn, Touré and Yamashita, 2009). According to McDonnell (1994) persuasive power of logic and evidence harmonize individual actions through evocation of reasoned images and informed decisions (McDonnell, 1994). Policy makers are therefore urged to disseminate information to participants in order for them to make their minds which will eventually lead to behavior change (McDonnell, 1994). According to Garvin and Roberto (2005) providing individuals with information is a sign of constant communication therefore an influential strategy of capturing the mood of individuals in an organization. The above argument corresponds to Winterbottom, Bekker, Conner and Mooney (2008) that narrative information is of paramount importance when it comes to individual decision making.

While looking at decision making in the family when it comes to purchase of properties, Spiro (1983) contends that the process is quite dynamic and complicated as the choices made have to reflect equal consent among the family members. Therefore, the process of persuasions plays a critical role in ensuring decisions are made where the issue is posed and in the presence of alternatives – conflict situations (Simon, 1965). Spiro (1983) argues that when alternatives are being weighed, each family member will try to influence one another towards his or her decision through the use of a myriad of influencing techniques while considering the characteristics of the family member, decision characteristics, importance of the decision to the family member and other situational factors.

Persuasion skills may be more necessary than ever and that no leader can succeed without this art due to its predictable ways of appealing to a limited set of deeply rooted human drives and needs (Cialdini, 2001). The right techniques of persuasion in an organization help to make alternatives clearer and in convincing the decision makers to side with these alternatives hence ending up making decisions based on those alternatives (McElhaney, 2000). Simon (1965) contends in such

circumstances new ways are likely to emerge that will enable organizational arrangements to change behaviors of the individuals when analyzing choices.

## **2.0 Issue: Role of experiments in decision-making**

### **2.1 Question one: How valid experiments are in the world of decision-making?**

### **2.3 Question two: How does experiments turn out to be crucial strategies for the decision makers?**

Despite criticism and skepticism experiments on decision making receive from across the board, they are found of offering a valid and useful approach in many situations (Griffin and Kacmarl 1991). In the recent past, experiments have received a wide attention especially in their implications for real-world decision-making (Winkler and Murphy, 1973). Behavioral experiments on commons dilemmas found out that people are willing to engage in costly punishment and frequently generating increases in the gross benefits (janssen, Holaham, Lee and Ostrom, 2010). According to these scholars, these findings illustrate the importance of careful generalization from the laboratory to the world of policy.

Simon (1965) make it clear that well organized experiments especially on small-group and individuals can foster decision making in an organization on the basis of new information generated by these experiments. Decision makers specifically stresses on the importance of experiments in regard to more-liberating forms of discourse, searching for alternatives and new ways of organizing (Romme, 2003). On the other hand, Armstrong and Brodie (1994) argues that cooperate managers upon employing experiments might overcome their tendency of opting for a dying division with unwise investments.

Suddendorf and Busby, 2005) proposed for an experimental paradigm that provides subjects with an opportunity to act now to satisfy a need - decision - not currently experienced. Experiments by Broder (2003) suggested that the majority of the participants were classified as using strategies that were adequate for the environment, supporting the notion of adaptive strategy selection. These aforementioned arguments explain why experiment paradigm is crucial especially in the identification of the correct implementations of classic compensatory and non-compensatory strategies such as the take-the-best and tallying heuristics and the weighted-linear model (Dimor, Marewskl and schroler, 2013).

Fisherman (1991) observed that knowledge that is derived from experimental science was superior over that which come from scholarly interpretations and theory. This is central especially in regard to an observation made by Avineri and Prashker (2003) that experiments in behavioral sciences often find the productions of utility maximization to be violated. For instance, according to Kleinman, Serfaty and Luh (1984) experiments are proposed in order to examine the general problems of how a team of human beings solve problems (make decisions) of distributed resources management under uncertainty in a multi-task environment. Currently, according to Griffiths

(1999) experimental paradigm is dominant and it emphasizes on identifying causal connections hence focusing on outcome at the expense of the process.

### **3.0 Issue: Heuristic method of decision making.**

#### **3.1 Question one: How does heuristic method employ the use of information during decision making?**

#### **3.2 Question two: What help does heuristic method offer on the situations that require urgent decisions?**

Heuristic models are crucial in making predictions of what has been chosen and also pay attention more especially to aspects of the processes, time taken and what information to be examined in making choices (Glimcher and Fehr, 2013). The limited time in a given demanding situation require specific information for quick decision making hence heuristic model becomes suitable. According to Gigerenzer and Gaissmaier (2011) heuristic models achieves the goal of making decisions in an accurate and faster manner by ignoring part of the information than is the case with other complex methods. Methods such rational require that you exploit every bit of the information before reaching at a conclusion on what decision should serve the situation therefore rendering themselves slow in decision making (Angelo and Williams, 2008).

Heuristic model facilitates the retrieval of relevant decision-making information from internal and external sources which is used to characterize decision making (Wilson and Dowlatabadi, 2007). Organizational managers when faced with a looming crisis that needs a quick decision, they quickly retrieve relevant information from the gallery and request extra information from other firms who have been in the similar scenario there before. These quick decisions are realized on the reduction of the effort spent on making decisions by examining less information, simplifying the weighing of cues, integration of less information, examining fewer cues and also significant effort reduction in retrieving cue values (Shah and Oppenheimer, 2008).

Heuristic model is helpful especially in the event effort, time and cost of searching necessary information for decision making (Gigerenzer and Gaissmaier, 2011). Romme (2003) is in support of this that the availability of information concerning the situation at hand by definition could be limited. Klein (2008) argues that heuristic model of decision making is helpful on the account that classical strategies deteriorate in the event of time pressure, do not incorporate the inherent factors in the real-world decisions, lack of flexibility for handling faster changing conditions and their difficulties of factoring in vagueness, ambiguity and inaccuracy in applying analytical methods.

According to Simon (1965) heuristic methods serves to be helpful in devising less than optimal decision procedures for the circumstances in which the issue of optimum is practically undiscoverable and unknown. Therefore, this model opt to narrow down to alternatives by way of rejecting those alternatives with poor score on a particular attribute (Wilson and Dowlatabadi, 2007). The elimination of some of the alternatives in the list implies less complexity and less time will be spent by decision makers to come up with decisions that conform to the needs of the

situation. This corresponds to what Gareth and Jennifer (2003) terms that rules of the thumb that emanates from heuristic approach significantly help policy makers to make sense of ambiguous information, complexity and uncertain situation.

### References.

Armstrong, J. S., & Brodie, R. J. (1994). Effects of portfolio planning methods on decision making: Experimental results. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11(1), 73-84.

Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. *Annual review of psychology*, 62, 451-482.

Cialdini, R. B. (2001). Harnessing the science of persuasion. *Harvard business review*, 79(9), 72-81.

Garvin, D. A., & Roberto, M. A. (2005). Change through persuasion. *Harvard business review*, 83, 26-33.

El-Shinnawy, M., & Vinze, A. (1998). Polarization and Persuasive Argumentation: A Study of Decision Making in Group Settings. *MIS Quarterly*, 22(2), 165-198. doi:10.2307/249394

Winterbottom, A., Bekker, H. L., Conner, M., & Mooney, A. (2008). Does narrative information bias individual's decision making? A systematic review. *Social science & medicine*, 67(12), 2079-2088.

Spiro, R. L. (1983). Persuasion in family decision-making. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(4), 393-402.

Klein, G. (2008). Naturalistic decision making. *Human factors*, 50(3), 456-460.

Romme, A. G. L. (2003). Making a difference: Organization as design. *Organization science*, 14(5), 558-573.

McElhaney, J. (2000). Persuasive Organization. *Litigation*, 26(3), 51-66. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29760144>

Coburn, C. E., Touré, J., & Yamashita, M. (2009). Evidence, interpretation, and persuasion: Instructional decision making at the district central office. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4), 1115-1161.

McDonnell, L. M. (1994). Assessment policy as persuasion and regulation. *American journal of education*, 102(4), 394-420.

Glimcher, P. W., & Fehr, E. (Eds.). (2013). *Neuroeconomics: Decision making and the brain*. Academic Press.

Wilson, C., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2007). Models of decision making and residential energy use. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 32, 169-203. Janssen, M. A., Holahan, R., Lee, A., & Ostrom,

---

E. (2010). Lab experiments for the study of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 328(5978), 613-617.

Winkler, R. L., & Murphy, A. H. (1973). Experiments in the laboratory and the real world. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 10(2), 252-270.

Suddendorf, T., & Busby, J. (2005). Making decisions with the future in mind: Developmental and comparative identification of mental time travel. *Learning and Motivation*, 36(2), 110-125.

Kleinman, D. L., Serfaty, D., & Luh, P. B. (1984, June). A research paradigm for multi-human decision making. In *1984 American Control Conference* (pp. 6-11). IEEE.

Bröder, A. (2003). Decision making with the "adaptive toolbox": influence of environmental structure, intelligence, and working memory load. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 29(4), 611.

Fishman, D. B. (1991). An introduction to the experimental versus the pragmatic paradigm in evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 14(4), 353-363.

Griffiths, A. (1999). Organizational interventions: Facing the limits of the natural science paradigm. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 589-596.

Avineri, E., & Prashker, J. N. (2003). Sensitivity to uncertainty: need for a paradigm shift. *Transportation Research Record*, 1854(1), 90-98.

Dimov, C., Marewski, J., & Schooler, L. (2013). Constraining ACT-R models of decision strategies: An experimental paradigm. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (Vol. 35, No. 35).