MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY

Dr. Shuvajit Chakraborty

Associate Professor

Department of Political Science

Nehru College Pailapool Cachar,Assam

ABSTRACT

This article is about public policy, which is the core, essence, and distinguishing characteristic of all governments across the world. It is the primary premise upon which the sovereign people vote them into power, hence it is the most important factor in their election (citizens of a country). People's opinions regarding the political party in question and whether or not they should return to the position of leading the country's political affairs are influenced by the potential policies that will be advertised by them during the election campaign, as well as the previous work and policies that were brought out and whether or not those policies were implemented by the party in question when they were in power.

keywords: *models, public policy*

introduction

In the 1970s and 1980s, people started using the concept of models and frames, which are things that form a discourse of analysis and supply it. It was believed that these approaches might organise issues, so providing them with shape and coherence. The idea that one may establish a border around reality is central to the concept of a model. This is an idea that might be held in common by a group of academics or a theorist. When we research public policy, we need to be aware of the ways in which various models of analysis describe and explain problems, as well as the ways in which these models compete with one another and move around: ' Throughout the course of this Unit, we are going to investigate a variety of analytical models and theoretical frameworks. The next four parts will each cover one or two of these models and methods in further detail. In its broadest sense, the phrase "public policy" refers to the policy (i.e., the plan of what to do) that is developed and carried out with the purpose of serving the public good. If one takes a very restricted definition of what constitutes public policy, then what is being discussed here is the course of action that the government is going to take (because Public is also used as a synonym for Government in many places).

Regarding the precise meaning of the term "public policy," there is no consensus. On the other hand, public policy may be thought of as the overarching structure that governs how the acts of the government are carried out in order to accomplish its objectives. It is a purposeful and consistent course of action that was conceived as a response to a perceived problem of a constituency, formulated by a particular political process, and adopted, implemented, and enforced by a public agency. This course of action was formulated in response to a perceived problem of a constituency. There are significant distinctions between goals, policies, and programming; hence, these terms should not be used synonymously or in a manner that is otherwise inconsistent. The government develops policies with the intention of accomplishing particular

objectives; for instance, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan is a government programmer that aims to accomplish the Policy of Free and compulsory education to all children between the ages of 6 and 14 in India. This policy was established through the Right to education act 2009, and it is a component of the meta policy of Education For All developed by UNESCO. An additional illustration of this is the anti-poverty programme, which has resulted in the creation of a number of other programmes, such as the Integrated Rural Development Programmer, MGNREGA, and others. The reduction of poverty is one objective that is subsumed within the broader objective of the total socioeconomic development of the nation. Each of these programmers has their own objectives they want to accomplish, which, when combined, will lead to the accomplishment of the overall objective outlined in the first policy. It's possible to have many different programmers working toward the same policy objective at the same time. In addition, in order for the government to accomplish its objectives, a variety of different policies are developed and implemented.

After a policy's aims have been articulated in the form of a statement, the next step is to design the programmes that will implement the policy's directives and bring about the desired results. A public policy is a document that contains the broad outline as well as the detailed description of formulation as well as implementation of various government programmers and plans. These are plans and programmers that are taken out for the goal or objective of public benefit and are implemented through the constitutional authorities, bureaucracy, and government organizations/institutions in collaboration with civil society organisations. It can be a law, an ordinance, a judicial ruling, an executive order, a decision, etc. It can take a variety of different forms.

MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY-MAKING

These address how public policy is made. Policy-making is only one part of the entire policy process.

1. INSTITUTIONAL MODEL

focuses on the conventional structure of governmental organisations. Describes the functions and organisational structures of the various departments and bureaus. takes into account provisions of the constitution, as well as administrative and common law, as well as decisions made by the courts. It places an emphasis on formal arrangements such as presidential commissions, executive reorganisations, federalism, and other similar things. Conventionally, the field of political science has focused its attention on the study of governmental institutions such as Congress, the Presidency, the Courts, Political Parties, and so on. These institutions are responsible for authoritatively determining, implementing, and enforcing public policy. Strictly speaking, a policy does not become a public policy unless some political agency decides to adopt it, put it into effect, and make it enforceable. The government monopolises the power to coerce obedience to policies and to sanction those who violate them. The government gives policies their legitimacy, which makes them legal; the government extends policies universally to cover all members of society; and the government extends policies to cover all people. Studies conducted in the past utilising the institutional method concentrated on institutional structures, organisation, responsibilities, and function rather than analysing the influence these factors had on public policy.

2. ELITE-MASS MODEL

A policy-making elite operates in an atmosphere marked by apathy and information distortion, and they are responsible for governing a mass population that is primarily passive. The elite determine policy, which is

then implemented by the masses. Those who hold power in society are differentiated from those who do not hold power. Values that set elites apart from the general population are held in common. The policies that are now in place are reflective of elite beliefs, and as a result, they tend to maintain the status quo. The elites enjoy greater wealth, greater education, and better prestige than the majority of the population. One way to look at the values and preferences of a ruling elite is to consider how they influence public policy. More often than not, elite opinion determines that of the masses. The elite make policy decisions, while public officials and administrators just implement those policies so that they may be "pushed down" to the masses. It takes for granted that:

1. there are a few strong people and a large number of helpless people in society; only the few decide what values should be (the mass do not decide public policy).
2. The few are not representative of the masses, and a disproportionate number of elites come from the higher social strata.
3. In order to avert revolution and maintain stability, there needs to be a gradual and ongoing ascent of those who are not members of the elite into positions of power; however, this ascent can only occur once the non-elite members of the group embrace the ideals of the elite.
4. There is a consensus among all of society's leaders about the most fundamental social system ideals, including private property, limited government, and individual liberty.
5. Rather than being revolutionary, future shifts in public policy will be gradual, and they will reflect changes in the attitudes of elites (not mass demands).
6. Apathetic masses have very little effect on active elites because they lack interest in politics.

The implication here is that the responsibility for the current condition of affairs, which includes the wellbeing of the general populace, lies with the elites. The masses are uninterested and poorly informed; the elite are able to manipulate the attitudes of the masses; the masses only have a limited and indirect effect on choices and policies. Since information can only travel in a downward direction, democratic elections of the people are purely symbolic in the sense that they link the masses to the system through political parties and the act of voting sometimes. Policies could shift somewhat over time, but the ruling elites are notoriously resistant to fundamental reform and won't let it happen. The only policy options that will be given serious consideration are those that fit within the spectrum of elites' commonly held values. Competition centres on a narrow range of issues, and elites agree more often than they disagree; there is always agreement on constitutional government, democratic procedures, majority rule, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom to form political parties and run for office, freedom to form political parties and run for office, freedom to form political parties and run for office, freedom to form political parties and run for office, equality of opportunity, private property, individual initiative and reward, and the legitimacy of free enterprise and capitalism. Since it is not possible to depend on the people to accept these principles in a consistent manner, it is necessary for the elite to support them.

3. GROUP MODEL

The formation of public policy is the consequence of a network of factors and pressures that interact with one another and react to one another. The focus is typically on the legislative branch, although interest groups can also exert pressure on the executive branch. There is a risk that regulatory agencies will be co-opted by the very entities they are supposed to oversee, and as a result, administrators will find it increasingly difficult to differentiate between policies that will help the general public and policies that will help the entities that are being regulated. Interactions between different groups are at the heart of political

life. People who share similar concerns and goals come together to make their demands (either formally or informally) known to the government. In the realm of politics, individuals only have significance when they take action as part of or on behalf of collective interests. The person and the government are connected through the group, which acts as a bridge.

The task of the political system is to

1) establish the rules of the game
2) arrange compromises and balance interests
3) enact compromises in public policy
4) enforce these compromises

In the field of physics, this concept is sometimes referred to as the equilibrium theory. Numbers, money, organisational strength, leadership, access to decision makers, and cohesiveness within an organisation are the factors that define one's level of influence. Policymakers respond to the pressure of groups by haggling, negotiating, and finding common ground among opposing demands. In order to get programmes passed, executives, politicians, and agency leaders all collaborate to form coalitions made up of members of respective constituencies. Parties in politics are alliances of various interest groups. People who live in centre cities, members of labour unions, people of ethnic or immigrant backgrounds, the economically disadvantaged, Catholics, liberals, intellectuals, blacks, and workers in blue collar jobs in the South have generally been Democrats. Historically, Republicans have been rich, rural, small town, whites, suburbanites, white collar employees, and middle class people.

The entire system assumes:

1) a 'latent' group supports the rules of the game
2) there is overlapping group membership which keeps groups from moving too far out of the political mainstream
3) there are checks and balances on groups competition

SYSTEMS MODEL

depends on principles from the field of information theory, including as input, output, and feedback. Considers the process of making policies to be cyclical. The question, "what are the main factors and patterns in the public policy-making system?" is posed here. What takes place within the proverbial "black box" that is the process of turning requests into public policy? What goes into it, and what comes out of it? To some extent, public policy may be seen as the political system's reaction to the pressures that are exerted on it from the environment outside of it. The political system is embedded in its surrounding environment. According to this framework, the term "environment" refers to the following factors: the natural resources, the climate, the topography; the demographic characteristics of the population, including its size, age distribution, and location; and the political characteristics of ideology, culture, social structure, economics, and technology. The outside world can introduce forces into the political system in two ways: as demands or as support. Individuals or organisations may petition the government to take action in response to actual or perceived environmental issues by submitting a formal request. When residents comply with official policies—such as by voting, paying taxes, and obeying the law—they are rewarded with support.

A society's political system is made up of a collection of interconnected institutions and procedures that work together to provide an authorised means of resource distribution. The legislative, the executive branch,

the administrative agencies, the courts, interest groups, political parties, and individual individuals make up the cast of characters in this drama.

The outputs consist of choices, acts, and changes to public policy. The political system may be understood as an identifiable network of institutions and processes that work together to convert inputs into outputs for the entire community. The components of the system are interconnected, it is capable of reacting to the external pressures, and it works to maintain itself in a state of equilibrium with its surrounding environment. The system is able to maintain itself by generating outputs that are sufficiently good (compromises are arranged, enacted and enforced). It is dependent on widespread support for the system itself and the use of force or the threat of force employed by the system.

Policies at the macro level are those that involve the entire system and are influenced by organisations both officially recognised and not officially recognised (media, etc.). It might revolve around issues such as the appropriate function of Congress or the Presidency, the link between the government and corporations, or the dynamic between citizens and enterprises. Subsystem policies are those that involve lawmakers, administrators, lobbyists, and academics that concentrate on specific issue areas. Subsystem policies are also known as sub-governments, policy clusters, coalitions, and iron triangles. Examples include the military, ports, agricultural subsidies, grazing pastures, and the civil aviation industry. Micro-level policies are efforts made by individuals, corporations, or communities to win favourable laws for themselves. These efforts can range from local to national to international levels. Requests from constituents in a legislator's "home" district are the most common kind of constituent lobbying. When there are more rules, programmes, and advantages provided by the government, there is a greater motivation for people to participate in local politics.

STREAMS AND WINDOWS MODEL

This model postulates that there are three streams that are constantly happening concurrently with one another. When these three streams meet, a policy window opens, and it's possible that a new policy may be formed as a result. The problem stream draws the attention of the general public and policymakers to a specific issue, provides a definition of the issue, and makes a case for a different approach to policymaking (or else the problem fades). The collection of monitoring data, the occurrence of focusing events, and the provision of feedback on already-in-place policies are all ways in which attention may be drawn to an issue. It is vital to categorise the problem in order to determine how it should be treated and/or how it should be resolved. Values, comparisons, and classifications are all significant.

The political stream is the place where the agenda for the government is formulated; that is, the list of topics or problems that the government is tasked with resolving. This is the consequence of the interplay of significant factors such as the national mood, organised interests, and the dynamics of public administration (jurisdictional conflicts between agencies, the makeup of government staff, etc.). This takes place as a result of the interaction of these main forces. Members of the government, appointees and staff, members of Congress, members of the medical community, interest organisations, individuals affiliated with elections, parties and campaigns, and public opinion are examples of participants who are frequently extremely prominent. After reaching an agreement among those groups, a bandwagon effect or title effect takes place since everyone wants to be included in the policy decision and not left out. The policy stream is the part of the process where many options are reviewed and decisions are taken. Here, the intellectual and personal aspects take up the majority of the attention, and a list of potential solutions is formed, from which decision-makers can pick one. Policy entrepreneurs and others, such as academics, researchers, consultants,

professional public administrators, Congressional employees, OMB staff members, and interest organisations, all play a part in the process. In order to determine whether or not a number of potential alternatives are politically viable, test balloons may be floated publicly or in secret. They have to be acceptable with regard to the value limitations, the technical constraints, and the financial restrictions. The use of logical reasoning and persuasive speech ultimately results in the formation of consensus (not bargaining). When a credible answer finally starts to take shape, tilt has taken place.

When these three currents come together, it's possible that a policy window may open. This could be the result of a shift in public opinion, a change in Congress or administration, or the emergence of an urgent crisis. Any one of the three streams can undergo change independently, but in order to arrive at a policy choice, all three must converge.

CRITIQUE OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY:

1) Institutional Model: When all institutions and the relationships they share with other organisations are thoroughly studied, it is possible to do so. However, in a society that is still developing, when one organisation provides services that overlap with those provided by another organisation, it can be difficult to differentiate between the two, leading to instances of duplication that waste the money and resources of the people living in that country.

2) Systems Model: Despite the fact that it is seen to be beneficial, it does have certain drawbacks. According to Thomas Dye, significant characteristics of the political system, which plays a very important role in the process of transforming decisions into policies, have been missing from the Systems Model. This is despite the fact that the political system plays a very important role in the process. In addition, the environmental inputs that have an effect on the political systems have not been adequately identified and articulated. It is also considered an overly simplistic method for attempting to convey the intricate cycle of policy. It uses the value-laden techniques of welfare economics, and other aspects like rationality, power, personnel, and institutions, amongst others, have been disregarded and not demonstrated as fundamental parts in the policy cycle. Moreover, it applies value-laden techniques of welfare economics..

3) Rational Model: When put into reality, problems occur due to the fact that social and environmental values can be difficult to define and that it might be difficult to reach a consensus on the same. It is not completely realistic because it is based on the principle that the person making the decision is aware of all the facts and statistics that need to be considered in the current situation, and that they also know the best way to deal with the situation and take a decision that is completely rational.

4) Bounded Rationality Model: It is only goal pursuing and does not take in a very detailed account of the means to attain it.

5) Incrementalism Model: It only considers the problems that are occurring at the moment and the solutions that can be implemented in the short term by taking one step at a time, but it ignores the more fundamental problem, which is that the root of the problem needs to be removed; otherwise, the little bit of work that has been done will be undone in a very short amount of time. Taking everything step by step for the time being. In addition to this, it creates room for additional stages that sneak up on you and were not at all contemplated at the beginning, which may or may not be useful depending on the situation.

6) Game Theory Model: As a consequence of this, you cannot declare that everyone will behave or respond in the same manner due to the fact that not everyone is entirely rational, as the notion of the Games Theory Model implies. This justifies selfishness in the name of personal interest, and as values are immensely diverse, you cannot claim that everyone will behave or respond in the same manner because you cannot predict how anybody values anything.

7) Optimal-Normative Model: It is predicated on a combination of rational and irrational reasons, although the particulars of those components have not been defined at this time. In addition to this, it is predicated on the assumption that the only conditions in which genuine optimality may be attainable are those in which the interrelationships between the numerous facets of knowledge have been established and analysed. This is because this is the only circumstance in which genuine optimality may be achievable. This suggests that the individual making the choice must have knowledge about two or more areas of concern regarding the scenario in order to make a better judgement, which is not possible nor is it realistic in the majority of circumstances when this is a need.

8) Elite Model: According to the information presented in this section, the only group of people who are capable of formulating policies is an exclusive club of citizens known as the elite. It is stated that these few individuals hold the positions of public administrators and politicians. There is no need to discuss with those who are not competent in this topic because these select few are the only persons who are able to establish policies. It does not take into account the relevance of civil society organisations and other non-profit and volunteer groups having local knowledge of problems and potential solutions to such problems. Neither does it take into account the fact that these organisations exist.

9) Group Model: It asserts that since there is not enough other organised opposition, a select few organisations and lobbying groups that have a monopoly on organised agitation and the tools to influence bureaucracy and legislation are able to get their way.

10) Market Exchange Model: It is a highly capitalist approach, which leads to the concentration of money and virtually never helps to the economic or social advancement of the people, especially those on lower rungs of society or who are less fortunate. This is especially true of those who are in a position of disadvantage. Because the market is solely concerned with profit, it will exert influence on the government to enact laws that are beneficial to them economically but not in a way that is socially uplifting. This creates a conundrum in the process of formulating welfare policy because it creates a dilemma in the process of formulating welfare policy.

Conclusion

The process of establishing public policy is a challenging one to go through. Both the particulars of public policy and the general scope of public policy of a nation may be significantly influenced, to a substantial degree, by the predominate ideology and political structure of that nation. There is no universal agreement on what exactly the phrase "public policy" refers to in its full sense. On the other hand, public policy may be looked of as the overall framework that regulates how the actions of the government are carried out in order to fulfil the goals that it has set for itself. It is a purposeful and consistent course of action that was conceived as a response to a perceived problem of a constituency, formulated by a specific political process, and adopted, implemented, and enforced by a public agency. It was conceived as a response to a perceived problem of a constituency and was formulated by a particular political process. This plan of action was conceived as a solution to a problem that was reportedly being experienced by a constituent group.

REFERENCE

1) Anderson, James E., 1984, Public Policy-Making, CBS CoIlegePublisl-ting, New York.

2) Etzioni, A.,"'Mixed Scanning : A 'third' approach to Decision-Making", Pub2icAdnzirzistratioiz Review, Vol. 27,1967.

3) Pattpn, Carl V. and David S. Sawicki, 1986, Basic Methods of Policy Analysis andplanning, Prentice-Hall, Englwood Cliffs.

4) LINDBWM, CHARLES E., and EDWARD J. WooDHOUSE. The Policy-Making Process, 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1993.

5) WILDAVSKY, AARoN. The New Politics of the Budgetary Process, 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.

6) Henig, Jeffrey R. Neighborhood Mobilization. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982.

7) Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D., & Redmond-Jones, D. (2002). Reconstituting Schools: Testing the Theory of Action. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 113-133.

8) Marsh, D., & Smith, M. J. (2001). Understanding Policy Networks: Towards a Dialectical Approach. Political Studies, 4–21.

9) O'Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Volume 10, Issue 2, 263-288.

10) Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1979). Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington are Dashed in Oakland : Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, this Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers who Seek to Build Morals. Berkely, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

11) Silver, D., Weitzman, B. C., & Brecher, C. (2002). Setting an agenda for local action: The limits of expert opin-ion and community voice. Policy Studies Journal, 363-378.

12) Smith, K. B., & Larimer, C. W. (2009). The Public Policy Theory Primer. Westview: Boulder CO.