



DEMOCRATIC POLITICS  
AND  
POLICY ANALYSIS

**Hank C. Jenkins-Smith**

*George Bush School of Government and Public Service  
Texas A&M University*

© Hank C. Jenkins-Smith 2001

## PREFACE

This is a book about the relationship between applied public policy analysis and democratic politics. The topic is urgent because policy analysis is increasingly-and formally-intertwined with the making of public policy in modern politics. From the standpoint of the norms of democratic politics, important charges have been leveled at policy analysts, claiming that the application of policy analysis undermines, distorts, or overburdens the policy-making process. From the perspective of the policy analyst, on the other hand, the question is whether the potential benefits of policy analysis can survive the vicissitudes of politics without being a mere handmaiden to the politically powerful or, alternatively, simply ignored and irrelevant.

Since the rise of policy analysis over the past two decades, the assessments of the role of analysis have oscillated between "belief and doubt."<sup>1</sup> Analysis has alternately been deemed irrelevant or outrightly harmful by its critics and a godsend by its advocates. Both critics and advocates have mobilized evidence -primarily in the form of case studies-backing their claims. The intent of this book is to analyze these claims and counterclaims in a way that is of use to students, scholars, and practitioners of both politics and policy analysis.

The goals of this book are to clarify the fundamental bases of public policy analysis-what I call the policy analysis paradigm-and to address, with a focus on the premises of the critiques regarding the role of analysis in democratic

<sup>1</sup> See Martin Rein and Sheldon White's "Policy Research: Belief and Doubt," *Policy Analysis*, 3(2) (Spring 1977), pp. 239-271. Also see Henry Aaron's *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective*, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1978).

politics, various themes critical of policy analysis. In so doing, a model of policy analysis and its political context is developed and applied to a set of federal energy policy cases. The first case is an in-depth study of strategies of analytical debate in a highly charged dispute over energy export policy in the early 1980s. Then an array of cases are applied that, while primarily concerned with energy issues, cover a broad range of the significant "policy contexts" in which analysis is applied. Finally, a conclusion is reached regarding the implications of policy analysis for democratic politics and the effects of politics on the practice of policy analysis.

For course work, this book should be of use in advanced undergraduate and graduate-level courses in public policy analysis, public policy processes, and public administration. For those whose strength is in the area of policy analysis, this book's greatest offerings are the treatment of the criticisms of policy analysis (chapter 3), and the integration of analysis with the politics of policy making (chapters 4 through 7). For those with less background in policy analysis, the discussion of the philosophical and technical underpinnings of policy analysis (chapter 2) is also essential: a general understanding of the concept of efficiency is necessary for any reasoned assessment of the intended and the de facto roles of public policy analysis.

The model of policy analysis in the political context (chapter 4) is intentionally designed to facilitate application across the full gamut of policy contexts. Thus I would encourage instructors and students to apply the model to new areas to test its propositions and to extend, enrich, and (where warranted) revise the model. While the book is written at an advanced level, the basic concepts are fully defined in the text and pinpointed in the index.

In writing a book of this scope, it is probably inevitable that many debts, intellectual and otherwise, will be incurred. The primary argument of this book was extensively influenced by Ted Bluhm, Paul Sabatier, and David Weimer. Many others have read and provided useful comments on all or parts of the book, including Richard Barke, Marshall Hoyler, Bruce Jacobs, Roger James, Liz Jenkins-Smith, Steve Minihan, Jill Clark, Robert Bartlett, and Peter deLeon. Others provided invaluable time and data in the form of the personal interviews employed in the case studies described in chapters 5 and 6. Bob Baker's thorough copy editing greatly improved the manuscript, and Ben Greensfelder kept production flowing smoothly. Finally, I wish to thank Cindy Stormer and Linda Stark of Brooks/Cole for their encouragement and assistance in bringing this project to completion. To all these individuals, and the many others who helped in innumerable ways, I express my heartfelt thanks! Blame for any errors, omissions, or other faults, however, rests completely (well, almost) with Paul Sabatier.

*Hank C. Jenkins-Smith*

# CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 Democratic Politics and Policy Analysis:  
Harmony or Tension? 1

**PART ONE**  
**THE FOUNDATIONS OF POLICY ANALYSIS:  
THREATS AND PROMISES 7**

CHAPTER 2 The Policy Analysis Paradigm 9

- 2.1 Characterizing Policy Analysis 10
- 2.2 Development of Utility Theory 15
- 2.3 The Concept of Efficiency 20
- 2.4 Efficiency and Market Prices 23
- 2.5 Efficiency Criterion: Prescription of the Paradigm 28
- 2.6 Policy Analysis and Politics in Tension 29

CHAPTER 3 The Threats of Policy Analysis 39

- 3.1 The Threat of Technocratic Control 41
- 3.2 The Normative Assault on the Policy  
Analysis Paradigm 55



## CONTENTS

3.3 Strains on Democratic Processes	68
3.4 Critical Themes and Democratic Norms	75
3.5 Summary	79
<b>PART TWO</b>	
<b>A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF POLICY ANALYSIS 81</b>	
CHAPTER 4 Analysis in Practice: Contexts and Roles	83
4.1 Characterizing Analysis	84
4.2 Analysis in Policy Subsystems	88
4.3 Policy Analysis and Subsystem Conflict	92
4.4 Prescription of Professional Roles	104
4.5 Summary	118
CHAPTER 5 Adversarial Analysis of U.S. Oil Export Policy	122
5.1 Background on the Alaskan Oil Export Issue	123
5.2 Basic Analytical Considerations	126
5.3 Forum, Players, and Positions	136
5.4 The Analysis	140
5.5 Strategies in Adversarial Analysis	162
5.6 Conclusions and Caveats	165
5.7 The Limitations of Policy Contexts	166
CHAPTER 6 Analysis as a Component of the Policy Process	167
6.1 Analysis in Practice: Cases-In-Brief	168
6.2 Levels of Conflict	172
6.3 Analytical Tractability	189
6.4 The Analytical Forum	194
6.5 Summary	197

CONTENTS

**PART THREE**  
**THE PRUDENTIAL PRACTICE OF**  
**POLICY ANALYSIS 201**

CHAPTER 7      Policy Analysis and Democratic Politics      203

    7.1 Does Policy Analysis Threaten Democracy? 204

    7.2 Does Democracy Threaten Analysis? 218

    7.3 Implications 220

## Process of public policy formulation in developing countries

Prof.Dr. Do Phu Hai, Faculty of Public Policy  
Graduate Academy of Social Science (GASS), Vietnam

**Abstract:** *Policy formulation clearly is a critical phase of the policy process which also is an explicit subject of policy design. The public policy formulation is part of the pre-decision phase of policy making including to craft the goals and priorities and options, costs and benefits of each options, externalities of each option. It involves identifying a set of policy alternatives and public policy tools to address a problem as a result that a prepared set of solutions is done for the final solutions from which decision makers actually choose by judging the feasibility, political acceptance, costs and benefits. But the attention to policy formulation is also embedded in work on policy communities and policy networks, who does the design? (see Chap 6, Studying Public Policy (Howlett, 2003)). On the other words, the formulation process will need the motivation and participation of different actors with their entrances of new actors and new ideas who will actually play their roles in the policy design process. In the context of developing countries, this paper aims to examine the model of policy formulation and the type of feasible solutions or options for resolving the policy problems. Thus, the structure of the sub-system with two components of the discourse community and interest network will decide the participation of different policy actors and final chosen public policy solutions.*

**Key words:** public policy, formulation, sub-system of public policy, policy networks, policy communities

The involvement of businesses and civil society - consumers, private entrepreneurs, employees and citizens and community groups, NGOs in designing public policy is critical if the Government of developing countries are to improve the transparency, quality and effectiveness of their policies as well as establishing the legitimacy of the public policy. Socio-economic and political conditions of a country determine or shape the network of a particular policy, so we explore recent research examining linkages between models of economic development and welfare regimes in developing countries where are known as weak institutional capacity, lack of accountability to the citizen to predict the policy formulation in developing countries.



As a preliminary effort to remedy this shortcoming in the literature, we offer a political logic for the observed variation in the character of institutions of social policy established by nondemocratic regimes. Pross (1986) described the policy community as a network of individuals, groups, government departments, organizations, and agencies that dominate decision making in a specific policy field.

Accordance to Hai Do (2010), the dominant model of policy formulation in developing countries is the bureaucratic politics amongst the interrupted equilibrium, organizational process, and rational actor. Frans Van Waarden (1992) combined Rhodes's analysis with eight basic types of subsystem in Atkinson and Coleman (1992) to issue seven criteria on which the network can be varied: number and type of actors, function of networks, structure, institutionalization, and rules of conduct, power relations, and actor strategies. Howlett and Ramesh (1998, 2003) continued to construct the taxonomy of discourse communities which are two dichotomous dimensions in dominant idea set and numbers of idea set can be realistically applied for the analysis in a place of policy formulation.

In additional, studying the interest networks, the taxonomy of interest networks which are again dichotomous dimensions of dominant actor and number of members, so these variables are shaping the structure and behavior of the policy networks (Howlett and Ramesh, 1998, 2003). The two variables and additional dominant idea set and numbers of idea set are used to discuss on the process of public policy formulation in developing countries.

In order to operate on the research question, that who does the policy design? And what are the motivation and participation of different actors with their entrances of new actors with new ideas who will actually play their roles in the policy design process? The research worked on the key variables such as *dominant idea set and number of idea sets* in the policy communities and variables of *dominant actor and number of members* in shaping the structure and behavior of policy networks. 'Discourse' can also refer to dialogue, language, and conversation within the policy communities. The individual policy maker is substantially used as the unit analysis in this research.

The research established the following hypotheses to address the research questions:



Hypothesis 1: In the subsystem, the discourse communities of the dominant idea set and number of idea sets will decide the structure of the policy communities.

Hypothesis 2: In the sub-system, the policy network of the dominant actors and number of members will shape the roles and motivation and participation of different actors;

### **1. Approaches to public policy formulation in developing world**

The economic development of a country depends on the quality of its policy framework, the decisions taken, especially the processes involved in formulating each decision. It is clear also that developing countries throughout the world vary considerably in their ability, and perhaps their willingness to formulate and implement policies that will generate improved development performance (Joan Corkery, Anthony Land, and Jean Bossuyt, 1995).

In public policy world, the policy formulation is part of the pre-decision phase of policy making. This task includes the crafting identification of a set of public policy alternatives to address the socio-economic problems, and selection process by narrowing that set of solution in preparation for the final policy solutions for the next stage. In Cochran and Malone (1996), the policy formulation is to deal with the problem, goals and priorities, solution options for the achievement of policy objectives, cost benefit analysis, negative and positive externalities are associated with each alternative. These stages embedded into the policy cycle which is now popular in developing world. However, the specification of policy alternatives does not follow neatly from the agenda setting process not lead neatly into implementation in Mara S. Sidney (2002) which is reflected the policy formulation in developing countries. Thus, the policy formulation is a function rather than a stage where dominant actors and set ideas shaping significantly during their course of actions. Apparently, the function is more relevant for the developing countries where there are weak institutions, regulatory capacity, accountability and participation and responsibility of sub-system of government, so the formulation is the continuous process.

The attention of policy formulation is also embedded in work on subsystem, advocacy coalition, networks, and policy communities (Weible and Sabatier). The policy formulation is taken up in the agenda setting works in some researchers in 1995 to 1998 (Kingdon and Birkland); however, the policy formulation is the work of the policy communities and policy networks (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002); it is apparent that identifying the policy

actors, understanding their beliefs and motivations, their judgments of feasibility, and their perceptions of the political context which is relevant for developing world (ibid).

Thus, the policy formulation is the function of the policy making. It is really the practice oriented policy making in developing world. Also, the policy formulation within the policy communities and policy networks is reflected the actual policy in developing countries because the policy making in development work in environment with weak institutions and capacity within the communities and networks.

## **2. Policy formulation in developing countries**

### *2.1. Policy design*

Most of policy sciences have known that the policy formulation uses the concept of policy design to emerge in response to implementation studies of policy systems which responsible for policy failure in 1970s-1980s. Most of policy design theorists given that the causal chain is the main cause of policies success or failure because the policy designs contribute to policy outcomes (Hai Do, 2012). Firstly, the policy design will need to specify the lists of policy instruments, institution-building (Weimer, 1992). Continuously, Fischer (2000) and Rixecker (1994) provided that the innovation and creativity are often raised from attention to the voices that contribute to the policy dialogue. Some other scholar focuses on policy discourse and dominant ideas. It consists of competing efforts to make meaning as much as to win votes. Indeed, the pursuit and exercise of power includes constructing images and stories, and deploying symbols (Fischer and Forester 1993; Rochefort and Cobb 1994; Schneider and Ingram 1997, 2005; Stone 2001; Yanow 1995).

Due to technical endeavor, leading them to characterize policies as “well” or “poorly” designed (e.g., Ingraham 1987; Linder and Peters 1985); this technical matter are popular in developing countries (Do, 2011). The scholars described a policy as well-designed if a careful analysis of means-end relationships. Thus, they tend to understand policy design as a political process preceding every policy choice (Bobrow and Dryzek 1987; Kingdon 1995; Schneider and Ingram 1997; Stone 2001). However, the options that address policy goals and instrument types require the injection of some new ideas and thinking into policy deliberation (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). Proposals for policy and program changes tend to arise from new actors in existing policy process, while changes relating to instrument types



and components tend to develop among existing actors as their preferences change (ibid, 147).

In policy formulation, the relevant actors are usually restricted to members of policy subsystems, since a requirement of participation at this stage of the process is some minimal level of knowledge in the subject area, allowing an actor to comment, at least hypothetically, on the feasibility of options put forward to resolve policy problems (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). This is necessary for developing countries to define the policy regime as the dominant actor is belonged to state, but not from the civil society; the limitation of participation of the civil society is popular.

## 2.2. *Policy tools*

The policy tools or governing instruments that governments use to put the policies into the effect (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). Over time, a subset of policy literature has focused explicitly on policy tools. Bardach (2005) offers eight-step framework of policy analysis, describing taxes, regulation, grants, services, budgets, information, rights, and other policy tools. For each tool, he suggests why and how it might be used, and what some of the possible pitfalls could be, aiming to stimulate creativity in crafting policy. Hood (1986) analyzes a range of government tools in significantly more detail with the ultimate aim of making sense of government complexity, generating ideas for policy design and enabling comparisons across governments. The wave of scholars use policy tools documents as trends away from direct provision of government services and toward measures that embed government officials in complex collaborative relationships with other levels of government, private-sector actors, and non-government organizations. These arrangements grant government parties much greater discretion than the close supervision and regulation of the past (Salamon, 2002). These indirect measures include contracting, grants, vouchers, tax expenditures, loan guarantees, government-sponsored enterprises and regulations, among others; many do not appear on government budgets in which he suggests helps to explain their popularity.

The research on policy tools highlights the political consequences of particular tools, as well as their underlying assumptions about problems, people, and behavior. Salamon characterizes the choice of tools as political as well as operation. Additionally, tools require