

MAPOL 2.2



M.A. POLITICS
SEMESTER - II
REVISED SYLLABUS AS PER NEP 2020

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Prof. Ravindra Kulkarni

Vice Chancellor

University of Mumbai, Mumbai

Prin. (Dr.) Ajay Bhamare

Pro Vice-Chancellor,

University of Mumbai

Professor Shivaji Sargar

Director,

CDOE, University of Mumbai

Programme Co-ordinator

: Mr. Anil R. Bankar

Associate Professor,
Head, Faculty Head, Arts and Humanities,
CDOE, University of Mumbai

Course Co-ordinator

: Dr. Kshipra Vasudeo

Assistant Professor,
CDOE, University of Mumbai

: Dr. Dattatray M. Tonde

Assistant Professor,
CDOE, University of Mumbai

Editor

: Dr. Kshipra Vasudeo

Assistant Professor,
CDOE, University of Mumbai,
Bandra, Mumbai.

Course Writers

: Dr. Ravi Shukla

Assistant Professor
R. D. National College,
Bandra, Mumbai.

: Mr. Roshan Varma

Assistant Professor
M. S. College of Law,
Thane.

: Dr. Shekhar Balkrishna Ashtikar

Post-Doctoral Research Fellow of ICSSR, New Delhi,
Political Science and International Relations
Ramkrishna Nagar, Parbhani, Maharashtra, 431401

March 2025, Print - 1

ISBN: 978-93-6728-127-7

Published by : Director,

Centre for Distance and Online Education,

University of Mumbai,

Vidyanagari, Mumbai - 400 098.

DTP composed and Printed by:

Mumbai University Press

Vidyanagari, Santacruz (E), Mumbai- 400098

CONTENTS

Unit No.	Title	Page No.
Module 1		
	1. Meaning, Scope, and Significance	1
Module 2		
	2. Theories and Approaches	19
Module 3		
	3. Transparency and Accountability	34
	4. Citizen's Charter, Right to Information, E-Governance, Role of Civil Society	41
	5. Ombudsman, Lok Pal and Lok Ayukta	49
Module 4		
	6. Dynamics of Public Policy Making	55
	7. Models of Policy Making Monitoring, Evaluation and Review of Policy	65

M.A. POLITICS
SEMESTER - II
REVISED SYLLABUS AS PER NEP 2020
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
SYLLABUS

Public Administration
(4 Credits, 60 Hours)

Course Objectives:

1. It aims to acquaint students with the understanding theoretical perspectives of Public Administration.
2. The paper is designed with both theoretical and applied aspects to accommodate the recent developments in the field.
3. Apart from purely academic aspects, the paper also takes care of some competitive examination syllabus.

Module 1: Meaning, Scope and Significance

- a) Evolution and changing nature of public administration
- b) Comparative Public Administration, Development Administration, New Public Administration
- c) New Public Management, Good Governance: concept and application

Module 2: Theories and Approaches

- a) Classical, Bureaucratic Model, Human Relations School,
- b) Scientific Management, Behavioural, Structural-functional Approach
- c) Marxian, Public Choice, Post-modern

Module 3: Transparency and Accountability

- a) Legislative, Executive and Judicial control over administration
- b) Ombudsman, Lokpal and Lokayukta
- c) Citizen's Charter, Right to Information, e-Governance, Role of Civil Society.

Module 4: Public Policy

- a) Dynamics of Public Policy Making
- b) Models of Policy Making
- c) Monitoring, Evaluation and Review of Policy

Outcomes

1. Students will be introduced with the administrative machinery of the country.
2. Students will be understood the process of Policy formulation
3. This paper will generate the awareness about the active participation in the administration

Reading List:

1. Avasthi, A., & Maheshwari, S. (2009). *Public Administration* (30th ed.). Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.
2. Basu, R. (1999). *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories* (Third ed.). New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
3. Bhagwan, V., & Bhushan, V. (2010). *Public Administration*. New Delhi: S. S. Chand & Company Ltd.
4. Bhattacharya, M. (1997). *Reconstruction Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers & Distributors.
5. Bhattacharya, M. (2011). *New Horizons Of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers & Distributors.
6. Chakrabarty, B., & Chand, P. (2012). *Public Administration in a Globalizing World* (First ed.). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd.
7. Dawes, S. S. (2008, December). The Evolution and Continuing Challenges of E-Governance. *Public Administration Review* (Special Issue), S86-S102.
8. Demmers, J., Jilberto, A., & Hogenboom, B. (2004). *Good Governance and democracy in a world of neoliberal regimes*. (J. Demmers, A. Jilberto, & B. Hogenboom, Eds.) London and New York: Routledge.
9. Fadia, B. L., & Fadia, K. (2010). *Indian Administration* (Fourth Revised ed.). Agra: Sahitya Bhavan Publications.
10. Fang, Z. (2002). E-Government in Digital Era: Concept, Practice, and Development. *International Journal of The Computer, The Internet and Management*, 10(2), 1-22.
11. Henry, N. (2010). *Public Administration and Public Affairs* (Eleventh ed.). New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
12. Kistaiah, M. (2010). Elton Mayo. In D. R. Prasad, V. S. Prasad, P. Satyanarayana, & Y. Pardhasaradhi (Eds.), *Administrative Thinkers* (Second Enlarged ed.). New Delhi: Sterling Private Limited.
13. Laxmikant, M. (2010). *Public Administration* (Eighth Reprint ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Companies.
14. Mayo, E. (1933). *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
15. Prasad, R., Pardhasaradhi, Y., Prasad, V. S., & Satyanarayana, P. (2010). *Administrative Thinkers* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt.Ltd.
16. Report of the Working Group on Convergence and E-Governance for the Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007), (November 2001). New Delhi: Planning Commission, Government of India.
17. Sahni, P., & Vayunandan, E. (2009). *Administrative Theory* (First ed.). New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
18. Sapru, R. (2008). *Administrative Theories and Management Thought* (Second ed.). New Delhi: Practice Hall of India Private Limited.
19. Sharma, M. P., & Sadana, B. L. (2008). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice* (45th ed.). Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
20. लोखंडे भगवान, थारकर पंजाबराव, भाबरदोडे विजयशिंग, 'लोकप्रशासन', मुक्त दूर व मुक्त अध्ययन केंद्र मुंबई विद्यापीठ, मुंबई .2023 .
21. बंग के.आर. 'लोकप्रशासन ' विद्या प्रकाशन औरंगाबाद
22. पाटील पी.बी., 'लोकप्रशासन ' फडके प्रकाशन कोल्हापूर

MEANING, SCOPE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

Unit Structure :

- 1.0 Objective
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Evolution and changing character of the discipline:
 - 1.2.1 Comparative Public Administration
 - 1.2.2 Development Administration
 - 1.2.3 New Public Administration
- 1.3 Challenges of liberalization, privatization, globalization, changing role of the public sector, public-private relations.
- 1.4 Good Governance: Concept and Application; New Public Management
- 1.5 Let us sum up
- 1.6 Unit end questions
- 1.7 Reference

1.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, we will explore the meaning of Public Administration and its evolution as a discipline. Along with the early developments in the field, the unit will discuss in detail three major advancements in the post-World War era: Comparative Public Administration, Development Administration, and New Public Administration. It will also examine the impact of globalization on Public Administration. Additionally, sections on Good Governance and New Public Management will introduce learners to the key developments in governance after the 1980s.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Human actions have social implications. Human behavior requires regulation and control. Humans need support and coordination of essential supplies for their existence. Their security is ensured by being together with other fellow beings. These and many more such conditions indicate that humans need the organization which pervades human existence from the cradle to the grave. Public administration is an all- pervasive organization performing a wide range of tasks at all levels of government like, budgeting, legislation, policy framing, policy execution, and administering government branches and agencies.

The term administration is derived from the Latin words ‘ad’ and ‘ministraire’, which means to care for, manage, and direct. To a certain extent, it suggests the management of people’s affairs. Scholars differ in

their understanding of the exact meaning of the term. For F.M. Marx and J. M. Pfiffner public administration is essentially a cooperative, organizational effort to systematically channelize resources to achieve common objectives to protect the public interest. While some thinkers argue for a broader approach towards the scope and range of activities of public administration and include all governmental activities for fulfillment of public policy, some scholars argue for a narrow view and consider only those activities which are concerned with the executive branch of government. L.D. White advocates including activities concerning fulfillment or enforcement of the public policy. Woodrow Wilson proposed a detailed and systematic application of the law. Dimock also held a similar opinion. Simon limits public administration to the activities of the executive or administrative branch only. Pfiffner argues for the coordinating role of administration in getting the work of government done so that people can work together to accomplish their set tasks. Speaking broadly, public administration is the development, implementation, and study of branches of government policy. It is concerned with the pursuit of public good by empowering civil society, ensuring a well-run, fair, and effective public service. It includes government offices at various levels ranging from local to national. Thus primarily public administration denotes the institutions of public bureaucracy within a state, the organizational structures which form the basis of public decision-making and implementation; and the arrangements by which public services are delivered.

In the preceding paragraph, we referred to narrow and broader perspectives about the scope of public administration. The narrow viewpoint, also called the managerial approach was advocated by classical theorists like Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick. In this sense, public administration as a practice is concerned with those aspects of administration that are related to the executive branch. As a field of study, the scope is limited to discover the scientific principles of administration which are supposed to be the universal objective laws of the management. The major thrust of the study is to improve the efficiency and economy of the organization. As against it L.D. White and others offered integrated broader viewpoints and suggested expanding the scope of public administration. Negro gives a comprehensive account of the scope of public administration. According to him public administration and political as well as social system are related to each other. This connectivity demands a broader approach towards the study of the subject. By this logic public administration is concerned with the formulation and implementation of public policies; it covers all three branches-executive, legislative and judicial- and their interrelationships, organizational structures, and machinery of administration; studies administrative processes, bureaucracy, and its activities; and necessitates coordination of group activity and close association between private groups and individuals to serve the people.

1.2 EVOLUTION AND CHANGING CHARACTER OF THE DISCIPLINE

Meaning, Scope, and
Significance

Public administration, as a practice, has evolved over thousands of years, deeply embedded in the governance structures of ancient civilizations. The administrative frameworks of early societies, such as those in China, Egypt, and India, underscore its enduring significance. Archaeological findings from the Indus Valley Civilization, particularly at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa, highlight a well-organized system of urban planning and resource management, reflecting the sophistication of early administrative mechanisms.

The intellectual foundations of public administration can be traced to classical political thought. The writings of Plato and Aristotle in ancient Greece extensively deliberated on governance, justice, and the role of the state, offering conceptual insights that continue to inform administrative theories. In India, Kautilya's *Arthashastra* provides a comprehensive treatise on statecraft, economic policies, and bureaucratic organization, demonstrating a structured approach to governance. These historical accounts affirm that public administration was not only practiced but also systematically theorized in antiquity, laying the groundwork for its evolution as an academic discipline.

Modern thinking on public administration began at the end of the 19th century. Forces of industrialization and colonialism pushed the debate over public administration from its traditional circles to modern arenas. The spread of rational thinking, scientific outlook, and democracy induced the transition of society from traditional to modern. Amidst such far-reaching global changes, the subject of Public Administration was striving to emerge as an independent discipline. Woodrow Wilson initiated this process in 1887 by publishing his famous essay, "The study of Public Administration" in which he addressed the problems and character of public administration in a modern democratic society. He laid the foundation of the science of public administration.

Avasthi and Maheshwari described five phases of the evolution of Public Administration. During the first phase (1887-1926) scholars like Woodrow Wilson and Frank Goodnow tried to separate the subject from political science. The emphasis was on efficient administration for the rational implementation of goals. Woodrow Wilson emphasized the need for a scientific approach to studying public administration. In the first quarter of the 20th century, the subject received increasing recognition in American academics. In 1926 Leonard D. White published the first textbook on the subject, '*Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*.' He underlined the politics and administration dichotomy with a note that administration is linked with politics via its involvement in policy matters.

The second phase (1926-1937) is known for the quest for scientific principles of administration and to establish the subject as an independent discipline. Willoughby's '*Principles of Public Administration*', Mary

Parker Follett's *Creative Experience*, Henri Fayol's *Industrial and General Management*, Mooney and Reiley's *Principles of Organisation* are important works during this phase. Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick in their '*Papers on the Science of Administration*' stated that Administration is a science. They argued for the discovery of objective principles of human organization, just like laws governing the physical world, which can be discovered by the scientific inductive method and have universal applicability.

The third phase (1938-1947) posed a formidable challenge to the claim that objective, universally applicable scientific principles of public administration can be discovered. Behaviouralists like Chester Bernard and Herbert Simon were at the forefront to declare that scientific management thinking was a myth on the ground that administration is comprised of humans and not machines. Robert Dahl summarized this opposition stating that administration is value-laden while science is value-free; human personalities differ and so do the social frameworks within which organizations inevitably operate and there is a need to take into account normative considerations, human behavior, and sociological and other factors while defining the parameters of public administration.

During the fourth phase (1948-1970) the discipline of public administration underwent a crisis of identity. The main reason was the behaviouralists' challenge. The movement for autonomy of the subject received a severe setback. Pfiffner and V.O. Key both advocated the fusion of politics and administration. D. Waldo called for the inclusion of policy issues and decision-making processes in the subject matter. Similarly, Paul Appleby in his *Policy and Administration* (1949) suggested that administration at a higher level is more generalized, political, and has a total governmental significance. At lower levels, it is less political and more particularistic. During this period Political Science overshadowed the growth and development of Public Administration as a separate discipline.

The fifth phase (1971 onwards) gave new lease of life to the discipline. During this phase, Public Administration acquired interdisciplinary character. The Minnowbrook Conference (1968) and subsequent publication of its proceedings by Frank Marini titled *Towards a New Public Administration* formulated basic postulates of New Public Administration. It rejected the value-neutral position of administration and focused on morality, ethics, and values. It upholds bureaucratic responsiveness, citizen participation in decision-making, social equity, and administrative responsibility for program effectiveness as constituents of public service ethic. It emphasized moral and political philosophy for administrators who must be proactive and client-oriented rather than being exclusively concerned with the virtues of economy and efficiency in administration.

To summarize, the nature of public administration as a subject has evolved since the 19th century. In response to the changing global context and the growing influence of adjacent social and natural sciences, the discipline has developed various approaches and theories. Some of these theories are discussed in Unit II of the syllabus. In the following sections, we will

examine major developments in the field of public administration during the post-Second World War era.

Meaning, Scope, and
Significance

1.2.1 Comparative Public Administration

Comparative Public Administration (CPA) represents a significant theoretical and methodological advancement in the evolution of public administration during the post-war period. Its primary objective was to develop a universally valid body of knowledge on administrative behavior. Robert Dahl and Dwight Waldo argued that without a comparative methodology, public administration's claim to be a "science of administration" would be unsubstantiated. CPA extended administrative theory-building beyond American experiences, advocating for cross-cultural and cross-national perspectives in public administration.

The post-World War II era necessitated an expansion of knowledge in public administration to address development challenges in erstwhile colonial countries. Societies in newly independent states were not in a position to directly apply studies from Western contexts to their administrative structures. Consequently, scholars emphasized the need to study politico-administrative institutions within their respective social settings. Theory-building in public administration and addressing the administrative challenges of developing countries were key motivating factors behind the emergence of CPA.

The origins of CPA can be traced to the 1952 public administration conference held at Princeton. A major milestone in its development was the establishment of the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) in 1960, supported by the Ford Foundation.

Robert H. Jackson defined CPA as "that facet of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs." CPA examines and compares similar and dissimilar features of administrative organizations or systems across different cultures and settings. Its objective is to identify the "causes" or "reasons" behind efficient and effective administrative performance. These comparisons can be cross-national, intra-national, cross-cultural, or cross-temporal.

Fred W. Riggs identified three key trends in the comparative study of public administration: the shift from a normative to an empirical orientation, from an idiographic to a nomothetic orientation, and from a non-ecological to an ecological orientation. The first trend emphasizes the empirical study of public administration; the second seeks to establish generalizations, laws, and hypotheses that identify behavioral regularities and correlations with variables; and the third advocates for studying administration as part of a larger administrative system or ecology.

Comparative administrative studies are generally conducted at three levels. Macro studies compare entire administrative systems within their ecological contexts, primarily to understand and explain the relationship between an

administrative system and its external environment (e.g., a comparison between India and Britain). Middle-range studies focus on specific aspects of an administrative system, such as local government structures. Micro studies analyze specific components of an administrative system within two or more administrative organizations, such as budget preparation in India and the USA.

Comparative Public Administration examines administrative development in the context of socio-economic change. It considers both ecological and developmental aspects, analyzing the interaction between administrative systems and their environments. This perspective helps explore the unique goals of specific cultures concerning their administrative frameworks. Additionally, it investigates the role of administrative systems in modernization and enables broad comparisons between the administrative structures of Western and non-Western countries.

The scope of comparative administration encompasses administrative systems, structures, organizations, functions, and methodologies at all levels of public authority—national, regional, or local, as well as executive or advisory. It also involves comparing the functions of administrative authorities, including executive, legislative, and judicial roles. Furthermore, it includes a comparative analysis of various forms of administrative control, personnel administration and its challenges, and functional administration in areas such as education, social welfare, and foreign affairs.

Comparative Public Administration has made significant contributions to the field of public administration. Generalizations derived from vast data collected across different nations and cultures have aided in theory development and provided a scientific foundation for the discipline. It has enhanced the understanding of administrative systems across various nations and cultures, enabling scholars to explain similarities and differences between them and identify the variables or factors responsible for these variations.

Additionally, Comparative Public Administration has helped both administrators and academicians analyze the factors influencing the performance of specific administrative structures and patterns in diverse environmental settings. It has offered valuable lessons for addressing challenges and solving problems within administrative systems by drawing insights from other nations and governance models. More importantly, it has provided an effective methodological toolkit, allowing social scientists to study foreign societies and transcend their own cultural domains.

1.2.2 Development Administration

The concept of Development Administration emerged after the Second World War as a response to the challenges faced by countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which were formerly colonies of Western European powers. These Newly Independent States (NIS) constituted two-thirds of the world's population and were grappling with post-colonial issues such as poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, malnutrition, and population

explosion. The role of government and administration in these nations required more than a laissez-faire approach; it was expected to drive change and modernization.

The integration of socio-economic structures with political systems, along with reforms in the structure and behavior of public institutions, was essential for fostering a strong national administrative culture. This transformation also required a shift in attitudes, values, and perspectives. The needs of these nations could not be met solely by the traditional focus of public administration on efficiency and economy. Instead, a new approach was required to suit the diverse ecological settings of public administration and to help achieve specific social goals.

The term Development Administration was first coined by Indian Civil Servant U.L. Goswami in 1955. It was later popularized by scholars such as Fred W. Riggs, Edwards W. Weidner, and Joseph La Palombara. Scholars, however, disagree on its exact meaning. Weidner defined Development Administration as “an action-oriented, goal-oriented administrative system.” He described development as a state of mind, a tendency, and a direction rather than a fixed goal. He further viewed development as “an aspect of change that is desirable, broadly predicted or planned, or at least influenced by governmental action.”

Riggs defined development as the “increased ability of human societies to shape their physical, human, and cultural environments.” According to him, a ‘developed’ system is one that can alter its environment more effectively than an ‘underdeveloped’ system. He asserted that the study of Development Administration could help identify the conditions necessary for achieving a maximum rate of development.

Broadly, Development Administration refers to the administration of developmental programs and the methods used by large-scale organizations, particularly governments, to implement policies and plans aimed at achieving developmental goals. This process inherently involves strengthening administrative capabilities. Pai Panandikar identified Development Administration with the “administration of planned change,” emphasizing the need for strengthening administrative capacities in a structured manner within a specified time frame to achieve specific developmental objectives.

The phrase Development Administration is intrinsically linked to this process of change and encompasses the structure, organization, and behavior required for the successful implementation of socio-economic development programs undertaken by the governments of developing nations.

Development Administration is change-oriented; it deliberately seeks to reorient people in desired directions. The administrative system is entrusted with the role of a change agent. Development Administration is result-oriented, as it expects specific outcomes and establishes clear performance norms. Development is a process of socio-economic change, and its success depends on citizens' participation in public administration.

Public servants must be equipped to engage with people effectively and actively involve them in development processes. This requires a fundamental shift in the outlook of civil servants toward the public. Development Administration demands a commitment to socio-economic change, a sense of involvement, and an empathetic concern from civil servants to complete time-bound programs.

Development Administration is dynamic and progressive, fostering innovation in governance structures and norms to adapt to changing political and social environments. It is compassionate and maintains a sympathetic attitude toward addressing the needs of marginalized sections, backward communities, and minority groups. Administrators in Development Administration are expected to be responsive and accountable, demonstrating willingness, dedication, and perseverance in achieving developmental goals. Additionally, Development Administration emphasizes the timely execution of programs to ensure effective implementation and desired outcomes.

1.2.3 New Public Administration

The 1960s is known as one of the most turbulent and crisis-ridden phases of the post-war era, significantly influencing various social science disciplines, including Public Administration. The period was marked by numerous societal challenges. Dissatisfaction among the American population regarding the Vietnam War, population growth, environmental problems, increasing social conflicts, and economic crises led the younger generation of intellectuals to question the efficacy and responsiveness of political and administrative systems. Additionally, there was a generational gap between scholars and practitioners of the discipline. Suggestions emerged advocating for the restoration of values and a renewed public purpose in government. It was deemed necessary to incorporate goals such as responsiveness to the needs of citizens and social equity in service delivery. This shift led to the emergence of New Public Administration (NPA).

Between 1967 and 1968, various efforts were initiated in the United States to provide a multidisciplinary, public policy, and social equity-oriented focus on Public Administration. The Honey Report on Higher Education, published in 1967, identified four major problems confronting the discipline: inadequate funding, uncertainty and confusion regarding its status, institutional shortcomings, and a lack of communication between scholars and practicing administrators. In response to these concerns, the American Academy of Political and Social Science organized a conference in Philadelphia in December 1967 to discuss "The Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods." Public Administration was examined from three perspectives: as an academic discipline, as a field of practice, and as a profession.

This conference was followed by the Minnowbrook Conference on Public Administration in 1968, presided over by Dwight Waldo, whose address reflected "New Thinking" in Public Administration. The proceedings of the

conference were comprehensively documented in "Towards a New Public Administration – The Minnowbrook Perspective," a book edited by Frank Marini (1971). The Minnowbrook Conference laid the foundation for the New Public Administration movement in the field of Public Administration.

Twenty years later, in 1988, the Second Minnowbrook Conference was held against the backdrop of the changing role of the state and government, increased privatization, outsourcing of services, and the growing role of non-state actors in the governance process. The period of the first conference was characterized by an emphasis on public purpose, the Vietnam War, urban riots, and campus unrest, accompanied by growing cynicism towards institutions, particularly the government. In contrast, the context of the second conference was radically different, dominated by the philosophy of privatization and a focus on private interests. Minnowbrook II aimed to compare the theoretical and research perspectives of both periods and their respective influences on the conduct of governmental and public affairs.

New Public Administration (NPA) has a distinct moral tone in its conceptualization. It is primarily normative and rooted in ethics. It criticized the traditional Public Administration approach for its excessive focus on efficiency and economy. Traditional approaches were deemed inadequate in addressing contemporary challenges, rendering them increasingly irrelevant. Public Administration, when viewed solely as a managerial science, lost its appeal, as it failed to acknowledge the broader implications of administrative actions within a political environment.

New Public Administration (NPA) questioned the value-neutrality of behavioral political science in general and management-oriented public administration in particular. It championed the cause of disadvantaged sections of society and advocated the utility of values being served through administrative action. NPA proposed a proactive role for governmental institutions in reducing economic and social disparities and ensuring equal life opportunities for all social groups within organizations. It introduced a new motto: *"To serve the cause of social equity is to actively work for social change."*

NPA suggested the institutionalization of change and the implementation of remedial measures to reduce the bureaucratic tendencies of large organizations. For these new theorists, the study of formal organizations—their structures and processes—was of secondary importance. Instead, NPA prioritized awareness of contemporary social and political issues, finding solutions for them, and making organizational changes to suit evolving societal needs.

Scholars emphasized four major goals that public administration was expected to achieve: relevance, values, social equity, change, and client orientation.

Relevance: New Public Administration seeks to bring studies of public administration closer to ground realities. It pointed out that the discipline should have relevance to contemporary problems and issues. The subject

should explicitly deal with the political environment and implications of administrative action. The new movement demanded radical syllabi change to facilitate meaningful studies oriented toward the realities of modern-day public life.

Values: NPA is value-oriented. It seeks to champion the cause of the disadvantaged sections in society. It advocates openness about the values being served through administrative action. It characterizes the new public administrator as less 'generic' and more 'public', less 'descriptive' and more 'prescriptive', less 'institution oriented' and more 'client-impact oriented', less 'neutral' and more 'normative'.

Social Equity: NPA openly advocates for the socially deprived groups with an action-oriented approach. It asserts that the distributive functions and impacts of governmental institutions should be a primary concern of public administration. The purpose of public action should be the reduction of economic and social disparities and the enhancement of life opportunities for all social groups within the organization.

Change: NPA challenged the status quo and the powerful interests entrenched in permanent institutions. It explored ways of institutionalizing change and addressing the bureaucratic tendencies of large organizations. NPA strongly advocated for active work toward social change.

In addition to these four goals, NPA promoted greater participation by all employees within an organization in matters of public policy formulation, implementation, and revision. Moreover, participation from individuals and groups outside the organization was encouraged to make public administration more responsive and client-oriented. It called for a shift in bureaucrats' attitudes, urging them to become more people-oriented.

The Minnowbrook conference significantly contributed to changing the complexion of public administration by advocating client orientation, social sensitivity, and normative concerns. The normative approach urged the government to adopt the objective of reducing economic and social disparities, thereby enhancing life opportunities for everyone in society.

1.3 CHALLENGES OF LIBERALIZATION, PRIVATIZATION, GLOBALIZATION, CHANGING ROLE OF PUBLIC SECTOR, PUBLIC-PRIVATE RELATIONS

Globalization refers to the interconnectedness of states and societies across national borders. It is the compression of time and space at an unprecedented scale, level, and depth. It is the process by which events in one part of the world cause repercussions and impacts in other parts of the world. Globalization has transformed the world into a global village, bringing individuals, communities, and organizations closer together and facilitating the exchange of capital, people, information, and culture between societies without hindrances. It has made the traditional notion of

state sovereignty redundant and reduced geographical boundaries to mere symbolic importance on maps.

Meaning, Scope, and
Significance

It is perceived that globalization is the product of a technological revolution in communication and information processes, as well as the aggressive position adopted by global capitalism in the post-Cold War era. From an economic perspective, it implies the removal of trade barriers and the facilitation of Foreign Direct Investment. The revolution in Information Communication Technology has led to the global exchange of information, data, and knowledge. The integration of culture in terms of cuisine, fashion, art, etc., has brought about the synthesis of traditions and transformed societies everywhere. The situation of law and order, along with security and defense, has acquired a global dimension with the spread of a global network of terror and underworld activities.

The societies and communities in different parts of the world are differently affected by this new interconnectedness. Their responses reflect their conditions vis-à-vis developed societies. The situations of nations regarding poverty, employment opportunities, standard of living, environmental degradation, sustainable livelihoods, loss of culture, social strife, and income disparities are not the same everywhere. The governance and administration of the countries' responses to globalization are determined by local political, socio-economic, and cultural dynamics.

Globalization has radically altered the notion of governance. Global institutions like the United Nations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development set the parameters of governance while distributing financial aid and expected recipient countries to abide by them. This led to the emergence of global governance. The entry of powerful multinational corporations, whose annual turnover is much higher than the collective budget of many countries, began playing a major role in policy decision-making. Even in the area of service delivery, flourishing civil society organizations and international and national-level non-governmental organizations replaced governmental agencies.

The role of the state has been radically altered amidst the accelerated pace of globalization and free-market competition. The existing systems of administration and governance were seen as inadequate to deal with the complex problems of society. As a consequence, public administration too came under heavy pressure to transform. Some areas of this impact can be listed as follows:

- a) **Entrepreneurial Government:** The traditional notion that administration is separate from politics and meant only to execute policies has received criticism due to the constant pressure of globalization. The efficiency and productivity of public sector organizations became the norm under the idea of entrepreneurial government. Slow-paced moving files, excessive rigidity, and red-tapism are now seen as things of the past.

- b) **Changing Role of Bureaucracy:** The administration is no longer perceived as the catalyst for change but rather as a service provider. Its role has transformed from being the executor of policies and running units of production to merely regulating and facilitating service delivery. The new economic order placed the responsibility for service provision on the private sector.
- c) **Reinventing Government:** Ideas like New Public Management and Good Governance have reinvented the process of governance beyond recognition. These ideas advocate for transparency, accountability, rule of law, free markets, a guarantee of human rights, and a client-friendly orientation in the workings of the government.
- d) **Public Service Reforms:** As a result of an emphasis on the private sector and entry of private capital in the process of governance through schemes like Public-Private Partnerships, the reforms in public service became the necessity of the hour. Reduction in the size of the public sector led to reducing the labor force in the government establishments. Disinvestment and privatization of the economy led to releasing the tapped capital of the state in public services. All this demanded public service reforms. Removal of pension schemes and other retirement benefits, ideas of linking employees' funds with the market have had a far-reaching impact on the public employment sector.
- e) **E-Governance:** Revolution in Information and Communication Technology led to the transformation of the functioning of government departments and ministries. It facilitated transparency in the administration and access of the people to the services through technology. The speed and nature of intergovernmental communication, intradepartmental communication, and communication between people and the government have profoundly increased. Online financial transactions further improved the speed and comfort of doing business.
- f) **Law and Order Situation:** With the global connectivity, crime and terrorism received a global dimension. Cybercrimes, financial frauds, cyber-attacks became a cause of concern for the administration. Law and order administration of the country required remodeling of the police department. The introduction of cybercrime units in the police administration became necessary. International terrorist organizations with their widespread networks made it mandatory to have strong counter-terrorism measures with international support and cooperation solicited from other nations.

Thus the process of globalization leads to the transformation of public administration all over the world. Globalization caused socio-economic-cultural-upheavals worldwide and public administration came under heavy pressure to respond appropriately. It radically altered the meaning of governance along with the lives of people.

1.4 GOOD GOVERNANCE: CONCEPT AND APPLICATION; NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Meaning, Scope, and
Significance

Good Governance

The concept of Good Governance emerged as a result of the neoliberal critique of governance and politics. It originated in the 1980s through international lending institutions such as the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The concept aimed to redefine governance by advocating state contraction and promoting the increased role of the market and the private sector as key regulators of society and the economy.

Good Governance, as a concept, was further developed during the 1990s through various documents and reports published by the World Bank and the OECD. Some of the most significant among them include:

The World Bank document on Sub-Saharan Africa (1989), which highlighted governance issues as key obstacles to development.

The Harare Commonwealth Declaration (1991), which emphasized democracy, human rights, and good governance as essential principles.

The World Bank report on Governance and Development (1992), which identified key components of good governance, such as accountability, transparency, and efficiency.

The OECD policy directives, which promoted participatory governance, rule of law, and sound public administration.

Key Features of Good Governance

Transparency – Ensures that decision-making processes are open and accessible to the public.

Accountability – Government officials and institutions are held responsible for their actions.

Rule of Law – Governance is based on fair and just legal frameworks applied equally to all.

Participation – Encourages active involvement of citizens in decision-making processes.

Efficiency and Effectiveness – Ensures that public resources are used optimally for development.

Equity and Inclusiveness – Policies should benefit all sections of society, including marginalized groups.

Good Governance is essential for sustainable development, economic growth, and social stability. It helps in reducing corruption, enhancing public trust, and improving the overall quality of administration. In recent

years, digital governance (e-governance) has also emerged as a crucial component, promoting better service delivery and citizen engagement.

Several reasons can be sighted for the emergence of the concept of Good Governance. The dissolution of the Soviet Union in the 90s facilitated the Western capitalist institutions to push the neo-liberal framework in erstwhile socialist economies. Socialism and planned economy model was perceived as failure and alternative models of Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization received wide recognition. The government-led bureaucracy failed to deliver the promises of development and modernization. Problems of poverty, unemployment, income inequality, lack of health care facilities, and social disorganization continued even after decades of experimenting with socialist governance. By the 1990s most of the countries dipped in severe economic crisis. The large size of bureaucracy and excessive intervention of government in the society and market was seen as the cause of 'misallocation of planned resources, distortion of priorities, rampant corruption and abuse of power by public agencies.

To bail the countries out of the depth of balance of payments issues and help them to stabilize their economy the global financial institutions like WB and OECD redefined the idea of 'governance' and demanded

'Structural adjustments' to full fill certain 'conditionality'. The concept of Good Governance found its disposition in those directives. For example, the World Bank (WB) in 1989 document on sub-Saharan Africa defined governance in terms of (a) public sector management, (b) accountability, (c) legal framework for development, (d) information and transparency. Leftwich pointed out three traits of governance as stated in the 1992

World Bank document, '*Governance and Development* (1992). These are, firstly, open, market-friendly competitive economy reducing bureaucracy, increasing privatization, and remodeling state as 'enabler' than as a 'provider'. Second, support for democratization, and third, improvement of human rights records.

Rumki Basu (2005) enlisted the following features of Good Governance.

- Economic liberalism which constitutes private ownership, investment, and greater equality;
- Political pluralism, which refers to the democratic participation of people in the development process and decentralization of authority from the center;
- Social development which includes human rights, rule of law; an independent judiciary, and a free press;
- Administrative accountability, which refers to transparency; less corruption, economy; efficiency and effectiveness; and
- Public sector reforms, strategic planning, and management of change

Thus good governance is a clear departure from the earlier traditions of governance and defined it in terms of an autonomous capacity, as separate from the politics in the society, of the society to fulfill its requirements. It lays stress on the market and civil society to fill the void created by the exit of the state. This led to some serious concerns being raised about the viability of the idea in terms of addressing the issues of governance. Some of them are how to ensure accountability of the private sector to society. How to ensure ethical behavior from the private industries? How much flexibility can be afforded without being risked for political mistakes? And, finally to ensure equity and representation of the masses against the influential interest groups and elites in the allocation of resources.

New Public Management

The New Public Management represents the major transition through which the discipline of public administration was passing through during the 1980s. The concept denotes the shift in the worldwide paradigmatic shift in the conceptualizations and practice of public administration. NPM sought to question the basic features of traditional public administration and replace them with new ones.

The theoretical and normative principles of traditional public administration of the early years of the 20th century were an institutional structure of work, specialization and hierarchy of offices, centralization of command structure, and public/private distinction. The guiding philosophy of this epoch was the management of public interest and the separation of politics from administration. This classical Weberian/scientific management model has been criticized because it led to rigid hierarchical centralized structures which are proven to be inadequate to meet organizational goals. Public agencies became machine-like, rigid, and impersonal. The concept of bureaucracy symbolized corruption, red-tapism, and the apathetic orientation of administration. Effective management and efficient production of organizational targets were unable to meet.

In the second half of the 20th century, many new approaches sprung up that underlined the role of human motivation, efficiency, and effectiveness in public policymaking, implementation, and management. It is emphasized that the actual process of administration confronts the constraints of time, data, and other perceptual limitations. Most public policy decisions involve multiple interests reconciling and hence incremental and synthesizing in nature.

This new post-Weberian view of public administration is people-oriented rather than structure-oriented. Instead of mechanization and routinization, it emphasizes human relations in the workplace, employee job satisfaction, and flexible work structures. In contrast to hierarchy and centralization, it advocates for decentralization to enhance adaptability, flexibility, and the mobilization of local initiatives to meet local needs and changing circumstances. Furthermore, participative decision-making and the free flow of information from the bottom to the top and vice versa are fundamental principles of this new approach.

Some key features of this post-Weberian, post-Wilsonian approach are as follows:

1. In the real world of governance, the politics-administration dichotomy is impractical and unrealistic. The strict separation of policymaking and implementation may lead to rigidity, disinterest, and administrative inefficiency.
2. Maximizing rationality is not feasible in actual administration. Instead, the concept of 'bounded rationality,' which involves reconciling various interests, should be applied in policy decisions.
3. The traditional "hierarchical structure" should be replaced by a "bottom-up approach" with decentralized power and decision-making. This shift is necessary for creating an effective, productive, and innovative organizational design.
4. Rigid, rule-bound monocratic structures are unsuitable for goal achievement and effectiveness. Job satisfaction and opportunity for full self-realization through multiple work roles is the key to goal achievement and effectiveness.
5. Public employees are not the sole custodians of public interest. Many times they can be self-aggrandizing and budget maximizing.

New Public Management advocates the adoption of private-sector techniques for public agencies in providing high-quality services to citizens and managerial autonomy to public management.

Firstly, it suggests performance evaluation indicators measure actual achievements and quality of services. Operating responsibilities are to be shifted from central departments to field agencies. Greater flexibility in working conditions such as contractual appointments is being permitted to make use of more expertise and employee creativity. The citizens are viewed as active customers.

Secondly, it rejects the principle of hierarchy to create environments for more effective and productive managerial leadership. Motivated and focused human and technological resources through recruitment and training of personnel based on merit, performance, and reward of attractive salary structure, diverse roles is considered the need of managerial leadership.

Thirdly, personal responsibility and accountability are sought to be built into the production process. Rewards including pay structures are based on the fulfillment of performance targets. There is a shift of general emphasis from policy to management with full cost-consciousness before making any decision. Private sector initiatives in infrastructure development such as roads, electricity, transport, etc, and involvement of Non-Government agencies in the social sector like health and education are encouraged.

Thus N.P.M. limits the political leadership only to macro politics while allows the bureaucrats the flexibility and autonomy of public managers who

would be making decisions based on cost and result accountability, ensure fair and transparent administration and be responsive to public needs and preferences. Economic rationality and ‘performance’ are the keywords in NPM.

Thus NPM movement was essentially a by-product of the collapse of the socialist states and management failures of the public sector in the first and the third worlds. NPM wishes to help revitalize the image of the bureaucracy from a machine-like, rigid, impersonal, inefficient, wasteful, and ultimately ineffective custodian of the public interest to a dynamic, result-oriented, efficient, responsive, and responsible public servant who is sensitive and aware of public needs, wishes and preferences.

1.5 LET US SUM UP

Over the past century, the field of Public Administration has undergone significant evolution. Emerging from the rise of rational thinking and the spread of industrialization, the discipline has always been closely linked to the concept of the public. Major trends in its development have reflected the changing nature of this relationship. In recent years, with the advancement of globalization, the discipline has transformed considerably, yet it maintains continuity with its past. It originated during the laissez-faire paradigm of the 19th century, which it later challenged by advocating for state expansion to implement the welfare state. In the 21st century, however, it has come full circle, embracing neoliberal principles of state contraction under the forces of globalization, liberalization, and privatization. Throughout this journey, various themes, theories, and frameworks have emerged, enriching the field.

1.6 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Concerning the various phases in its evolution, describe the changing character of the discipline of Public Administration.
2. Explain in detail the concept and theory of Comparative Public Administration.
3. Write a detailed note on Development Administration.
4. Elaborate on the factors that led to the emergence of New Public Management. Explain the features of NPM.
5. Write an essay on the impact of globalization on Public Administration.
6. Write a note on:
 - a. Good Governance
 - b. New Public Management.

1.7 REFERENCE

- Bava, Noorjahan. *Public Administration in the 21st Century*, Kanishka Publishers New Delhi, 2010.
- Avasthi, Maheshwari, *Public Administration*, Laxmi Narayan Agarwal Publications, Agra, 2006.
- Basu, Rumki, *Public Administration: Concept and Theories*, Sterling Publications, New Delhi, 2005.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit, *New Horizons of Public Administration*, Jawahar Publications, New Delhi, 2008.
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut, and Bhattacharya Mohit (ed.), *Public Administration a Reader*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2005
- Fadia, B. L. & Dr. Kuldeep Fadia, *Public Administration: Administrative Theories and Concepts*, Sahitya Bhawan, Agra, 2015
- Henry, Nicholas., *Paradigms of Public Administration*, Public Administration Review. Vol. 35, No. 4 (July-Aug, 1975) pp. 378-389.
- Sharma, M. P., and Sadana, B. L., *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*, KitabMahal, New Delhi, .2014.

THEORIES AND APPROACHES

Unit Structure:

- 2.0 Objective
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Classical, Bureaucratic Model, Human Relations School.
 - 2.2.1 Classical Approach
 - 2.2.2 Bureaucratic Model
 - 2.2.3 Human Relations School
- 2.3 Scientific Management, behavioral, Structural-functional Approach.
 - 2.3.1 Scientific Management Approach
 - 2.3.2 Behavioral Approach
 - 2.3.3 Structural-Functional Approach
- 2.4 Marxian, Public Choice, Post-Modern.
 - 2.4.1 Marxian Approach
 - 2.4.2 Public Choice Approach
 - 2.4.3 Post-Modern Approach
- 2.5 Let us sum up
- 2.6 Unit end questions
- 2.7 Reference

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, we will explore various approaches to the study of public administration. The primary objective is to familiarize learners with the major themes developed by different schools of thought in the field of public administration. This unit presents and illustrates nine broad approaches that have significantly contributed to the expansion of the theoretical frontiers of public administration.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Ever since Woodrow Wilson published the first paper on the study of public administration, the subject has evolved as an independent discipline. To lay its foundation, many scholars have contributed to the process of theory-building in public administration. Consequently, various approaches have emerged, each offering a different perspective and methodology to address the problems encountered by modern society. Studying these approaches is an essential step towards gaining a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.

The approaches discussed in this unit do not follow a chronological arrangement, as their development and evolution are interconnected. Some approaches evolved parallel to others, while some emerged from the formulations of others. Certain approaches developed as the antithesis of others, while some appear almost identical. However, no single approach is sufficient or adequate to fully understand and explain every aspect of public administration. These approaches complement each other, and the appropriate selection of an approach to answer a given question depends entirely on the student.

These approaches are products of and reactions to global phenomena and forces. Some broad forces that contributed to their emergence in the past century include the growth of the capitalist economy, the defeat of colonialism, technological innovations, and the spread of democratic systems worldwide.

2.2 CLASSICAL, BUREAUCRATIC MODEL, HUMAN RELATIONS SCHOOL

2.2.1 Classical Approach to Public Administration

The classical approach to public administration primarily addressed the question of whether public administration is an art or a science. The major concern of classical theory was to discover objective laws similar to those governing the natural world, as identified by natural and physical sciences. These principles were presumed to be prerequisites for improving the productivity, efficiency, and economy of organizations. This approach was developed by prominent scholars such as Luther Gulick, Lyndall Urwick, Henri Fayol, Mooney, Reiley, Mary Parker Follett, and Shelton. The four defining features of classical theory are impersonality, specialization, efficiency, and hierarchy.

Luther Gulick authored several books and made significant contributions to the science of administration and modern management. Urwick also wrote extensively on the science of administration. Both scholars were greatly influenced by the works of Henri Fayol and Frederick Taylor. Together, they proposed the Classical Theory of Management, also known as Administrative Management Theory, which defended public administration as a science.

In the development of classical theory, Gulick and Urwick emphasized the importance of studying the structure of organizations. Gulick identified ten principles that he believed formed the strong foundation of modern organizations. These principles include division of labor, departmental organization, hierarchy, coordination, coordination committees, decentralization, unity of command, staff and line, delegation, and span of control.

Urwick proposed eight principles, including the objective of the organization, the principle of correspondence, authority and responsibility, the scalar principle, span of control, the principle of specialization, coordination, and the principle of definition, among others.

One of Gulick's most influential contributions is the POSDCORB model, which transformed the way organizations are managed. POSDCORB stands for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting, representing the key functions of administration.

Henri Fayol stated that management is essential for all human activities and organizations. He categorized organizational activities into six groups: **technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, and administrative**. Fayol outlined fourteen principles of organization, which are: **division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to general interest, remuneration of personnel, centralization, scalar chain, order, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, initiative, and comradeship**.

Mooney and Reiley emphasized the **principle of scalar formation**, which refers to the hierarchical, graded arrangement within the organization with a system of superior-subordinate relationships.

The classical approach has been subjected to severe criticism for its shortcomings. Herbert Simon referred to the principles of public administration as “**proverbs**” due to their lack of empirical validity and universal applicability—both of which are necessary conditions for scientific inquiry. The principles also lack consistency and often appear contradictory.

Additionally, the theory neglects the **human element** in organizations, portraying organizations as systems of mechanical elements where humans are considered merely one part of the production process. This mechanical perception reduces human labor to an **instrumental role** aimed solely at increasing productivity and efficiency. Consequently, the theory is often accused of being **pro-management** and overlooking the social and psychological needs of workers.

2.2.2 Bureaucratic Model of Public Administration

The bureaucratic model of public administration is a significant contribution of Max Weber, a German sociologist, to the field of Public Administration. His book *Economy and Society*, published in 1922, contains his ideas on bureaucracy. His writings encompass a wide range of studies on ancient and modern states, elaborating on the functioning of bureaucracies across different eras. Weber was greatly influenced by the ideas of **Immanuel Kant** and **Heinrich Rickert**. Under their influence, he adopted the belief in **rationalization** as the core principle governing the economy, politics, society, culture, and religion in modern society.

According to Weber, the need to maintain armies, manage public finances, and administer the political affairs of empires led to the emergence of **bureaucratization** in ancient times. Modern societies are more complex than ancient ones; hence, administration has also evolved into a more intricate system. He emphasized that a bureaucratic state is characterized by specific **behavioral and structural features**, such as **division of labor, hierarchy, rules and rationality, impersonality, rule orientation, and neutrality**.

Weber used the term ‘**rational-legal authority**’ to describe modern liberal states. He argued that authority can be classified into three types:

- **Traditional authority:** Based on legitimacy derived from heredity, customs, or conventions.
- **Charismatic authority:** Gains legitimacy from the personal traits of an individual.
- **Rational-legal authority:** Based on established laws and formal rules, making it the most suitable form for modern governance.

Weber was concerned with the functioning of **liberal democratic societies**, for which he proposed **rational-legal authority** based on legitimacy derived from the **rule of law**. In this type of authority, power emanates from the **legal offices** that individuals hold. It is **temporary** and exercised by officials only while holding office, for the term permitted by the **positive law** of the land. Furthermore, individuals holding such authority are selected based on **formal qualifications** through processes established by the law. This form of authority aligns with **political systems** operating based on **constitutional principles**.

The bureaucratic model proposed by Weber attracted criticism from various scholars. **Herbert Simon** and **Chester Barnard** argued that following Weber’s structural approach would reduce **efficiency** because **informal organizations** and **positive human relations**—both essential for improving efficiency—are compromised in Weber’s model.

Gouldner criticized Weber for denying bureaucrats the **operational freedom** necessary to carry out their duties effectively. By emphasizing **obedience** and **discipline**, Weber’s model discourages **innovation** and **proactive behavior** among administrators.

Additionally, Weber did not give sufficient attention to **human behavior**, **interpersonal relations**, **morale**, and **motivational factors**, making his model a **mechanistic structure** that neglects the **human side of the enterprise**.

Harold Laski criticized Weber’s model for replacing **passion with routine**, **flexibility with rigid rules**, **promptness with delays**, and **innovation with precedence** in decision-making.

2.2.3 Human Relations School of Public Administration

The Human Relations School countered the mechanical conception of scientific management theory and placed human beings at the center of administrative thinking. The theory stressed that administrative organizations are comprised of individuals with different psychological motivations, and thus their behavior inside the organizations exhibits socio-psychological dynamics. Some important thinkers of this school are Robert Merton, F.J. Roethlisberger, Alex Bavelas, Keith Davis, A.H. Maslow, D. Cartwright, Leonard Sayles, and Chris Argyris.

Elton Mayo is the chief exponent of the human relations theory of public administration. The famous Hawthorne experiments, conducted under his supervision, investigated the relationship between productivity and factors such as the physical conditions at the workplace (lighting, humidity, temperature, and hours of sleep), participation of workers, social relations, and networks among workers. The experiment was conducted in several phases during the interwar period and established a new paradigm in Managerial Studies.

The approach mainly stressed that human beings are motivated by several factors such as the social environment, group dynamics, personal goals, value systems, beliefs, codes of conduct, and ethics. It is necessary to align these factors with the organization's objectives to achieve better results in terms of worker efficiency. The theory demonstrated that the classical understanding of measuring and setting targets for employees and motivating them by providing economic incentives may not always work. The theory also rejected the efforts of the scientific management approach, which explained the working of organizations based on certain objective principles.

The theory highlighted the importance of human factors like informal relationships and the group dynamics in day to day operations of an organization which is as complex as the formal structure and mechanism of modern organizations.

The Human Relations Theory was criticized for adopting an anti-union stance. The theory underestimated the scope of worker-management conflict and labor unrest. There was concern that the theory might be misused by management to exploit the working class by manipulating workers to comply with management directives, rather than encouraging management to understand human nature and implement necessary organizational changes.

Additionally, the theory was criticized for overemphasizing human needs while undermining the importance of accomplishment and responsibility. It was also argued that the claimed relationship between employee satisfaction and increased productivity lacks universal validity across different organizational settings.

2.3 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT, BEHAVIORAL, STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL APPROACH.

2.3.1 Scientific Management Approach of Public Administration

The idea of Scientific Management originated in the latter part of the 19th century as a result of industrialization in America. Henry R. Towne (1844–1924) is considered an early exponent of this approach. In a paper presented in 1886, titled *The Engineer as an Economist*, he argued that the time had come for engineers to pay attention to the development of management techniques as part of their engineering profession. The term ‘scientific management’ was coined by Louis Brandeis in 1910.

The approach is primarily known due to the work of F.W. Taylor, who is regarded as the father of Scientific Management. Taylor argued that, like any other social or personal activity, management is also a science. The application of scientific principles improves the performance of these activities. His major works include A Piece-rate System (1895), Shop Management (1903), The Art of Cutting Metals (1906), and The Principles of Scientific Management (1911).

Taylor criticized the authoritarian managerial style of traditional managers, considering it ill-suited for running modern workplaces. According to him, they neglected their managerial responsibilities of determining standards, planning work, organizing, controlling, and devising incentive schemes. He argued that the foremost objective of management should be to pay high wages and have low unit production costs to achieve increased industrial efficiency.

Taylor's philosophy of scientific management is that there is no inherent conflict between the interests of employers, workers, and consumers. The results of higher productivity should benefit all equally—higher wages for workers, greater profits for employers, and lower prices for consumers.

Taylor's philosophy of management was based on four basic principles of scientific management.

- a) **Development of the True Science of Work:** Taylor had a tremendous belief in the capacity of scientific methodology to improve productivity and solve problems of human organizations. He suggested the application of scientific methods of research and experiments. He believed that 'science, not rule of thumb' would enable organizations to enhance productivity, help workers increase earnings, and help the company prosper.
- b) **Harmony, Not Discord:** According to this principle, the atmosphere in the organization should be of mutual trust and harmony. The management and labor should follow the concept of 'mental revolution' to end all conflicts between the two parties for the mutual benefit of both.
- c) **Cooperation, Not Individualism:** Taylor suggested that managers and workers should develop a spirit of cooperation. They should collectively decide the standards of performance and put in collective effort to achieve them. This would increase the involvement and participation of workers in decision-making and foster a sense of responsibility.
- d) **Development of Every Person to His/Her Greatest Efficiency and Prosperity:** Taylor recognized the need for the scientific selection of the right employees for appropriate jobs based on their initial qualifications and potential for further learning. He emphasized the effective supervision of workers and their working conditions after assigning them to the right jobs. Taylor laid the foundation for modern personnel management by combining the science of work with scientifically selected and trained workers.

During his professional career as a mechanical engineer, Taylor followed scientific methods to solve management problems. He conducted a series of experiments to determine the most effective tools and the optimum cutting speed. His experiments led to the discovery of high-speed steel. In developing the shop system, Taylor conducted controlled experiments to measure the time taken by workers or machines to perform tasks under specific processes, materials, and methods.

In another experiment, he analyzed how workers handled materials, machines, and tools, attempting to determine their ability in dealing with equipment and materials. To counter the practice of soldiering among workers and improve efficiency, Taylor conducted experiments to establish the best level of performance for jobs and the conditions necessary to achieve that level. He proposed a piece-rate system to improve wage administration in factories.

2.3.2 Behavioral Approach of Public Administration

The behavioral approach was the result of the reaction to the bureaucratic, institutional-structural, and organizational approach. It challenged the so-called scientific management approach that laid undue emphasis on the discovery of universal objective laws of organizational structures.

The behavioral approach developed in the fourth decade of the 20th century. It focuses on the actual behavior of individuals and groups in organizations. Herbert Simon and Robert Dahl were the major exponents of behavioralism in public administration. They argued that administrative behavior is a part of behavioral science and public administration should study individual and collective human behavior.

The behavioral approach is largely descriptive. Individuals are given adequate attention in the analysis of organizations. In the behavioral approach, factors like motivation, decision-making, authority, and regulation are given due emphasis.

The approach laid stress on the informal aspects of an organization. The patterns of communication are studied to understand the working style of members as well as leaders amongst themselves and with each other. The methodology of inquiry is empirical and applies field study, laboratory experiments, and the application of statistical methods for systematically analyzing data. The approach is interdisciplinary and borrows theories, concepts, and formulations from other social sciences like social psychology and cultural anthropology.

The behavioral approach expanded the canvas of understanding public administration by paying adequate attention to the effect of political, social, economic, and psychological environments on human motivation. It resolved that this broader context determines the level of contribution of an individual to the working of the administration. The choices that leaders make, the effect of human sentiments on the working of administration, the role of biases, and perceptions of leaders as well as followers in the working of an organization are studied by behaviorists.

The approach stirred the field of administrative studies by opening new frontiers of cross-structural and cross-cultural administrative behaviors that resulted in the development of a comparative approach to public administration.

The behavioural approach is criticized for its limited utility to analyse all types of administrative phenomena. The formulations of behavioural sciences have limited application to explain only administrative behaviour. Other dimensions and issues of administration remain largely beyond the scope of the theory. Behavioural science per se is mainly helpful to study small social groups and individuals, whereas public administration covers a huge size of the human collective activity of larger human communities. One of the major criticisms is the neglect of human values and norms in the study of human behaviour. Value neutrality of behavioural sciences makes the study of public administration sterile and irrelevant to the vital issues of the modern age. Human values cannot be quantified or observed and do not qualify to be fit enough to be the subject matter of the behavioural approach. Public administration without human values will be reduced to the machine producing desired output, which is just not possible.

2.3.3 Structural-Functional Approach of Public Administration

Fred Riggs is considered the chief exponent of the structural-functional approach of administration. The approach borrowed theoretical formulations of the structural and functional school of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown from the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. According to them, society has norms, customs, traditions, and institutions that collectively form the structures and functions of that society. In the absence of those or failure of their working, the society will become dysfunctional or decay. Major proponents of this approach are Gabriel Almond, David Apter, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, and Fred Riggs.

Fred Riggs was interested in understanding the administrations of societies other than America, especially of the developing countries. He resorted to the structural-functional approach of Anthropology and Sociology and followed terminology and conceptual framework to understand the distinct and unfamiliar societies of the developing world. In this way, Riggs contributed an effective analytical tool to understand and comparatively study public administration.

The approach analyzes the administration, both as a concrete system of departments and sections held together by shared beliefs, customs, and morals as well as abstract or analytic formed by power or authority. These structures perform certain functions like communication, administration, lawmaking, adjudication, etc. These structures display characteristics like hierarchy, specialization, rules, and roles. There can be behavioral attributes of these structures like rationality, neutrality, professionalism, and rule orientation.

The structural functionalists believed that similar kinds of structures do not necessarily perform the same functions across organizations. A single structure can very well perform multiple functions while multiple structures can perform a single function.

According to Riggs, economic, socio-communicational, symbolic, and political are four functional requisites of a society. Riggs proposed a Prismatic Model that illustrates how the society transitioned from a traditional to a modern industrialized way of life. The traditional society according to him has a fused structure while industrial modern society is diffracted. As the light passes through a prism, the white light represents a fused structure of traditional society and the resultant rainbow represents refracted structures of an industrialized society.

2.4 MARXIAN, PUBLIC CHOICE, POST-MODERN

2.4.1 Marxian Approach of Public Administration

Marxian Approach is named after Karl Marx, a renowned philosopher of the 19th Century whose contribution to the field of human sciences is path-breaking in terms of volume and scope, breadth, and depth of his formulations spread across multiple disciplines. The Marxian approach to public administration can better be understood from the implication of his general theory of Communism rather than his direct handling of the topic, which is rare to find in his writings. Stewart Clegg, David Dunkerly, Nicos Mouzelis, and Braverman are the main exponents of the Marxian approach.

Marx opined that bureaucracy is the political expression of the division of labor. He suggested that bureaucracy creates conditions that subject people to gross manipulations. In Marxian analysis, the state is the agent of the bourgeoisie class and serves their interests against the interests of the masses. Masses are impoverished and controlled by the state through the apparatus of bureaucracy. In a capitalist society, bureaucracy operates hand in glove with the dominant class and projects the interests of the haves as that of the interest of the entire society.

In this sense bureaucracy is mainly an oppressive system beyond the comprehension and control of the Proletariat. Although it masquerades as efficient and comprised of meritorious individuals, in reality, it is utterly incompetent and does not serve the function which it claims. In a certain way, it has certain symbols and secret ways of working and staunch traditions that make it a class in itself maintained to continue the state control over the allocation of resources.

Marx predicted that following class struggle the state will wither away. Bureaucracy as the instrument of the state will also end along with it. In the resultant Communist society, the functions of the bureaucracy would be taken over by the members of the society. In the course of events, the exploitative nature of the administration will go away and be replaced by the management of things and not of the people.

In the transition phase between the proletariat revolution and the establishment of an egalitarian communist society, the state will be controlled by the proletariat. During the domination of the proletariat, state bureaucracy will act as an agent of social transformation to get rid of bourgeoisie elements in the society. In the Marxist tradition, this is treated as a transitional phenomenon.

The critics of the Marxian school of administration argued that in socialist systems bureaucracy constituted as a “New Class”, i.e. ruling in the name of the proletariat. This class exhibits dictatorial tendencies with strong vices of red-tapism, secrecy, disregard for human rights, and self aggrandizement.

2.4.2 Public Choice Approach of Public Administration

The Public Choice Approach to public administration emerged in the 1960s, with Vincent Ostrom as its chief exponent. He called for replacing the traditional paradigm of bureaucratic administration with a democratic administration. The Public Choice Approach advocated institutional pluralism in the provision of public goods and services. It emphasizes institutional diversity, democratic decision-making, and the management of public service distribution by applying economic principles, decentralization, and public participation in administration.

This approach is highly critical of the traditional bureaucratic process, which relies on a centralized administrative structure, a strict separation of politics from administration, administrative hierarchy, and rational, neutral bureaucracy. The Public Choice Approach challenges the politics-administration dichotomy, a concept formulated by early administrative thinkers such as Woodrow Wilson, Frank Goodnow, Leonard White, and William Willoughby. These scholars advocated for the separation of political and administrative functions of government, a distinction that prevailed for nearly half a century and significantly influenced the practice of public administration.

However, this view came under criticism after the Second World War. Post-war developments in governance, increased complexity in public administration, and growing demands for citizen participation led to a reconsideration of the rigid division between politics and administration. The Public Choice Approach emerged as a response, advocating for market-based mechanisms, competition, and efficiency in public service delivery.

War period witnessed a crisis of identity in the subject of public administration. The effort to separate politics and administration was perceived to be futile while dealing with changing circumstances worldwide. Separation of administration from politics, implementation from policy-making, and private from public administration is reworked and a new integrated approach to public administration became the new paradigm of administrative theory.

Other exponents of this approach are Buchanan, Downs, Olson, Tullock, Mitchell, Niskanen, and Oppenheimer. They formulated the theory of administrative egoism. The approach suggested that the real-life bureaucracy is usually hostile to the public interest and favors resource manipulation and self-aggrandizement. They believe that bureaucrats prefer self-interest over the public interest. Such behaviors and attitudes lead to an increase in size and costs of government and inflated departmental budgets. Bureaucracy is responsible for the declining quality of public services. There is no such thing as neutral and rational bureaucracy.

The approach suggested the new paradigm of government collaboration with market forces and remodeling of working of government to increase efficiency through competitiveness. Public Choice is the economic theory of politics as well as public administration. Choice implies competition. The competition improves the standards of services. The 'public choice' approach challenged the state monopoly in the provision of public goods and services. It believes that the multiplicity of service providers gives individual citizens the necessary choice. An individual knows his self-interest and would maximize this in his choices.

The Public Choice Approach challenges the traditionally established public interest theory of democratic government that assumes that decision-making in government is motivated by unselfish benevolence by elected representatives or full-time government employees, thus public servants are motivated by a desire to maximize society's welfare. As against it, Public Choice Approach argues that career bureaucracy is inefficient and unresponsive because it is not subject to market forces. Civil servants' attitude towards consumers of their services is different from the attitude of private sector producers to his customers. The producer's revenue comes from his customer but in government, there is no clear correlation between public revenue and expenditure: the revenue comes from the finance ministry. Secondly, a civil servant has little incentive to minimize the costs and maximum profits. In government, he does not gain financially from any such transaction.

Niskanen suggested increasing competition among the bureau for the supply of public services. He also advised changing the incentives for bureaucracy to motivate them. He further suggested increasing the competition to the bureaucracy by greater use of private sources for the supply of public services.

The public choice school has recommended organizational reforms like reducing the role of the state, curbing the power of government monopolies, constitutional checks to curb the power of politicians and civil servants of running budget deficits or imposing taxation beyond a certain extent. Further, the approach suggests separation of the advisory, regulatory, and delivery functions of bureaucracy, privatization of health care or education reducing the size of bureaucracies, controlling the governmental expenditures, and promoting competitiveness among public agencies.

2.4.3 Post-Modern Approach of Public Administration

Postmodern Public Administration is the most recent addition to the field of public administration. The term post-modernism was coined by literary critics and French philosophers like Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Francois Lyotard, German philosophers like Nietzsche and Heidegger in the 1960s. In public administration, the roots of post-modernism can be traced to the United States of America. In American Public Administration the core of the post-modern discussion was started by a small group of scholars organized by Public Administration Theory- Network (PAT-Net, 1981) and held its first national conference in 1988, in the USA. They were inspired

by Gareth Morgan's Book (1986) 'Images of Organization', which discussed the contemporary trends in organizational and cultural sociology and how our thinking about the organization may be understood as metaphors rather than as anything "real". To strengthen our creative abilities in thinking, Morgan said we should think in terms of 'imagination' rather than 'organization.'

Public administration as a study is part of social sciences. Social scientists since the last 150 years have been preoccupied with modernity and the characteristics of modern society and industrialization. Thinkers like Karl Marx, Durkheim, and Max Weber interpreted modernity in their way. The industrial revolution is the basis of modernity. The term the postmodern denotes that modern is gone and that something new which is postmodern has taken over. Public administration covers institutions, government, the process of administration, etc. Post-modernism questions the relevance to various social or public institutions and challenges the ontological presuppositions about the society and the individual.

Modernism believes in organizational rationality. Rationality is the basis because organizations are established from the Industrial Revolution. Rational thinking is modernity. Post-modernism debunks this rational process and denies that such principles can be mastered by the administrators.

The postmodern reaction against 20th-century modernism takes the form of a new type of system criticizing the hierarchy-based structure in public administration, supporting group activity, and supporting socially excluded and oppressed groups in society. At the same time, the postmodernists are against categorization.

Postmodernism questions the underlying assumptions and methods in social sciences. It questions the meaningfulness of the concept of objective knowledge. Modernists use scientific methods like documentation analysis, statistical analysis, survey methods, and other rigorous procedures of inquiry but post-modernists are against these methods. Modernists call this morality in the research methods to understand something. But postmodernists prefer relativism to objectivity. A rational idea or a thought is replaced by processes of reasoning.

Post-modernism inclines toward decentralization, individualization, and internationalization. The worldwide matrix organization, outsourcing, and user-run public organizations are characteristic organizational features of postmodern conditions. In public administration, it advocates for a retreat from central planning and reliance on specialists. In political science, it questions the authority of hierarchical, bureaucratic decision-making structures that function in carefully defined spheres.

There are post-modernist writers like Fox and Miller who are often concerned with the contrast between the contemporary state of public administration and various ideas outlined in normative theories. They raise the question about the contemporary state of public administration.

Post-modernism encompasses assumptions related to imagination, deconstruction, deterritorialization, and alterity.

Imagination challenges the limits of rational bureaucracy, which is based on strict adherence to rules. While modernists relied on rationalization, post-modernists emphasize imagination as a means of reinterpreting administrative structures and decision-making.

Deconstruction involves analyzing texts, events, and symbols to reveal how “reality” is socially constructed, thereby enabling new perspectives. Farmer used the method of deconstruction to question the underlying assumptions of seemingly well-established categories, such as bureaucratic phenomena. Public administrators should apply post-modern analysis to re-examine their fundamental assumptions, which are often based on fixed paradigms, concepts, and categories.

According to Farmer, enhancing efficiency alone does not constitute good administration. Instead, a well-administered society is one in which marginalized groups—including the poor, the oppressed, and women—are liberated. Thus, for post-modernists, efficiency is not the primary criterion of good administration. Efficiency should not be interpreted merely as a straightforward formula or ratio but, as Dwight Waldo argued, it must be evaluated within a framework of consciously held societal values.

Under post-modern conditions, alternative values such as fairness, equality, utility, and autonomy may be promoted. However, to gain recognition in the policy design phase, these values must align with certain formal requirements of modern governance.

Deterritorialization refers to radical changes in thought structures under post-modernism. It opposes rationalist concepts such as central planning and other authority-based structures, advocating for more decentralized and flexible governance models.

Alterity emphasizes empathy and a renewed focus on socially excluded and oppressed groups. In this process, modern assumptions about representation are challenged. Alterity serves as a moral stance that counterbalances the traditional bureaucratic-efficiency model of public administration.

Farmer takes a firm anti-administrative stance in this regard, arguing that administrators should become less authoritative and more service-oriented. He asserts that there is no single way of understanding governance and that diversity must be encouraged in administrative thought and practice.

Post-modernists created the concept of discursive democracy. It implies a pro-active role for public administrators. Public officials or administrators should be more pragmatic in their dealings with the people. They should look for an adaptive process to create a democratic environment. The post-modernists opine that there should be a reengagement of the government with its people and the participation of the civil servants in their environments, as conscious actors in a democratic system. Public administration should be more facilitative in the sense that it should make

efforts to involve citizens in the administrative process through collaborative pragmatism. Pragmatism demands experimentation and learning through experience and not rigid adherence to any particular system of governance. But it should be based on a democratic understanding of its multiple realities and conflicts. The post-modernists say that there should not be any grand theorizing or grand narratives in public administration. The administrator should be a transformative, facilitative, public service practitioner.

Under post-modernism, there is a concept of critical theory, according to which agents/administrators work towards emancipation. They try to transform society through dialogue, discussion, education. The role of the administrators is that of a mediator in a critical analysis or in the process of resolving the tensions and stresses which arise on account of contradictions opposition and negation.

2.5 LET US SUM UP

To sum up, public administration is an established field of inquiry with considerable autonomy over its subject matter. Although it is a part of the broader social sciences and has borrowed theories, formulations, and concepts from other disciplines, it has developed its own identity by transforming and adapting to the changing conditions of time and place. The wide variety of approaches discussed above demonstrates the dynamic and evolving nature of the discipline.

While this chapter provides only a preliminary discussion, learners are encouraged to explore the vast body of literature available on these approaches. Some of these sources are listed in the reference section below.

2.6 UNIT END QUESTIONS

- 1) Explain in detail the classical approach to the study of public administration.
- 2) Elaborate the Weberian model of bureaucracy.
- 3) Examine the contribution of human relations school to the study of public administration.
- 4) What are the main features of the scientific management theory of public administration?
- 5) What is the contribution of the behavioral school to the study of public administration?
- 6) Write a note on the structural-functional approach of public administration.
- 7) Discuss the unique contribution of the Marxian approach to understanding the role of bureaucracy in capitalist society.

- 8) Explain the public choice approach of public administration.
- 9) How is the post-modern approach different from other approaches of public administration? Discuss at length.

2.7 REFERENCE

- Bava, Noorjahan. *Public Administration in the 21st Century*, Kanishka Publishers New Delhi, 2010.
- Avasthi, Maheshwari, *Public Administration*, Laxmi Narayan Agarwal Publications, Agra, 2006.
- Basu, Rumki, *Public Administration: Concept and Theories*, Sterling Publications, New Delhi, 2005.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit, *New Horizons of Public Administration*, Jawahar Publications, New Delhi, 2008.
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut, and Bhattacharya Mohit (ed.), *Public Administration a Reader*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2005
- Fadia, B. L. & Dr. Kuldeep Fadia, *Public Administration: Administrative Theories and Concepts*, Sahitya Bhawan, Agra, 2015
- Sahni, Pardeep, and Vayunandan, Etakula, *Administrative Theory*, PHI, New Delhi, 2010
- Sharma, M. P., and Sadana, B. L., *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*, Kitab Mahal, New Delhi, 2014
- Vishnoo Bhagwan and Vidya Bhusan, *Public Administrative*, S. Chand., New Delhi, 2010.



TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Unit Structure :

- 3.0 Objective
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Legislative Control
- 3.3 Executive Control
- 3.4 Judicial Control
- 3.5 Unit End Questions
- 3.6 References

3.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, we will try to understand three types of structural means to control over administration, which are mainly legislative, executive, and judicial.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Accountability and Control are the two crucial elements of public administration that are important in a democratic government. Administrative accountability is emphasized using several controls. The public officials are accountable to various agencies which exercise control over them. Now broadly speaking there are two types of administrative control, namely internal control and external control. Internal control majorly refers to the Budgetary system, Hierarchical order, Personnel management, Enquiries, and investigations, etc. Whereas, the external control over administration deals with three agencies namely: Legislature, Executive, and Judiciary. In any representative democratic government, whether it is Parliamentary or Presidential, the legislature is considered as the supreme and crucial organ as it includes the representatives of the people. Its control over administration focuses on maintaining accountability and responsibility.

3.2 LEGISLATIVE CONTROL

The parliamentary system of government is present in India today, which is formulated on the prime objective of 'collective responsibility'. It means that the ministers are held responsible to the Parliament for their policies and actions. However, the legislative control over administration under the parliamentary system is indirect that is through ministers. In other words, it is the minister who is responsible for the actions of the administrators working under his ministry/department. There are several techniques or tools of parliamentary control over an administration that are:

- A) Law Making:** It is considered as the core function of the Parliament. As the Parliament lays down the regulations and policies of the government by enacting or repealing the laws. The Parliament enacts laws in a skeleton form and authorizes the executive to make detailed rules, regulations, and policies within the framework of the parent law. This is called 'Delegated Legislation' as the rules and regulations are displayed before the Parliament for its consideration.
- B) Question Hour:** The very first hour of every parliamentary proceeding is allotted for this. During this particular time, the member of Parliament ask questions and the ministers usually give answers. The questions are classified into three categories that are Starred, Unstarred, and Short Notice. Questions or interpellations are often considered effective tools of legislative control over administration and it helps in keeping the civil service alert, aware, and on its toes.
- C) Zero Hour:** It is usually an informal system that is made available to the members of the Parliament to raise questions/ matters without any prior intimation and it immediately starts after the Question Hour and lasts until the agenda for the day is wholly covered up. The time breach instituted between the Question Hour and the agenda is called Zero Hour. It is a part of the Indian Parliamentary procedure since 1962.
- D) Half-an-hour Discussion:** This means discussion on an issue/matter of sufficient public importance which has been subjected to a lot of debate and the answer to which needs elucidation on a matter of fact. The Speaker of Lok Sabha can assign three days in a week for such type of discussion. As there is no formal motion or voting before the Parliament.
- E) Short Duration Discussion:** It is a two-hour discussion as the time assigned for such a discussion should not exceed two hours. The existing members of Parliament can raise such discussions on a matter/issue of urgent public attention and importance. Here again, the Speaker allots two days in a week to carry out discussions. This discussion is not subjected to a formal motion before the House nor voting, it is in practice since 1953.
- F) Other Discussions:** There are several other occasions prevalent to the members of Parliament to raise discussions and debates to examine and criticize the administration for its failure and lapses. These majorly include:
- 1) Inaugural speech delivered by the President of India (also known as Motion of Thanks).
 - 2) Introduction of various bills for the enactment of laws (that is known as debates on legislation).
 - 3) Introduction and passing of resolutions on issues that are of general public interest.

- G) Calling Attention Motion:** It is introduced in the Indian Parliament by a member to call the attention of a minister to an issue of urgent public importance and to seek a considerable authoritative statement from him on that issue. It is an Indian innovation in the parliamentary procedure and has been in practice since 1954 and it is also incorporated in the rules of procedure.
- H) Adjournment Motion:** This motion is another crucial element that is introduced in the Parliament to draw the attention of the House to a matter of urgent public importance. This particular motion requires the support of 50 members to be present in the Parliament. As it deals with the regular functioning of the House, it is considered an extraordinary device. It includes an objective of censure against the government and therefore Rajya Sabha is not allowed to make use of this mechanism. However, the discussion with regards to adjournment motion should last a maximum of two hours and thirty minutes not more than that. The right to move a motion for an adjournment of the administrative affairs of the House is subjected to some scrutiny and restrictions.
- I) No Confidence Motion:** This particular motion means that the ministry stays in office as long as it enjoys the support/confidence of the majority of the members of the Lok Sabha. However, the Lok Sabha can remove the ministers from office by simply passing the No-Confidence Motion. Article 75 of the Indian Constitution coherently states that the Council of Ministers shall be collectively accountable and responsible to the Lower House (Lok Sabha). Thus, the motion requires the support of 50 members present in the house and voting.
- J) Censure Motion:** It requires a reason for its adoption in the Lok Sabha. It is primarily moved against an individual minister or a group of ministers or the entire Council of Ministers. This particular motion is moved for censuring the Council of Ministers for specific policies, regulations, and actions. If gets passed in the Lower House the Council of Ministers are not subjected to resign from the office.

Budgetary System: Another important tool of parliamentary control over administration is the Budgetary system. The parliament controls the revenues and expenditure of the government through the enactment of the budget. It deals with the sanctioning, raising, and spending of government funds. It can also criticize the policy mechanisms of the government and point out the drawbacks of administration during the process of enactment of the budget. Effective legislative control over the expenditure of the government requires the Parliament to satisfy itself that the appropriations have been utilized economically for the approved purposes within the framework of the grants. It should also undertake a detailed analysis of the annual budget estimates of the government to suggest possible economies in the implementation of plans and programs embodied therein.

Audit System: The important authority that is Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG), on behalf of the Parliament audits, executes the accounts of government and submits an annual ‘Audit Report’ about the monetary transactions of the government. It also highlights the uneconomical and irregular expenditures of the government. The CAG is considered as an agent of the Parliament and is held responsible only to it that is the Parliament. However, the financial accountability and stability of the government to the Parliament are granted through the audit report of the CAG.

Parliamentary Committees: Apart from these tools and techniques several other committees carry out the work of the legislature namely:

- Public Accounts Committee
- Estimates Committee
- Committee on Public Undertakings

3.3 EXECUTIVE CONTROL

The Executive Control simply means that the control exercised by the Chief Executive (Political executive) over the functioning of the bureaucracy. In the Parliamentary system of government, the Cabinet is collectively responsible and accountable to the Parliament for its policy implementation and actions. Each Minister is solely responsible for the policies and acts of omission and commission in his particular Ministry. In other words, it is the ministerial responsibility that forms the basic feature of the Parliamentary government. For this prime reason, the political executive (Cabinet and Ministers) exercises control over administration. The executive control is characterized as inclusive in content, constant, continuous, stimulative, corrective, and directive. The executive exercises control over administration through the means of tools and techniques.

- A. Political Direction (Policy Making):** In India, the Cabinet forms and directs the administrative policies and enjoys the power of supervision and coordination concerning its implementation. The minister who is head of one or more departments, emphasizes laying down the departmental policy and supervises, directs, and coordinates its implementation by the administrators. Thus, through the political mechanism, the minister controls the operations of administrative agencies working under his Ministry. The departmental officials are directly responsible to the Minister.
- B) Budgetary System:** The second important organ of the government that is the executive controls effectively the administration through the budgetary system. It formulates the budget, gets it enacted by the Parliament, and allocates the necessary funds to the administrative agencies to meet their expenditure. In all such activities, the Ministry of Finance (Central Financial Agency of Government of India) plays a crucial role. It helps in exercising financial control over administration.

- C) Appointment and Removal:** This is the effective method of executive control over administration. As the executive plays an efficient role in personnel management and controls and enjoys the power of appointment and removal of top officials. In this work, the executive is assisted and supported by the Department of Personnel and Training, The Ministry of Finance, and the UPSC. Therefore, the ministers have full control over the administration of departments under their charge through the appointment of such appointees.
- D) Ordinances:** The Constitution of India empowers the President to promulgate ordinances during the interval of Parliament to meet situations demanding immediate attention and action. An ordinance is regarded as the authoritative and powerful act of Parliament and hence governs the functioning of the administration.
- E) Civil Service Code:** The executive has laid down a prescribed civil service code to be observed and followed by the administrators in the exercise of their official power. It includes a set of conduct rules which prevent the administrators from misusing their powers for personal interest. Some important rules are:
- 1) All-India Services (Conduct) Rules 1954
 - 2) Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules 1955
 - 3) Railway Services (Conduct) Rules 1956

These rules deal with several things like loyalty to the State, obeying the official orders of the superiors, political activities of civil servants, etc.

- A) Staff Agencies:** The executive exercises control over administration through Staff agencies also. The significant Staff agencies established in India are the Department of Administrative Reforms, The Planning Commission (NITI Aayog), The Cabinet Secretariat, and the Prime Minister's Office. Therefore, these staff agencies exercise influence and indirectly control the administrative agencies and play a crucial role in coordinating their policies and programs.

Thus, India has adopted a Parliamentary system where there are two executive heads in the Parliamentary System, one is nominal while the other is the real head. The President of India is a nominal executive and the Prime Minister is the real head of the government.

3.4 JUDICIAL CONTROL

The control exercised by the Courts over the administration is called Judicial control. The primary principle of judicial control over administration is the protection and safeguarding of the rights and liberties of citizens by ensuring the legality of administrative acts. The basis of judicial control over administration emanates from the core concept of

‘Rule of Law’ which is a cardinal feature of the British Constitution as well as the Indian Constitution.

The scope of the judiciary is to intervene in the administrative acts when there is a lack of jurisdiction that is the administrator acts without authority or beyond the scope of his authority. The error of law is when the official administrator misinterprets the law and imposes upon the citizen but these obligations are not mandatory by the content of the law. Error in fact-finding, abuse of authority that is the official uses his authority vindictively to harm some person, and lastly, error of procedure when the official does not obey or follow the laid down procedure.

The Judiciary exercises control over administration through the methods incorporated in the Constitution.

- A) **Judicial Review:** It is the efficient power of the Courts to examine the legality and constitutionality of administrative acts. On the examination, if they are found to be violative of the Constitution (Ultra virus) then they can be declared as illegal/unconstitutional by the Court.
- B) **Statutory Appeal:** The Parliamentary statute that is the law may itself provide that in a particular type of administrative action, the aggrieved citizen will have the right of appeal to the courts. Under such conditions, the statutory appeal is possible.
- C) **Suits against Government:** In India, Article 300 of the Constitution deals with the suability of the State. It clearly states that the Union government and State government can be sued, subject to the provisions of the law enforced by the Parliament and state legislature. However, the State is suable in contracts. That means the contractual liability of the Union government and State government is similar to that of an individual under the ordinary law of contract.
- D) **Suits against Public Officials:** The President and State Governors enjoy personal immunity from legal liability for their official acts. During their particular term of proceedings. They simply cannot be arrested or imprisoned. However, after furnishing two months' notice, civil proceedings can be implemented against them during their tenure in respect of personal acts. The ministers do not enjoy such power benefits, immunities and hence they can be sued in ordinary courts like common citizens for crimes as well as torts.

Under the provision of the Judicial Officer's Protection Act of 1850, the judicial administrators are subsequently immune from any liability in respect of their acts and hence cannot be sued. The Civil servants are empowered with personal immunity from legal liability for official contracts under Article 299 of the Constitution of India.

Thus, India is a federal state in which there is a dual government. But the judicial system is unitary. This means the Constituent States do not have a separate judiciary. The judiciary is considered as the law- interpreting

organ of the government. India has a single integrated judiciary with Supreme Court as the apex court. The Constitution of India officially regards the Supreme Court as the ‘Guardian of Fundamental Rights. Hence the judges of the Supreme Court and High Court can issue various types of Writs like Habeas Corpus, Mandamus, Prohibition, Certiorari, Quo Warranto whichever may be appropriate for enforcement of Fundamental Rights.

Nowadays judiciary has broadened the scope for interpretation of its powers. This is going a step forward by taking up responsibilities of protecting the rights of citizens and for making scrutiny of government decisions. In short, Judiciary has redefined the idea of who can approach the Court. Earlier practice was that only the person whose rights get violated can approach the court but now the Supreme Court allows that any citizen on behalf of the person whose rights are in danger can approach the court and the court will take note of that. This is called Judicial Activism. The concept of judicial activism is getting executed through public interest litigation has been in practice since 1979.

3.5 UNIT END QUESTIONS

- 1) Write a short note on the importance of control over administration.
- 2) What are the various means of legislative control over administration?
- 3) Describe in detail various ways of executive control over administration.
- 4) Explain the means of judicial control over administration.

3.6 REFERENCES

- Avasthi and Maheshwari, 2009, “*Public Administration*” Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.
- Basu Rumki, 2004, “*Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*” Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Laxmikanth.M, 2019, “*Public Administration*” McGraw Hill Education.

CITIZEN'S CHARTER, RIGHT TO INFORMATION, E-GOVERNANCE, ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Unit Structure :

- 4.0 Objective
- 4.1 Citizen's Charter
- 4.2 Right to Information
- 4.3 E-Governance
- 4.4 Role of Civil Society
- 4.5 Unit End Questions
- 4.6 References

4.0 OBJECTIVE

So far in this module, in the last two units, we studied the structural and institutional mechanisms designed to maintain ethics and accountability of administration and governance. The constitutional and institutional means have their worth in handling the issue of integrity and corruption. But in recent years more emphasis has been given to the direct intervention of the people in ensuring good governance and empowering the agency of civil society to check the government and the administration to deliver what they are expected to deliver in the democracy. In this unit we will focus on the devices of active citizen involvement like Citizen's Charter, Right to Information, E-Governance to employ technology to deliver the public goods and role of Civil Society as an effective stakeholder in the process of governance.

4.1 CITIZEN'S CHARTER

The concept of Citizen in the Citizen's Charter implies the clients or customers whose interests and values are dealt with by the Charter. The Charter is generally not legally enforceable and thus is non-justiciable. The Citizen's Charter institutional system is an effective mechanism for solving the problems which a citizen encounters in day-to-day life while dealing with the organizations providing public services.

The emergence of the concept:

The Citizen's Charter concept enshrines a connection built based on trust between the service provider and its users. The concept was first formulated and implemented in the UK by the Conservative Government of John Major in 1991 as a national program with the core aim to continuously improve the quality of public services for the people of the country so that these services respond to the needs and demands of the users.

Objectives of Citizen's Charter:

The basic objectives of the Citizen's Charter are as follows: -

- a. Quality:** Effectively improving the quality of services
- b. Choice:** Where Possible
- c. Standards:** It specifies what to exactly expect and how to act if standards are not met.
- d. Value:** For the taxpayer's money
- e. Accountability:** Individuals and Organizations
- f. Transparency:** Rules/Procedures/Scenes/Grievances

The Indian Scenario of Citizen's Charter:

Citizens have become more vigilant and expect the administration not merely to respond to their needs and demands but also to anticipate them. A conference including Chief Secretaries was organized in 1996 to develop "An agenda for an effective and responsive administration" to make the public services more efficient, clean, transparent, accountable, and citizen-friendly. Another Conference was held in New Delhi in 1997 including the Chief Ministers of various states and union territories which was presided over by the Prime Minister of India, an "Action Plan for effective and responsive government" should be implemented at Centre and State levels. One of the major implications that were formulated at the Conference was that the Central and State government would articulate Citizen Charter starting with those sectors that have a large public interface. The three main aspects of the Action Plan that were discussed at the Conference were:

1. Making administration accountable, responsible, and citizen-friendly.
2. Ensuring transparency and right to information
3. Initiating measures to cleanse and motivate civil services.

Moreover, the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances in India formulated the task of coordinating, formulating, and operationalizing the Citizen's Charter. It has effectively made efforts to formulate and operationalize Citizen Charter's in Central Government, State Government, and Union Territory administrations. For the publicity purpose, a comprehensive website of the Citizen's Charter in the Government of India has been developed and launched by the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG) on 31st May 2002. While the government continued the work with regards to the Citizen's Charter in a major public interface area of government would not only focus on the new concept in bureaucracy but also acts as a role model for replication in other sectors/areas. Therefore, the banking sector was considered appropriate for this purpose keeping in view to bring about economic reforms and this sector was fairly advanced in terms of customer service and information technology.

The primary goal was to set up the Banking sector as a model of excellence in the implementation of the Citizen's Charter.

Problems faced in implementing the charter:

- 1) Devoid of participative mechanism: In a majority of cases, the cases were not formulated through a consultative process with cutting-edge staff who will finally implement it.
- 2) Lack of public awareness: Only a small section of end-users was aware of the provisions made in the charter since effective efforts of communicating and educating the people about the standards of delivery promise have not been adequately addressed.
- 3) End users, Civil society organizations, and NGOs are not consulted when the charter is drafted. As the basic aim of the charter is to make public service delivery more citizen-friendly consultation with stakeholders is a must.
- 4) Tendency to have a uniform Citizen's charter for all offices under the parent organization. The Charter has still not been adopted by all ministers, departments. This overlooks local issues.

Therefore, Citizen's Charter constitutes a very important part of the discourse of public administration to establish accountability and transparency and to provide speedy solutions to the queries of citizens.

4.2 RIGHT TO INFORMATION

Right to information means the autonomy and freedom of people to have access to government information. It subjectively implies that the citizens and non-governmental organizations should enjoy considerable and reasonable free access to all documents about the governmental operations, decisions, and performance. It offers openness and transparency in the overall functioning of government. In the year 1992, World Bank has released a document titled 'Governance and Development. The document has incorporated seven elements of governance and one of the elements is transparency and providing information. The right to information is necessary because of the below- mentioned reasons:

- 1) It helps in making the administration more transparent and accountable to people.
- 2) It supports in reducing the gap between administration and people
- 3) Helps in public awareness regarding matters of administrative decision-making.
- 4) Offers enhanced delivery of goods and services to people by civil servants.
- 5) Facilitates constructive criticism of the administration
- 6) It enhances public participation in the administration

- 7) Facilitates public interest by discouraging unlawfulness and arbitrariness in administrative decision-making.
- 8) Helps in reducing the scope for corruption in the administration
- 9) Facilitates making the administration more responsive to the requirements of people.
- 10) Supports in reducing the chance of abuse of authority by public servants.

Global Scenario:

Sweden is considered to be the first country in the world to adopt and introduce the right to information in 1766. Later on, Finland introduced it as the Freedom of Information legislation in 1951. Followed by its USA granted the right to information to its citizens by the enactment of Freedom of Information Act 1966. Both Denmark and Norway have implemented the same legislation in 1970. In Britain, the Fulton Committee 1966-68 investigated and found too much of secrecy in public administration, and in 2005 the UK Freedom of Information Act came into existence.

Position in India:

The important document that is the Constitution of India has no direct provision expressly conferring the right to information to the citizens. Therefore, Supreme Court has stated in 1975 that the right to information is a crucial part of the following two Fundamental Rights guaranteed by the Constitution: -

- 1) Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression (Article 19)
- 2) Right to Life and Personal Liberty (Article 21)

Moreover, in 2005 the Parliament has enacted new legislation that is the Right to Information Act and this new legislation replaced the old Freedom of Information Act 2002. The new act has certain provisions: -

- 1) It provides for the appointment of an information officer in every department to provide correct information to the people on request.
- 2) It has fixed a 30-day deadline for providing information deadline is 48 hours in information is related to the life or liberty of a person.
- 3) For people below the poverty line, the information is freely provided but for others, a certain fee is charged.
- 4) It provides for the establishment of the office of a Central Information Commission and State Information Commission to implement the provisions.
- 5) The President is empowered to appoint a Chief Information Commissioner and Governors of State will appoint State Information Commissioner and for a fixed term of 5 years.

- 6) The new act of 2005 overrides the Official Secrets Act 1923 on the recommendation of the Fifth Pay Commission in 1994-97. The information commissions can allow access to the info if public interest outweighs the harm to protected persons.

At the state level also, several states have introduced their right to information legislation. Tamil Nadu is the first state to do so. In Rajasthan, the Right to Information movement was started by Aruna Roy in the

1990s. The MazdoorKisan Shakti Sangathan has successfully carried out agitation, in accessing and using the information to put an end to local corruption and exploitation. In the early 2000s, Anna Hazare led a movement in Maharashtra state which forced the state government to enact Maharashtra Right to Information Act and it was later considered as the base document for the Right to Information Act 2005 enacted by the Union government.

4.3 E-GOVERNANCE

E-governance that is electronic governance is the use of Information and Communication Technology to carry out the functioning of the government of a country. E-governance simply means the application of ICT to transform the efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of the exchange of information and transaction between governments, government agencies, government and citizens, government and business. The concept of E-governance aims to empower people through the mechanism of providing them access to information. The major objective of E-governance is to offer a SMARRT Government. The acronym SMARRT implies Simple, Moral, Accountable, Responsive, Responsible, and Transparent government.

Advantages of E-governance:

1. **Speed:** Technology enhances communication to be speedier. Internet, Cell phones have reduced the time taken in normal communication.
2. **Cost Reduction:** Most of the government expenditure is formulated towards the cost of stationary. Traditional paper-based communication requires a lot of stationary, printers, computers, etc. which leads to continuous heavy expenditure. However, modern technology like the Internet, Phones makes communication faster and cheaper saving valuable money for the government.
3. **Transparency:** The use of ICT makes governing and administrative processes transparent. All the crucial information of the government can be made available on the internet. The citizens can have a look at the information at their ease. However, it can be only made possible when every unit of the information of the government is correctly uploaded on the internet and is made available for the public to peruse.
4. **Accountability:** Once the governing and administrative process becomes transparent then the government is ultimately made accountable.

Accountability usually implies the answerability of the government to the public. It is often the answerability for the deeds of the government. An accountable government is always considered a responsible government.

Therefore, the administration worldwide has got qualitative and quantitative transformations through the implementation of ICT. The impact of E-governance in reforming and assessing public administration has become a part of the academic discourse on good governance. The concept of E-governance now has become an accepted aspect for improving and enhancing the quality of the delivery of public services. Reforming government processes is crucial for establishing transparency, efficiency, productivity, and reducing bureaucratic controls. The pace, transparency, and accountability associated with E-governance have the valuable potential to make public administration responsive to ensure good governance. Thus, we can say that E-governance is the effective mechanism of Good Governance for developing countries like India to reduce corruption, provide efficient and effective quality services to their citizens.

4.4 ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The concept of 'Civil Society' has come into existence to enjoy much political, administrative and intellectual currency in recent years. But it has a fairly long historical background. So traditionally the two terms 'State' and 'Civil Society' were used interchangeably and treated synonymously and this trend continued till the 18th century. G.W.F Hegel

is considered the first political philosopher who separated and differentiated civil society from state. His footsteps were followed by Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels in the 19th Century. In the 20th Century, Antonio Gramsci conceptualized the concept of Civil Society. So, a Civil Society covers all forms of voluntary association and social interaction which is not controlled by the state.

Features of Civil Society:

- 1) It is often referred to as non-state institutions, organized society and covers a large space in society.
- 2) It considers the groups which are intermediate between the State (political society) and family (national society).
- 3) Though it is considered autonomous, it is subjected to the authority of the state.
- 4) It is in pursuit of a common public good.
- 5) It effectively facilitates citizen's participation in politico-administrative affairs.
- 6) Its crucial attribute is voluntarism, not coercion.

- 7) It preaches pluralism to reduce the degree of domination of the State.
- 8) It strongly implies the existence of freedom of association, freedom of thought, and other civil and economic rights.

Components of Civil Society:

The components included under the umbrella concept of Civil Society are:

- 1) Non-governmental organizations
- 2) Trade Unions
- 3) Cooperatives
- 4) Farmer's Organization
- 5) Youth Groups
- 6) Religious associations
- 7) Women's groups.

In the USA, the concept of Civil Society is highly developed, while the scenario in India is that the concept is fast growing since the

1970s. In India Civil Society is observed as a fluid association of social groupings or on religious mobilization as much as on voluntary social associations.

Role of Civil Society:

Civil Society plays a crucial role in welfare and development administration. The various dimensions of their role are:

- 1) Civil society mobilizes the poor for socio-economic development.
- 2) It disseminates information and helps in creating awareness among the public regarding various schemes, programs, projects enacted by the government for their betterment.
- 3) Enhances public participation in the administrative process.
- 4) Facilitates the administrative machinery to become more responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people.
- 5) It helps in imposing a community system of accountability on the working of administrative machinery at lower levels. Thus, it helps in reducing the scope of corruption.
- 6) Helps in creating political consciousness among the people by discussing various political issues.
- 7) It acts as the watchdogs of the public interest.

Limitations of Civil Society:

Thus, there are some **limitations** also of the voluntary organizations which are a part of civil society.

- 1) Lack of sufficient monetary resources
- 2) Lack of efficient and trained workers
- 3) Bureaucratic non-cooperation and resistance
- 4) Insufficient information base
- 5) Stipulated functional perspective (nonholistic approach).
- 6) Political disturbance and influence
- 7) Resistance from local landlords, money lenders, etc.
- 8) A diverse socio-economic, political environment like casteism, communalism, poverty, etc.

Therefore, assessing the relative merit and demerit of Civil Society and the Voluntary Sector, the World Development Report 1997 stated that, the voluntary sector portrays its strengths to the table but also its weakness. It rigorously enhances public awareness, raising citizens' concerns, and delivering services. Local self-help organizations are sometimes considered the givers of local public goods and services, because of their closeness to local matters. However, their concern is often for certain religious groups and not particularly to society as a whole. Their accountability is often limited and their resources are constrained.

4.5 UNIT END QUESTIONS

- 1) Explain the status of the Citizens' Charter in India.
- 2) Write a detailed note on Right to Information as an effective tool to ensure transparency in governance.
- 3) Explain the implication of E-Governance to transform the way governments serve the citizen better.
- 4) What is the role of Civil Society in modern governance?

4.6 REFERENCES

- Fadia.L.B and Dr.FadiaKuldeep, 2020, "*Public Administration: Administrative Theories*" SahityaBhawan.
- Laxmikanth.M, 2019, "*Public Administration*" McGraw Hill Education.
- Shreyasi Ghosh, 2016, "*The essence of e-governance in the modern era of Indian public administration today*" Future of E-government: learning from the past, Vol.4 No.3 (2016) Issue-September, ISSN 2347-6869 (E) pg no. 110 to 123.

OMBUDSMAN, LOK PAL AND LOK AYUKTA

Unit Structure :

- 5.0 Objective
- 5.1 Ombudsman System
- 5.2 Lok Pal
- 5.3 LokAyukta
- 5.4 Unit End Questions
- 5.5 References

5.0 OBJECTIVE

In this unit, we will try to study the institutions envisaged to contain the problem of corruption in the administration. There is a long- standing demand to have an institutional check on the administration which will be effective and efficient as well. The demand for *Lok Pal* and *Lokayukta* stems from this expectation. Follow the detailed description given below regarding this.

5.1 OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM

Modern democratic states are often identified by welfare orientation. However, the government has come to play a crucial role in the social, economic, and political development of the nation and this has ultimately resulted in the wider expansion of bureaucracy and the multiplication of administrative process, which in turn has eventually increased the administrative power and discretion enjoyed by the civil servants at different levels of the government. Thus, the misuse or abuse of this power and discretion by civil servants opens up scope for harassment, malpractices, maladministration, and corruption and such a type of situation often gives rise to citizen's grievances against the administration. The true success of democracy and the achievement of social, economic, and political development depend on the degree to which the citizen's grievances are redressed. Therefore, the institutional device formulated for citizen's grievances is called as Ombudsman System.

The earliest device of a democratic institution established in the world for speedy and fast redressal of citizen's grievance is the Scandinavian institution of Ombudsman. The institutional device of the Ombudsman was created for the first time in Sweden in 1809. 'Ombud' is a Swedish word that means a person who acts as the representative or spokesperson of another person. The Swedish institutional system of Ombudsman deals with the citizen's grievances in the following matters:

- 1) Misuse of administrative power and authority
- 2) Maladministration i.e. inefficiency in achieving the goal and targets.
- 3) Corruption in administrative work that is demanding bribery for doing things
- 4) Nepotism
- 5) Discourtesy i.e. misbehavior, for instance, use of abusive language.

The Swedish Ombudsman is appointed by the Parliament for a tenure of four years. He is subjected to get removed only by the Parliament on the ground of its loss of confidence in him. He is subjected to submit his annual report to the Parliament and therefore is known as

‘Parliamentary Ombudsman’. But he is independent of the Parliament (legislature) as well as the executive and judiciary. Moreover, the Ombudsman system is a Constitutional authority and completely enjoys the powers and privileges to supervise the compliance of laws and regulations, by the public administrators and see to it that they discharge their duties properly. But the Ombudsman does not have the power to reverse or quash a decision and has no direct control over administration or the Courts.

The Ombudsman can act either based on a complaint lodged by the citizen against unfair administrative action or *Suo Moto*. He can prosecute any hearing officially including the judges. But he cannot inflict any punishment. He can only report the matter to higher authorities to take necessary corrective action. Characteristics of the Ombudsman system are:

- 1) Independence of action is granted from the executive.
- 2) Impartial and objective investigation of complaints
- 3) *Suomoto* power to start investigations.
- 4) Right to report to the Parliament as opposed to the executive. The institution of Ombudsman is primarily based on the concept of administrative accountability to legislature.
- 5) Wide publicity is given to its working in press and others.
- 6) Direct, Simple, informal, cheap, speedy method of handling the received complaints.

In Sweden initially, the Ombudsman was created but then it spread to other Scandinavian countries like Finland (1919), Denmark (1955), and Norway (1962). However, New Zealand is considered to be the first Commonwealth country in the world to have adopted the institutional device of the Ombudsman system in the form of Parliamentary Commissioner for investigation in 1962. Since then more than 40 countries of the world have adopted the Ombudsman system with different nomenclature and functions. In India, the Ombudsman is called Lokpal and Lokayukta.

Hence, the system of Ombudsman is a very crucial institution for the protection of democratic rights and freedoms and to free the general

administration from corruption and efficiency and in Scandinavian countries, the Ombudsman is regarded very important as it plays a crucial role in granting redressal to citizen's grievances.

5.2 LOK PAL

The Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) which was initially headed by the eminent leader Morarji Desai submitted a special and important interim report on 'Problems of Redressal of Citizen's Grievances' in the year 1966. In this particular report, the ARC specially initiated for setting up of two important authorities designated as 'Lokpal' and 'Lokayukta' with the main of providing speedy redressal of citizen's grievances. These particular institutions were to be set up based on the model of the institution of Ombudsman in Scandinavian countries. The Lokpal specifically deals with complaints against ministers and secretaries at the Central and State levels. The ARC kept the judiciary outside the purview of Lokpal and Lokayukta as it is present in New Zealand. But in the case of Sweden, the judicial system is within the purview of the Ombudsman. According to the policies of ARC, the Lokpal would be appointed by the President after consultation with the Chief Justice of India, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, and the Chairman of Rajya Sabha. The government of India has accepted the policies and recommendations of ARC.

The recommendations formulated by ARC are:

- 1) They should be independent and impartial.
- 2) Their investigations and proceedings shall be conducted in private and should be uniform.
- 3) Their appointment shall as far as possible should be non-political.
- 4) Their job is to tackle the issues basically in the discretionary field involving acts of injustice, corruption, and favoritism.
- 5) Their proceedings should not be subjected to judicial interference and they should have the maximum latitude and powers in obtaining information relevant to their particular duties
- 6) They should not look forward to any benefit from the executive government. So far, 8 official attempts have been initiated to bring about legislation on the Lok pal subject. Bills were introduced in 1968, 1971, 1977, 1985, 1989, 1996, 1998, and in August 2001 by the NDA government under A.B. Vajpayee. However, none of the bills have been passed in the Parliament due to some reasons.

The salient features of the 2001 Lokpal bill are as follows:

- 1) The bill effectively emphasizes the enactment of Lokpal to inquire into allegations of corruption against public officials including the Prime Minister, provided the offense committed is within 10 years from the day the complaint is lodged.

- 2) The institution of Lokpal shall include a chairperson who is or has been a Chief Justice or a Judge of the Supreme Court and two members who are or have been the Judges of the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice of High Court.
- 3) The chairpersons and members need to be appointed by the President of India on the recommendation of a committee which is under the control of the Vice President of India and comprising the Prime Minister, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, Home Minister, Leader of the House other than the House in which the Prime Minister is a member and leaders of the opposition in both the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha.
- 4) The bill focuses on a fixed tenure of 3 years for the chairperson and the members.
- 5) The bill entrusts that the Lokpal is capable of functioning independently and discharge its functions without any kind of fear or favor.
- 6) The institution of Lokpal will look into complaints alleging that a public official has committed an offense punishable under the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. Now public officials include the Prime Minister and Member of Parliament. The judges of the Supreme Court and the institution of the Election Commission have been subsequently kept out of the jurisdiction of Lokpal.
- 7) The complaints and allegations against the Prime Minister related to his functions and duties in the matters of national security and maintenance of public order have also been kept out of the purview of Lokpal.
- 8) To enable the Lokpal to carry out its function efficiently and in a quasi-judicial manner, it has been entrusted with the powers of a civil court in respect of summoning and enforcing the attendance of any person or examining him on oath.
- 9) The bill emphasizes for an open court or if the Lokpal wishes in-camera proceedings, it needs to be completed within 6 months, with a provision for extension of 6 months more.
- 10) The institution of Lokpal is entrusted with penal powers to discourage frivolous complaints.

5.3 LOK AYUKTA

It deals with the complaints related to other higher officials apart from ministers and secretaries at the Central and State level. In Maharashtra, the institution of Lokayukta was set up in 1971. There are 11 states in which Lokayukta is established. They are namely Orissa (1970), Maharashtra (1971), Rajasthan (1973), Bihar (1974), Uttar Pradesh (1975), Madhya Pradesh (1981), Andhra Pradesh (1983), Himachal Pradesh (1983), Karnataka (1985), Gujarat (1986) and Punjab (1995).

The various aspects of Lokayukta are as follows:

- A) Structural Variations:** The structure of Lokayukta is not similar in all states. Some states like Rajasthan, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Maharashtra have established the Lokayukta as well as Up Lokayukta. While some other states like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Himachal Pradesh have created only Lokayukta and not Up-Lokayukta. This variation in the pattern was not suggested by ARC in the states.
- B) Appointment:** Both the Lokayukta and Up-Lokayukta are appointed by the Government of the State. While appointing the Governor in most of the States, the institutional system of Lokayukta consults with (a) the Chief Justice of the State High Court (b) the Leader of the opposition in the state legislative assembly.
- C) Qualifications:** Judicial qualifications have been initiated and prescribed for Lokayukta in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Orissa, Karnataka, and Assam. But there is no specific provision with regards to qualifications as prescribed in the states of Bihar, Maharashtra, and Rajasthan.
- D) Tenure:** In most of the states, the decided tenure is 5 years for Lokayukta or 65 years of age whichever is earlier and he is not eligible for reappointment for a second term.
- E) Jurisdiction:** There is as such no uniformity regarding the jurisdiction of Lokayukta in all the States. The following points can be noted: -
 - 1) The Chief Minister is considered as a part of the jurisdiction of Lokayukta in the states of Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Gujarat but he is not included in states of Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Bihar, and Orissa.
 - 2) Ministers and higher civil administrators are included in the purview of Lokayukta in almost all states. Talking of Maharashtra, it included former ministers and civil ministers in the Lokayukta.
 - 3) Members of states legislature are included in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, and Assam
 - 4) The officials and authorities of the local bodies, corporations, companies, and societies are included in the purview of the institutional device of Lokayukta in most of the states.
 - 5) Investigations: In most of the states the institution of Lokayukta investigates based on a complaint lodged by the citizen against unfair administrative action or Suomoto.

- 6) Scope of Cases covered: The Lokayukta specifically tackles cases of citizen's grievances as well as allegations in the respective states namely Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, and Karnataka.

F) Other Features:

- 1) The Lokayukta presents annually to the governor a consolidated report on his performance. The Governor then displays the report along with an explanatory note before the State Legislature and the Lokayukta is responsible to State Legislature.
- 2) He takes assistance from the state investigating agencies for conducting inquiries.
- 3) He can order relevant resources like files and documents from the State government departments.
- 4) The recommendation made by Lokayukta is only advisory and not binding on the State Government.

Thus, it can be said that India still has a long way to go as far as containing corruption is concerned. Two main reforms that need to be made on an urgent basis are (a) the Establishment of a strong Lokpal at the Centre and (b) Uniformity in the powers and functions of Lokayuktas in the States.

5.4 UNIT END QUESTIONS

- 1) Write a short note on the Ombudsman System to contain corruption in Indian Administration.
- 2) Write a detailed note on the institution of Lokpal to control corruption at the Central level of governance.
- 3) What are the features of Lokayukta?

5.5 REFERENCES

- Arora Ramesh, and Goyal "*Indian Public Administration, Institutions and Issues*" Wishwa Publication.
- Fadia. B. L. and Fadia. Kuldeep, 2020, "*Public Administration: Administrative Theories*" Sahitya Bhavan.
- Laxmikanth.M, 2019, "*Public Administration*" McGraw Hill Education.

DYNAMICS OF PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

Unit Structure :

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Meaning & Definitions
- 6.3 Nature of Public Policy
- 6.4 Key Characteristics
- 6.5 Dynamics of Public Policy & Features of policy dynamics
- 6.6 Different Models of Public Policy
- 6.7 Summary
- 6.8 Questions
- 6.9 References

6.0 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this unit is to understand the meaning, definitions key characteristics, dynamics as well as various models of public policy along with their strength and criticisms developed by various theorist.

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- Explain the meaning and nature of public policy
- Key characteristics, dynamics & Nature of Public policy
- Meaning of models of public policy

6.1. INTRODUCTION

In the beginning: People have a tendency to be affected, either directly or indirectly, by the policies that the government makes for them in their day-to-day lives. Each and every facet of human existence in society is influenced by public policy. As an illustration, the government implemented a vaccination program with the intention of vaccinating youngsters before they started attending school. Similarly, prohibition on smoking in public places like restaurants and businesses, seatbelt mandates, speed restrictions, and DUI regulations to promote road safety are some of the instances that affect the lives of people. Public policies are established to assure health, safety, and obedience to laws and regulations in the wider benefit of society. However, not all policies are favourable to people, as stated by Anderson, that governmental policies in the modern, complex society are certainly pervasive. Individually, they bring about pleasure, aggravation, and suffering; collectively, they have significant repercussions for one's well-being and happiness, and they give both advantages and

disadvantages. (Anderson, 2011) Moreover, the creation of management and public policy as established arenas of study and teaching has been among the significant 21st-century advances in the social sciences. Both of them share a lot of similarities, including the fact that they are fundamentally multidisciplinary, have a significant component, and bear the burden of practical significance. Although both are essentially American innovations, it is difficult to accurately date the foundation of the field of knowledge since, similar to the majority of evolutionary processes, it is difficult to pinpoint its beginnings. (Chakrabarty & Sanyal, 2017) Public policy is defined in numerous ways, including as

6.2 DEFINITIONS

1. Public policy is defined in various ways such as “Public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do.” (Weible & Denver, 2017)
2. Robert Eye Stone defined public policy as “the relationship between a government unit and its environment.” (Barailly)
3. Jenkins defined “public policy is a set of interrelated decisions made by political actor or group of actors to select goals and achieve them.” (Bernier & Clavier, 2011)

Meaning:

The preceding definitions illustrate the idea that public policy revolves around public good and social welfare. Or, as Chakrabarty stated, policy refers to a rule—a guide to decision-making. (Chakrabarty & Sanyal, 2017) Therefore, public policy refers to the system of laws, rules, courses of activities, and financing priorities set by governments to address social concerns or achieve certain goals. It acts as a guide for decision-making and action in areas that affect the public. Any law that affects the public at large, or persons or all members of a community, is consequently subject matter of public policy. Since public policy is developed by the government for the people, groups of people, or society, it has legal support and sanctions to apply it.

6.3 NATURE OF PUBLIC POLICY

In terms of its nature, public policy is defined as the framework of laws, rules, courses of action, and financing priorities established by governments to address societal concerns and enhance citizens' welfare. It is a dynamic and ever-changing system shaped by political, economic, social, and cultural variables. Public policy decisions are made at all levels of government—local, state, and national—and frequently entail collaboration with private groups, non-governmental institutions, and the general public. Public policy is complex, affected by the interactions of government institutions, political ideologies, and public interests. At its root, public policy seeks to solve societal problems, whether in healthcare, education, the environment, or economic development. Governments develop policies

depending on their goals and resources, and the success of these policies is determined by their implementation and flexibility. Political dynamics influence public policy as elected officials and policymakers work to balance the interests of many stakeholders. Political ideology, party platforms, and electoral factors all influence the course of policy decisions. In democratic nations, public policy is formed through legislative debates, public conversation, and input from interest groups, think tanks, and advocacy organizations. Policy decisions in authoritarian regimes may be more centralized and less transparent to the public. The policy-making process is multifaceted, encompassing problem identification, policy design, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. The identification of societal concerns that require government involvement is a critical first step. Once an issue is identified, officials conduct studies and analyses to generate viable policy solutions. Decision-making includes considering options, determining feasibility, and obtaining political and public support. To properly implement policies, government agencies and stakeholders must coordinate. Evaluation determines if a policy has achieved its objectives and identifies opportunities for improvement or modification. Economic concerns also impact public policy, since governments must spend resources efficiently in order to maximize public benefit. Fiscal limits, taxation policies, and budget priorities all have an impact on policy implementation feasibility. Economic theories and empirical data help policymakers devise actions that enhance growth, stability, and equity. Policies concerning taxation, social welfare, and public spending reflect the government's approach to economic management. Social and cultural issues have an important role in creating public policy. Cultural norms, historical experiences, and societal values all have an impact on policy acceptance and preferences. Civil rights, gender equality, and environmental sustainability are often influenced by changing social views and movements. Policymakers must manage these factors to develop policies that reflect public mood while solving important issues. Public policy frequently necessitates collaboration among several levels of government and various sectors of society.

The federal, state, and local governments must work together to ensure that policies are implemented effectively. International cooperation is also necessary to handle global issues such as climate change, public health crises, and economic interdependence. Policymakers must collaborate with experts, industry leaders, and civil society to establish well-informed and effective policies. Public policy's effectiveness is determined by its ability to adapt to changing circumstances. Policies must be adaptable enough to address new issues, technology breakthroughs, and variations in public opinion. To ensure that policies remain relevant and effective, governments frequently change and update them via amendments, new legislation, or administrative tweaks. Public policy is an important tool for government, influencing quality of life and societal progress. It entails striking a balance between opposing interests, making evidence-based decisions, and implementing effective tactics. Whether tackling economic inequality, public health concerns, or environmental sustainability, public policy is a tool that governments use to create a more just, prosperous, and stable society.

6.4 KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC POLICY

As noted above, public policy aimed at social welfare and well-being of society operates on broad directions or viewpoints that the government lays down in order to take judgements. It plays a significant role in forming society and addressing complicated situations. Public policy has the following features.

1. **Purposeful:** Public policy is always meant to address specific problems, or policies are always established to tackle actual and pressing problems faced by society. A purposeful public policy ensures resources are assigned efficiently to confront the issues successfully, such as strengthening the economy, lowering crime, enhancing public health, reforming education to cope with the changing global environment, and ensuring environmental sustainability. A purposeful public policy allows policymakers to express the intent and objectives of a policy clearly to the public, which assures accountability and transparency.
2. **Systematic:** Public policy must be systematic because it requires structured processes to assess, plan, implement, and evaluate policies that handle social challenges effectively. A systematic method to public policy assures that programs are well-organised, evidence-based, and capable of attaining their aim while limiting unexpected consequences. Similarly, a systematic procedure guarantees that policies are executed consistently across diverse locations, industries, and people, preventing ad-hoc or arbitrary decision-making. A systematic method is always reliant on data gathering, research, and analysis to discover the fundamental causes of problems and produce evidence-based remedies, which helps to avoid inefficient and harmful policies.
3. **Strategic:** Public policy must be strategic to ensure that it aligns with long-term goals, anticipates future issues, and optimises resources for optimum social benefits. Further, a strategic approach guarantees that policies are not just reactive to immediate challenges but also proactive in crafting a better future. Strategic policies are aimed at contributing to overall goals such as economic growth, social fairness, or sustainable development, maintaining continuity and direction in the governance. A strategic public policy contains vision, prioritising, integration, an implementation plan, as well as monitoring and evaluation components.
4. **Dynamic:** Public policy is dynamic and adaptive and not static. It changes and adapts over time in response to changing conditions, societal requirements, and developing difficulties. Policy makers regularly examine policies to consider new evidence, technological improvements, and feedback from stakeholders to ensure policies stay relevant and practicable. Dynamic policies enable governments to respond quickly to unforeseen issues, such as pandemics, natural disasters, or geopolitical developments, without being bound by old

frameworks. Likewise, by being adaptable, dynamic policies assist societies in building resilience to shocks and uncertainty, ensuring sustainable progress.

5. **Involves stakeholders:** Public policy always involves a wide range of stakeholders; generally, stakeholders are those individuals, groups, or organisations for whom policy is developed. They have great interest and influence in the formulation, execution, or result of a certain policy. Secondly, the inclusion of various stakeholders guarantees that the policy is inclusive, well-informed, and capable of answering the concerns of those affected. Generally, stakeholders include several categories, such as legislative bodies (forming policy), executive bodies (enforcement), and judicial bodies (interpretation and resolution of disputes). Citizens and communities, business and industry groupings, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), academia and specialists, media, etc., are essential stakeholders in the policy creation and execution.
6. **Effective Implementation and Evaluation:** Effective implementation and evaluation are crucial components of successful public policy, without which even well-designed programs might fail to achieve their intended objectives. Implementation refers to the process of putting a policy into action. It entails converting policy decisions into actual steps and outcomes. To be effective, the implementation of the policy must always be explicit in its objectives that are intended to be achieved. It must be backed by adequate resources such as financial, manpower, and technology. Furthermore, the implementing agencies must be completely capable and possess all the essential skills, infrastructure, and authority. Coordination with stakeholders constitutes a key cornerstone of good public policy and functions smoothly. There must be a monitoring system to measure success and identify issues during the implementation of the public policy. Transparent communication about the policy's goal and processes helps increase public support and compliance.

6.5 PUBLIC POLICY DYNAMICS

“Policy dynamics refers to the study of change and stability of public policies.” (Dye, 1972) or simply, Public policy dynamics are the processes, people, and circumstances that influence the creation, execution, and evolution of public policies. At its heart, public policy refers to government decisions and activities taken to solve social concerns in accordance with principles, priorities, and evidence. Public policy dynamics are shaped by the interaction of political, social, economic, and cultural elements, making it a complex and adaptable process. The policymaking process begins with identifying issues that demand government intervention. Public demand, media coverage, interest group activism, or political objectives draw officials' attention to problems. The framing of these issues frequently influences their importance and the type of response they evoke. For example, framing a public health issue as an economic danger may elicit a different governmental response than framing it as a medical emergency. Actors play a critical role in creating public policy. These people include

elected politicians, bureaucrats, interest groups, think tanks, academics, and individuals. Each actor offers their own set of interests, knowledge, and clout to the policy debate. Elected officials frequently prioritise policies that coincide with their political philosophies or electoral mandates.

Bureaucrats put policies into action and can influence their design through their technical competence. Interest groups and think tanks advocate for policies that support their goals, while citizens participate through advocacy, protests, and voting. The institutional structure has a large impact on public policy. Governments function inside systems that govern decision-making and implementation. Federal systems, for example, distribute policymaking power at the national, regional, and local levels, opening up options for collaboration or conflict. Democratic, authoritarian, and hybrid political systems all have an impact on the inclusivity and transparency of the policymaking process. Legal systems influence policy by providing means for enforcement and accountability. Economic factors affect public policy by affecting the resources available to address societal concerns. Fiscal restrictions may limit the extent of policy interventions, whereas economic growth may create opportunity for increased public services. Domestic policies are increasingly impacted by international economic trends, trade agreements, and global governance organisations, adding to the complexity of globalisation. Social and cultural issues influence social norms and expectations, which impact public policy. When constructing interventions, policymakers must consider a wide range of cultural norms, historical contexts, and public opinions. Social movements and public opinion may be major factors in driving policy change, as demonstrated in civil rights, environmental preservation, and public health. The implementation of public policy is a dynamic process in which plans are put into action. This stage frequently reveals discrepancies between policy design and actual outcomes as a result of resource restrictions, bureaucratic inefficiency, or unexpected problems. Coordination across government levels, effective communication, and monitoring and evaluation systems are all required for successful implementation. Feedback loops are a crucial part of public policy dynamics. Policies are rarely static; rather, they change in response to their outcomes, new information, and shifting societal requirements. Evaluations, public consultations, and political disputes all serve as feedback mechanisms that assist policymakers develop and modify policies over time. This iterative process guarantees that policies are relevant and effective in dealing with the complexity of modern government. Crises and disruptions have an impact on public policy dynamics. Natural disasters, pandemics, economic downturns, and political upheavals frequently require governments to respond quickly and adaptably. Crises can spur innovation, but they also reveal flaws in existing systems and institutions. To summarise, public policy dynamics are the complex interactions of problems, players, institutions, and circumstances. The process is naturally political, affected by opposing interests and power relations. It is also dynamic, necessitating ongoing adjustment to changing conditions and feedback. Understanding these intricacies is critical for developing and executing policies that successfully address societal issues.

Characteristics of public policy dynamics.

Public policy is a complicated and diverse concept with certain qualities that define its aim, scope, and implementation. These traits distinguish public policy from other forms of decision-making and shed light on how governments solve societal concerns.

Public policy is always Intentional: One fundamental feature of public policy is its intentionality. Public policy is not haphazard or unintentional; it is a purposeful and goal-orientated course of action intended to attain certain results. Governments create policies to address specific issues, meet societal requirements, or encourage progress. Public policy, whether used to improve public health, manage climate change, or boost economic growth, provides a systematic approach to complicated situations.

Authoritative: Another distinguishing feature is its authoritativeness. Public policies are government-backed choices that are legitimate and enforceable. Policies are developed and executed within the context of laws, regulations, and institutions, ensuring that they bear the full weight of the state's authority. This authority sets public policy apart from recommendations or voluntary actions made by private entities or individuals.

Public and collaborative: Public policy is essentially public and collaborative. It addresses issues that concern the entire society or certain groups within it. Unlike private decisions, which are made by individuals or organisations, public policy takes into account collective interests and seeks to balance opposing demands. This collaborative approach frequently challenges politicians to reconcile varied and sometimes conflicting interests while ensuring that policies are equitable and inclusive.

Trans-disciplinary: Public policy is also distinguished by its trans-disciplinary nature. Policy development and execution necessitate knowledge from a variety of disciplines, including economics, sociology, political science, law, and environmental science. For example, a renewable energy policy may include technical engineering expertise, an economic study of costs and benefits, and legal compliance issues. This multidisciplinary approach guarantees that policies are strong and informed.

Operates under institutions and legal frame: Public policy operates under a certain institutional and legal framework. Governmental bodies, such as legislatures, executive agencies, and judicial systems, create and implement policies, providing a framework for decision-making and enforcement. These frameworks differ among countries and political systems, altering the character and scope of public initiatives. For example, in federal systems, policies may be coordinated between national and regional administrations, whereas in unitary systems, decision-making may be more centralised.

Dynamic and adaptive: Public policy is dynamic and adaptive, evolving in response to shifting societal requirements, technological breakthroughs, and new knowledge. Policies are rarely static; they are constantly updated

through feedback loops such as public consultations, evaluations, and reviews of implementation results. This iterative method keeps policies relevant and effective throughout time.

Resource dependent: Another feature of public policy is its resource-dependent nature. Policies require the allocation of resources—financial, human, and material—to be effectively executed. Governments must prioritise and manage these resources within financial limits, which frequently necessitate painful trade-offs. For example, extending healthcare access may necessitate reallocating funding from other sectors or raising government revenue through taxation. Politics and power dynamics also have an impact on public policy. It is shaped by the ideas, priorities, and goals of political leaders and parties, as well as interest groups, civil society organisations, and the general public. These individuals contribute a variety of opinions and frequently compete to influence policy results, making public policy fundamentally political.

Public policy can be pro-active or re-active: Finally, public policy might be proactive or reactive. It can be intended to foresee future difficulties and implement preventive actions, such as laws that encourage renewable energy to combat climate change. Alternatively, it could respond to acute crises like natural disasters or economic downturns. The mix of proactive and reactive policymaking frequently reflects the government's capacity and vision.

6.6 DIFFERENT MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY

Different models are significant in public policy because they provide systematic approaches to comprehending, analysing, and addressing the intricacies of social decision-making. Public policy is implemented in situations characterised by unpredictability, different interests, and intricate interdependencies. Models serve as conceptual tools, allowing policymakers and analysts to make sense of these complexities by abstracting crucial parts and offering a simpler depiction of reality. They provide policymakers with perspectives through which to evaluate problem dynamics, discover linkages between factors, and predict the probable outcomes of initiatives. Models accommodate the varied range of situations, problems, and stakeholder interests that define public policy. Given the complexity of political, social, economic, and cultural situations, no single model can encompass all aspects of governing. Some models, for example, emphasise logical decision-making processes, whilst others highlight the impact of power dynamics, incremental changes, or institutional frameworks. Each model emphasises a distinct component of the policymaking process, allowing for a more thorough and nuanced understanding of the factors at play. Models are also useful for organising and guiding decision-making. They offer frameworks that break down complex policy challenges into more manageable components, allowing policymakers to concentrate on certain stages of the process, such as problem identification, solution formulation, or implementation. For example, stage-based models divide the policymaking process into several

phases, ensuring that each step is thoroughly considered. This framework reduces oversight and encourages a deliberate approach to policy challenges. Another important purpose of models is their potential to facilitate evidence-based policymaking. They contribute to the integration of data, research, and analysis into decision-making processes, providing a platform for evaluating policy choices. Models enable policymakers to simulate scenarios, evaluate trade-offs, and anticipate outcomes, making them critical for choosing policies that are effective, efficient, and equitable. They also give instruments for monitoring and assessing policies after they have been implemented, providing insights for future improvement and adaptation.

Models are also important because they may highlight the roles and interconnections of the many players and organisations involved in policymaking. They give light on how power, resources, and interests impact policy decisions, whether through official institutions or informal networks of influence. This understanding is critical for navigating the political dimensions of policymaking, resolving conflicts, and encouraging collaboration among many stakeholders. Furthermore, models promote critical thinking and creativity in public policy. They urge politicians to consider alternate ways, investigate numerous options, and question preconceptions. Models can reveal blind spots and inspire inventive solutions to complex situations by providing several perspectives. The detailed models of public policy are explored in Unit B and C.

6.7 SUMMARY

Public policy is an organized strategy used by governments to address societal challenges through legislation, regulations, and activities. It changes in response to political, economic, and social pressures, balancing public interests with government priorities. Its nature is dynamic, requiring problem identification, conceptualization, execution, and evaluation to assure efficacy. Economic restrictions, political ideologies, and cultural values influence policy decisions and outcomes. Collaboration between government levels, the private sector, and civil society is critical for successful policy implementation. Policies must be adaptive to changing conditions, new challenges, and technological improvements. Public participation, expert perspectives, and empirical data all help to steer decision-making processes. The ultimate purpose of public policy is to improve government, ensure stability, and increase societal well-being through strategic interventions.

6.8 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the meaning and nature of public policy.
2. Explain the key characteristics of Public policy.
3. What is mean by public policy dynamics? Explain features of public policy dynamics.

6.9 REFERENCES

- Anderson J.E. (2011) Public Policymaking, (7th ed.) Cengage Learning.
- Baraily S. Public policy- Definitions and characteristics and Types of Public Policy. <https://wbsche.wb.gov.in/assets/pdf/political-science/PUBLIC-POLICY.PDF>
- Bernier N.F. & Clavier C. (2011), Public health policy research: Making the case for a political science approach. Health Promotion International. 26(1) 109-113
- <https://doi:10.1093/heapro/daq079>
- Chakrabarty R. & Sanyal K. (2017) Oxford India Short Introductions: Public Policy in India, (1st ed) Oxford university press.
- Cairney & Paul (2019). Understanding public policy: Theories and Issues. Bloomsbury Publishing. P.26.
- Weible C. M. (2023), Policy dynamics: Insight about policy change, In Peter R. and Bednar J. (Eds), Institutional Dynamics and Organizational complexity: How social rules have shaped evolution of Human Societies.
- <https://institutionaldynamicsbook.culturalevolutionsociety.org>

MODELS OF POLICY MAKING MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF POLICY

Unit Structure :

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Models of Public Policy
 - 7.1.1 Stage Model
 - 7.1.2 Rational Model
 - 7.1.3 Incremental Model
 - 7.1.4 Advocacy coalition Framework
 - 7.1.5 Punctuated Equilibrium Model
- 7.2 Some other important Model
- 7.3 Monitoring, review and evaluation of public policy
- 7.4 Summery
- 7.5 Questions
- 7.6 References

7.0 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this unit is to understand the various models of public policy along with their strength and criticisms developed by various theorist. Also Monitoring, review and evaluation of public policy

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- Various models of implementation of Public policy
- Some other models of public policy
- Monitoring, review and evaluation system of Public policy

In module 4 unit (A), we learned about the meaning, nature, definitions, and dynamics of public policy. In this course, we will investigate several forms of public policy as well as types of review and revaluation.

7.1 MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY

7.1.1 Stage-Model of Public Policy

Political scientist Harold Lasswell is credited with creating the phase's model of public policy. (Cairney, Paul, 2019) He was one of the first experts to break down the policy-making process into stages. He argued that the

stages defined how public policies were made and also how they should be made. He split these stages into the following) The stage model of public policy is a paradigm that divides the policymaking process into discrete phases, providing an organized approach to understanding how policies are developed and implemented. It all starts with problem identification and agenda formulation, in which societal challenges are identified, described, and prioritized for government response. During this stage, stakeholders such as people, interest groups, and policymakers work to raise awareness of certain issues and assure their inclusion on the political agenda. The following step is policy formation, which involves developing viable solutions to the identified problems. This involves conducting research, consulting with experts and stakeholders, and developing proposals. Several solutions are evaluated, and their practicality is assessed to ensure they are consistent with existing resources and political priorities. Once feasible options have been provided, the process proceeds to decision-making.

At this level, policymakers select a specific plan of action from among the available options. Factors that impact decisions include public opinion, political ideology, and economic conditions. After a choice is made, the policy implementation process begins. The accepted policy is put into action by developing programs, enforcing regulations, and allocating money. Government agencies and personnel are responsible for translating policy into actual results and ensuring that it is carried out successfully and efficiently. Finally, the process culminates with policy evaluation, which assesses the policy's effectiveness and effects. This stage entails assessing whether the policy met its objectives and identifying opportunities for improvement. Based on the results of the evaluation, the policy may be amended, continued, or terminated. While the stage model implies a linear process, policymaking is frequently dynamic and iterative, with phases overlapping and feedback loops informing continuous adjustments.

Advantages:

1. The stage model provides a clear and structured way to break down the complex process of policymaking into manageable and understandable steps.
2. By segmenting the process into stages, the model allows for detailed analysis at each step.
3. The model is broad to be applied across various policy domains and contexts, making it a versatile tool.

Criticisms of this model:

1. This model is criticized for its over simplicity, which presupposes a linear sequential movement through stages. In fact, policy processes are often non-linear, iterative, and interrelated.
2. The model is also attacked for its inflexibility, as it does not fully address the dynamic character of actual world policy making, where stages might overlap or occur out of sequence.

3. The stage model is also challenged for its reliance on formal processes and neglects informal factors such as power dynamics, political bargaining, and the participation of non-state players.
4. It is also criticized for disregarding contextual aspects and does not account for external factors such as cultural, economic, and international effects.
5. Lastly, this model is criticized for lacking predictive capacity as it provides a descriptive framework but cannot forecast policy outcomes or guide decision-making effectively.

7.1.2 Rational Model of Public Policy

The rational model of public policy is typically attributed to economist Adam Smith, who first presented the concept of “rational choice theory” in his book “The Wealth of Nations” in the 18th century. The rational model is a theoretical framework used to explain the process of policy-making as a logical, methodical, and goal-driven approach. It presupposes that policymakers operate rationally by identifying the best potential solutions to society problems based on detailed analysis and optimization of resources. This concept is targeted at obtaining maximum efficiency and benefits. It makes the assumption that decision-makers are logical beings who seek to choose the best course of action by carefully weighing all of the possibilities and maximizing social utility. The procedure starts with a precise definition and identification of the issue that needs government action. To do this, pertinent data must be gathered in order to comprehend the problem's causes, extent, and possible outcomes. The next stage after defining the issue is to establish clear goals or objectives that the policy aims to accomplish. These objectives offer a standard by which the policy's effectiveness can be measured. After that, decision-makers create a thorough list of possible policy options or actions. This stage is essential since it guarantees that, prior to reaching a decision, all feasible options are taken into account.

The alternatives' expenses, advantages, viability, and anticipated results are then thoroughly examined and contrasted. A key component of the rational model, the cost-benefit analysis enables decision-makers to balance the benefits and drawbacks of every alternative. The approach is predicated on the idea that decision-makers possess the ability to objectively evaluate information and have access to accurate and comprehensive data. This research determines the optimal policy option, which minimizes costs and risks while providing the largest net benefit to society. Following the selection of a policy, attention turns to its implementation, where institutions and government agencies carry out the decision. Lastly, to ascertain whether the policy accomplishes its goals, it is tracked and assessed. The evaluation's efficacy may be increased by making changes or revisions in response to feedback. Despite offering a logical and idealised method for formulating policy, the rational model has a number of drawbacks. These include the intricacy of evaluating every potential option, the difficulty of acquiring comprehensive information, the impact of

societal and political limitations, and the reality that values, interests, and power dynamics frequently affect decision-making. Notwithstanding these obstacles, the rational model continues to serve as a fundamental framework for comprehending and pursuing evidence-based policies.

Advantages of the Rational Model:

1. **Systematic:** It gives an organized framework for decision-making.
2. **Focus on Objectives:** It increases clarity of purpose and alignment of actions with goals.
3. **Use of Optimum Resource:** Aims at efficient allocation of resources.
4. **Transparency:** Decisions are based on clear evidence and logical analysis, which helps increase public trust.
5. **Responsibility:** It provides measurable objectives, enabling evaluation and responsibility.

Criticisms:

1. **Assumes ideal information:** It assumes perfect knowledge, but in fact, policymakers typically operate with inadequate or ambiguous information, restricting their ability to examine all alternatives.
2. **Time-consuming and resource-intensive:** Comprehensive investigation of all options can be problematic in urgent or resource-constrained situations.
3. **Ignored Political and emotional factors:** It generally neglected the influence of politics, power dynamics, and human emotions on decision-making.
4. **Overlooks Complexity:** Many policy challenges are wicked problems with no clear solutions, making rational analysis impossible.
5. **Idealistic:** This paradigm believes that politicians are entirely rational and unbiased and free from external constraints, which is rarely true.

7.1.3 Incremental Model of Public Policy (Lindblom's "Muddling Through")

The incremental model developed by Charles E. Lindblom in his 1959 paper, "The science of Muddling through," presented an alternative to the rational model of policy making. It argues that policymakers generally make judgments through modest, incremental adjustments rather than through comprehensive, goal-orientated tactics. This approach respects the actual limitations of time, resources, and information that policymakers encounter in the real world. A decision-making framework known as the incremental model of public policy prioritizes minor, incremental modifications to current policies above drastic, large-scale ones. It is based on the knowledge that decision-makers must work in an environment of

uncertainty and conflicting interests, and that many times, limited resources, time, and information limit their ability to make policy judgments. Political science and public administration both frequently employ this model to describe how policies change over time and adjust to new situations. The incremental model starts with the policies that are already in place rather than making judgments in a vacuum. Policymakers concentrate on improving or slightly modifying these laws, resolving particular problems, or tackling novel difficulties. Frequently referred to as "muddling through," this strategy involves legislators making incremental, pragmatic adjustments instead of striving for a comprehensive resolution to an issue. The focus is on practicality and feasibility, with decision-makers giving preference to solutions that are financially feasible, administratively feasible, and politically acceptable.

The idea that policymakers function in a world of limited reason is one of the fundamental tenets of the incremental model. This indicates that limitations like time, information, and skill limit their capacity to thoroughly examine every possible policy option and its implications. They look for a workable solution that satisfies current demands and conforms to established institutional and political structures, rather than an ideal one. Additionally, the gradual approach emphasizes the importance of consensus-building, compromise, and negotiation in the policy-making process. The public, lawmakers, interest groups, and government agencies are only a few of the many parties that frequently participate in policymaking; each has their own priorities and areas of interest. The incremental model recognizes that reaching consensus among these disparate parties frequently necessitates simple, gradual adjustments that take into account many points of view. When different and occasionally opposing interests impact policymaking, this paradigm is especially helpful in democracies and pluralistic cultures. By making changes gradually, it helps reduce risks and uncertainties and enables policymakers to keep an eye on results and make additional adjustments as needed. By avoiding drastic or sudden changes that can spark opposition or controversy, incrementalism can also improve political stability. Nevertheless, there are drawbacks to the incremental model. The reliance on minor adjustments, according to critics, can result in policy inertia, which impedes essential improvements and maintains the status quo. Additionally, it could overlook pressing issues or complicated ones that call for all-encompassing answers. Furthermore, the paradigm might not be appropriate in circumstances requiring quick decisions, such as crises or emergencies. Notwithstanding these objections, the incremental model is nevertheless a well-liked and useful method of formulating policy. Additionally, it offers a framework for comprehending how policies change and adapt over time, reflecting the realities of decision-making in complex and uncertain situations. The model's emphasis on incremental change promotes adaptability, learning, and flexibility, which makes it a useful instrument for dealing with public policy conflicts. Incremental Model has following characteristics:

1. According to this concept, policies are updated gradually rather than being replaced with entirely new ones. Changes build upon existing policies, avoiding abrupt shifts.

2. The model focuses on solutions that are politically and administratively feasible. It also respects restrictions such as limited resources, information, and political will.
3. In this approach, decisions aim to solve urgent difficulties rather than long-term objectives. It emphasizes satisfactory solutions rather than optimizing.
4. Policies are considered as experiments with modifications made based on outcomes. It facilitates learning from the past actions.
5. This approach sees policy making as the pluralistic process; here decisions are impacted by numerous stakeholders, including bureaucrats, interest groups, and the public.

Advantages:

1. This model reflects the practical restrictions policymakers confront, such as time, information, and political pressures.
2. Small, incremental adjustments are always less dangerous than big reforms. Errors can be addressed more easily without substantial expenses or interruptions.
3. Gradual adjustments make it simpler to gather support from many stakeholders, lowering resistance.
4. Allows policies to change and improve over time through a process of continual learning and adjustment.

Criticisms:

The model is challenged on the following ground:

1. **Conservative Bias:** Reinforces the status quo, making it harder to address deep-rooted problems or execute dramatic improvements.
2. **Inefficiency:** Incremental modifications may result in a patchwork of policies that lack coherence or fail to address the core causes of difficulties.
3. **Ignores Long-Term Goals:** Focusing on short-term repairs may neglect bigger, long-term aims.
4. **Lack of Innovation:** Limits the opportunity for creative or transformative ideas, as it relies on prior policies as the foundation for current ones.
5. **Inadequate for Complex Problems:** "Wicked problems" (e.g., climate change, inequality) typically demand comprehensive and coordinated approaches, which the Incremental Model may not supply.

7.1.4 The institutional model of public policy:

Within the realm of public policy, the institutional model places an emphasis on the part that governmental institutions play in the process of formulating policies. It places an emphasis on the ways in which formal structures, legal frameworks, and bureaucratic organizations help to determine the development, execution, and results of their respective policies. The foundation of this paradigm is found in the field of political science, and it emphasizes the institutional setting in which policies are formulated and implemented. The focus of the institutional model of public policy is on how governmental institutions influence, carry out, and justify public policies. It highlights that official government entities, including legislatures, executive branches, courts, and administrative agencies, are ultimately responsible for the decisions, actions, and regulations that constitute public policies. According to this paradigm, institutions are the primary players in the formulation of public policy, and the structure, regulations, and practices of these institutions dictate the course and substance of public policy. Fundamentally, the institutional model asserts that institutional processes produce public policy. The framework for making, enforcing, and assessing policy decisions is provided by government institutions. In order to solve societal issues, these organizations have the power to decide what qualifies as a public issue, rank policy objectives, and distribute funds. This concept holds that policies are the result of government acts and are supported by the state's coercive authority. They are also legally binding and enforceable. The formal rules, procedures, and norms that regulate institutional conduct are important, according to the institutional model. For instance, how legislation is discussed, changed, and passed is determined by the legislative process. In a similar vein, administrative agencies are in charge of carrying out these laws, interpreting their contents, and operationalizing them through the issuance of regulations. On the other side, courts are essential for interpreting the law, settling conflicts, and making sure that laws and legal principles are followed by policy. The institutional model's emphasis on the legitimacy of governmental institutions is one of its main characteristics. Because they are developed through established procedures that uphold the values of democracy, accountability, and the rule of law, policies that originate from official institutions are seen as legitimate. This legitimacy is essential for preserving public confidence in government actions and guaranteeing that policies are followed. The impact of institutional architecture on policy outcomes is also acknowledged by the institutional model. How policies are created and carried out depends on a government's structure, including its federal or unitary system, the distribution of powers among its parts, and the roles of elected and appointed officials. For example, under unitary systems, decision-making authority is more centralized, whereas in federal systems, policymaking may include coordination between the national and subnational administrations. This paradigm also recognizes the continuity and stability that institutions offer. Institutions are made to last, and the established procedures they follow offer a structure for gradual and predictable policymaking. Even when

current policies are out of date or ineffectual, institutions may become stiff as a result of this stability.

The Institutional Model's Most Important Characteristics are:

1. Contribution of Institutes, which include legislatures, executive branches, judicial branches, and bureaucracy, are the key actors in the process of formulating public policy. Policies are considered to be the results of the rules, procedures, and structures that are implemented inside an institution.
2. Legal framework, the legitimacy and authority of a country's policies are derived from the legal and constitutional framework of that country. Institutions are responsible for ensuring that policies are in accordance with the law.
3. Authority and power, Institutions hold the authority to make binding decisions and enforce them. Different institutions have specific roles, such as law-making, policy implementation, and adjudication.
4. Stability and predictability, Institutional frameworks bring stability and predictability to the policy-making process by providing explicit procedures and hierarchies.
5. Public interest orientation, Institutions are required to act in the public interest, ensuring accountability, equity, and fairness. However there are some components which highlights the focus of the institutions such as

The formal forms, procedures, and power of governmental institutions in influencing public policy are the main components of the institutional model of public policy. Among these components are:

1. Government Institutions: The model focuses on formal organizations that are in charge of creating, carrying out, and upholding policies, including legislatures, executive branches, courts, and administrative agencies.
2. Authority and Legitimacy: Because institutional policies are based on established legal frameworks and democratic processes, they are regarded as legitimate and enforceable.
3. Rules and Procedures: To ensure uniformity, accountability, and order, institutions function according to established rules, regulations, and procedures that control decision-making.
4. Policy Outputs: Institutions' choices, laws, rules, and acts are seen as the concrete results of public policy, which tackles social concerns and needs.
5. Stability and Continuity: Over time, institutions create a stable framework for governing that offers structure and predictability while gradually adjusting to change.

6. **Division of Powers:** The model places a strong emphasis on the division or sharing of authority between the various branches and governmental levels, which has an impact on the creation and application of policies.
7. **Legal Framework:** To ensure that policies are in line with more general legal and ethical standards, they are created and implemented in the framework of constitutional and legal rules.

Policy making under Institutional Model: In the institutional model, the formal structures, regulations, and practices of government institutions are at the center of the policymaking process. These institutions are crucial to the development, execution, and assessment of public policies. It draws attention to the rule-bound and authoritative character of government entities in solving societal issues through organized procedures. With the help of institutional structures, policymaking is defined by a methodical evolution through discrete phases. Problem identification is the first step in the process, during which societal problems or difficulties are acknowledged as needing government action. Expert analysis, media attention, interest group activism, and public demand can all help raise awareness of these problems. Institutions prioritize issues according to criteria like political viability, resource availability, and compatibility with institutional objectives. In this stage, the formal policy agenda is established, and a few chosen concerns are formally acknowledged for governmental review. The policy-making stage begins as soon as a topic is on the agenda. Potential solutions are drafted by government organizations like legislatures, executive branches, and administrative agencies. This entails carrying out studies, speaking with specialists, and discussing potential policy options. To guarantee that policy suggestions are carefully considered and improved, institutions follow set protocols, such as committee reviews, public hearings, and parliamentary discussions. Because of its structured nature, this phase guarantees that policy solutions are generated within the institutions' respective legal and procedural constraints. The formal adoption of policies is the next step in the decision-making process after they are formulated.

While decisions in executive bodies may be made by orders or decrees, in legislatures this may entail voting on new laws. The institutional approach makes sure that policies are accepted through legal and open channels by emphasizing adherence to formal rules and decision-making procedures. These institutions' political dynamics, institutional hierarchies, and power dynamics all affect how this phase turns out. Following adoption of a policy, the implementation stage starts. The executive branch assigns administrative divisions or agencies the responsibility of carrying out the policy. Allocating resources, coordinating efforts across several governmental levels, and converting policy goals into workable strategies are all part of this. The institutional model emphasizes how crucial bureaucratic frameworks are to successful execution. In order to achieve policy outcomes in line with the institutional framework, these entities function under a defined chain of command and standardized procedures. Policy evaluation is the process's last stage, during which institutions

evaluate the efficacy and influence of the enacted policy. This entails evaluating the policy's effectiveness, spotting any unforeseen repercussions, and pinpointing areas in need of development. This phase's feedback is crucial because it helps shape future policy changes and guarantees that institutional decision-making stays sensitive to the demands of society.

All things considered, the institutional model presents policymaking as a methodical, rule-based procedure that is directed by the power, dependability, and legitimacy of governmental institutions. This approach guarantees the development and implementation of public policies within a framework of legality, accountability, and procedural integrity by emphasizing formal procedures and institutional functions.

Criticisms of the Institutional Model

1. **Bureaucratic Rigidity:** Institutions may become extremely inflexible, resulting in inefficiency and reluctance to change.
2. **Elite Dominance:** Decision-making may be dominated by political elites or bureaucracy, decreasing popular engagement.
3. **Slow Decision-Making:** Institutional procedures can be time-consuming, delaying policy solutions to critical crises.
4. **Limited Adaptability:** Institutions may fail to adjust to dynamic and complicated issues, such as globalisation or technological development.
5. **Neglect of Informal Influences:** Focuses exclusively on formal institutions, neglecting the impact of informal networks, lobbying, and interest groups.

7.1.5 Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) of Public Policy:

The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), established by Paul Sabatier and Hank Jenkins-Smith in the late 1980s, is a model for understanding the policy process in complex, multi-level governance systems. ACF emphasizes the role of coalitions of individuals and organizations who share similar values and work together to affect policy within a certain policy subsystem. This approach is particularly effective for assessing policy change over the long term (a decade or more) in fields distinguished by technical complexity and conflicting values, such as environmental policy, health care, and energy regulation. A thorough framework for comprehending how policies are created, carried out, and modified over time is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) model of public policy. The ACF's core idea is that groups and individuals working on a policy domain come together to create coalitions because they have similar values, views, and objectives. Government representatives, interest groups, scholars, journalists, and non-governmental organizations are just a few of the many actors that make up these coalitions. By advancing their favored policy concepts and solutions, the coalition's seek to affect policy results. Three levels can be distinguished among these coalitions' common beliefs, deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and subsidiary beliefs. While

secondary beliefs are more focused and adaptable, deep core beliefs are more basic and challenging to alter, and policy core beliefs are tied to particular policy goals. The ACF functions inside a policy subsystem, which is a particular field of policy that encompasses all parties engaged in the problem's resolution. External variables including public opinion, governmental changes, technical improvements, and socioeconomic situations all have an impact on subsystems. By giving coalitions the chance to further their goals or by shifting the distribution of power among them, these outside events can have a big effect on the dynamics inside a subsystem. The notion that policy change takes place over extended periods of time—typically ten years or longer—is a fundamental component of the ACF. This is due to the fact that policy procedures are intricate, entail highly held opinions, and necessitate resolving disputes between opposing coalitions. However, exogenous shocks or crises—like economic recessions, natural disasters, or changes in political leadership—often lead to considerable policy change. These incidents have the potential to upend established power structures, put dominant coalitions to the test, and give other coalitions a chance to shape public policy.

Policy-oriented learning, or the process by which coalitions gradually improve their tactics and viewpoints in light of fresh data, experiences, and conversations with other stakeholders, is another essential component of the ACF. Technical data, comments on how policies are being implemented, and discussions within the policy subsystem all aid in learning. Coalitions may modify their policy objectives or tactics during this process, which could result in minor policy changes or even changes within the ruling coalition. The ACF also recognizes the function of mediators or brokers in the formulation of public policy. These people or groups, who are frequently situated outside of the main coalitions, are essential in mediating disputes, promoting understanding between opposing coalitions, and facilitating discussions. Through their efforts, disagreements are lessened and agreements are fostered, which may result in the adoption and application of policies. In short, by highlighting the importance of coalitions, beliefs, outside events, and learning, the Advocacy Coalition Framework offers a comprehensive and dynamic perspective of the policymaking process. It draws attention to the ways in which various players in a policy subsystem interact, vie, and change over time to affect policy results. This approach is especially helpful for examining complicated, divisive policy topics where numerous parties with varying interests and values are involved in continuous discussions and agreements.

Key Components of ACF

1. **Advocacy Coalitions:** Composed of actors with common values and policy goals. Work to influence public policy by engaging in techniques such as lobbying, research distribution, and public campaigns.
2. **Policy Subsystem:** A specific policy domain (e.g., climate policy or education reform) where coalitions function. Includes all relevant actors: governmental (e.g., regulators, lawmakers) and non-governmental (e.g., NGOs, think tanks).

3. **External Events and Shocks:** External forces such as natural catastrophes, economic developments, or political shifts can upset the status quo and give possibilities for policy reform. Example: A big oil spill might provoke stronger environmental rules.
4. **Policy-Orientated Learning:** Ongoing process where coalitions modify their strategies depending on new knowledge or facts. Leads to slight adjustments in secondary beliefs but seldom impacts core beliefs.
5. **Policy Brokers:** Neutral actors who arbitrate problems between coalitions. Aim to find compromises or implement decisions that address competing interests.

Process of Policy Change in ACF

Actors with shared values establish advocacy coalitions. Competing coalitions with a subsystem strive for influence over policy decisions. In stable contexts, coalitions engage in incremental learning and adjustment. Policy changes are small and occur within the existing framework. Significant external shocks alter the balance of power inside the subsystem. Example: A financial crisis may weaken the coalition arguing for expensive climate policy. External shocks or learning may lead to shifts in coalition dominance. A previously marginalized alliance may gain power and force policy change. Major policy shifts occur when dominant coalitions adjust their policy core views or when external reasons force change.

Criticisms of the Advocacy Coalition Framework

1. **Overemphasis on Beliefs:** Critics contend that material interests and power dynamics are underemphasized in favor of ideological factors.
2. **Challenges in Measuring Beliefs:** Identifying and categorizing actors' beliefs can be subjective and challenging.
3. **Limited function of institutions:** Focuses on alliances and subsystems while downplaying the function of formal government structures and institutions.
4. **Dependence on External Shocks:** Relies significantly on external events to explain important policy changes, potentially disregarding internal dynamics.
5. **Complexity in Application:** Analyzing the connections between coalitions, subsystems, and external influences can be methodologically com.

7.1.6 Punctuated Equilibrium Model of Public Policy:

The Equilibrium with Punctuation, a public policy model is a theoretical framework that describes how policy changes through sudden and stable changes instead of gradual, continuous modifications. This model, which was created by Bryan Jones and Frank Baumgartner, was inspired by

evolutionary biology, which shows that organisms go through extended periods of stability interspersed with swift evolutionary changes. Similar to this, abrupt and substantial changes in public policy can break extended stretches of policy stability. The model starts with the understanding that policy subsystems, which include interest groups, bureaucratic agencies, and policymakers, frequently function in institutional environments that support incrementalism and stability. Decision-making is governed by established conventions, protocols, and routines in these situations. Because decision-makers are constrained by bounded rationality and only consider a small number of topics at a time, institutions oppose change, and stakeholders profit from the status quo, policies typically stay the same. As a result, small tweaks or gradual modifications become the standard. But according to the Punctuated Equilibrium Model, this stability could be upset by outside shocks, changes in the public's focus, or adjustments to the political landscape. These disturbances have the potential to cause substantial policy change as well as undermine current policy subsystems. Changes in public opinion, the introduction of new problems, the impact of the media, or the participation of new players in the policymaking process are some of the main causes of these changes. The function of policy images and venues is a key idea in the model. The way that the public, media, and policymakers frame or interpret a problem is known as its "policy image." Perception shifts have the power to affect an issue's political significance and galvanize support for change. For instance, redefining an environmental issue that was previously seen as a local issue as a global disaster may garner more attention and call for action. The institutional settings where choices are made, such as legislatures, courts, or administrative agencies, are referred to as policy forums. Significant change can also result by changing the location where a policy issue is discussed. When a policy issue is transferred from a bureaucratic agency to the legislature or from state-level to national decision-making, for example, new actors, viewpoints, and power dynamics may be introduced, upending the status quo.

After a disruption, the policy-making process can alter quickly, leading to a time of high activity and substantial transformation. In order to handle the perceived crisis or opportunity, new policies may be introduced during this phase, and current alliances and institutional arrangements may be contested. Large-scale changes like the adoption of historic laws or the creation of new regulatory frameworks are examples of these shifts. The system frequently reaches a new equilibrium after a time of fast change, at which point the recently created structures and rules become stable. This new stability might last until another upheaval happens, which would repeat the cycle of change and stability. The model highlights that policymaking is a process that fluctuates between stable periods and significant changes, influenced by variations in institutional dynamics, public attention, and external variables. The Punctuated Equilibrium Model offers a useful framework for comprehending why some policy issues undergo abrupt, revolutionary change while others stay the same for extended periods of time. It emphasizes how crucial exogenous shocks, framing changes, and institutional venue changes are in influencing policy dynamics. The paradigm is especially helpful for examining big policy changes in fields

like healthcare, economic regulation, environmental protection, and civil rights, where extended stretches of relative inaction are frequently followed by important changes.

Core Assumptions of PEM:

1. **Stability Dominates Policy Systems:** For most of the time, public policies stay stable due to institutional routines, entrenched power structures, and incremental alterations.
2. **Policy Change Is Rare and Dramatic:** Significant policy changes occur only during moments of disruption or crisis, breaking long periods of stability.
3. **Bounded Rationality:** Policymakers have limited cognitive and informational capacities, forcing them to focus on a few topics at a time while disregarding others.
4. **Role of Policy Subsystems:** Policy is shaped within subsystems involving government institutions, interest groups, media, and other stakeholders. Subsystems contribute to stability but can also become areas of significant change.
5. **Agenda-Setting Matters:** Changes in public or political attention can bring previously overlooked topics to the forefront, driving policy reforms.

Key Features of PEM

1. **Incrementalism vs. Disruption:** During equilibrium periods, policy changes are gradual, involving minor, marginal adjustments. During punctuations, policy changes are rapid and large-scale, often altering the policy trajectory.
2. **Policy Monopolies:** Stability is maintained by "policy monopolies," where a few actors control decision-making within a certain policy domain. These monopolies control the narrative and access to decision-making processes.
3. **Issue Framing and Public Attention:** Changes in how issues are framed or perceived by the public can undermine established monopolies. The media plays a significant influence in directing public attention and reframing topics.
4. **Feedback Loops:** Positive feedback: Small changes in public or political attention can magnify quickly, leading to big developments. Negative feedback: Institutional systems suppress changes, reinforcing stability.

Process of Policy Change in PEM: According to the Policy-Environment-Model (PEM) of public policy, policy players, the environment, and feedback mechanisms interact dynamically during the policy change process. The socioeconomic, cultural, and political contexts have an impact

on the decisions made by policy players, such as governments, stakeholders, and institutions. Environmental shifts, such shifts in public sentiment, the state of the economy, or technological developments, put pressure on policymakers to adjust. Feedback mechanisms let actors know how effective or ineffective policies are by analyzing current policies and results. Policies can be modified, redesigned, or replaced using this iterative method to better meet changing environmental requirements and policy goals.

Strengths of the Punctuated Equilibrium Model

1. **Explains Nonlinear Change:** Captures both periods of stability and rapid shifts, reflecting real-world policy dynamics.
2. **Role of Public Attention:** Highlights the influence of public and media attention in influencing policy change.
3. **Dynamic and Adaptive:** Accounts for the interaction of institutional stability and the possibility for disruption.
4. **Broad Applicability:** Useful for analysing numerous policy sectors, including as healthcare, climate change, and education reform.
5. **Incorporates Complexity:** Acknowledges the multidimensional character of policymaking, incorporating various actors and external influences.

Criticisms of the Punctuated Equilibrium Model

1. **Overemphasis on Crises:** Critics say that PEM may exaggerate the impact of external shocks in initiating policy change.
2. **Lack of Predictive Power:** While it explains historical changes, PEM is less good in predicting when and where punctuations would occur.
3. **Limited Focus on Incremental Change:** The approach tends to underplay the relevance of slow, cumulative improvements.
4. **Ambiguity in Mechanisms:** The specific processes leading from shocks to punctuations can be unclear or oversimplified
5. **Inconsistent Application:** Defining and quantifying "punctuations" and "equilibriums" might differ, resulting to inconsistent conclusions in empirical study.

Despite this, there are various additional models of public policy that are addressed briefly below.

7.2 MULTIPLE STREAMS FRAMEWORK (KINGDON MODEL)

The Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) is a public policy model that explains policy changes by evaluating the interactions of three distinct

streams: problems, policies, and politics. The problem stream includes concerns that have piqued the interest of policymakers and stakeholders, as evidenced by indicators, focal events, or crises that emphasize the need for action. The policy stream is made up of ideas, proposals, and solutions generated by policy communities, with ideas competing based on feasibility and acceptance. The political stream refers to the political backdrop, which includes public sentiment, political priorities, and policymaker alignment. When these streams meet, they create a "policy window" of opportunity. This convergence is frequently promoted by policy entrepreneurs, who advocate for specific solutions, connect the streams, and profit on the timing of the opportunity. The model emphasizes the non-linear and dynamic character of policymaking, in which time, context, and strategic action all play important roles in determining policy results.

Core Components of the MSF:

1. The Three Streams

- 1. Problem Stream:** Focuses on finding issues that demand government action. Problems gain prominence through indicators (e.g., economic statistics), emphasising events (e.g., disasters), or feedback (e.g., policy evaluations). **Policy Stream:** Contains ideas, recommendations, and solutions from professionals, think tanks, and interest groups. Policies must be technically possible, politically acceptable, and align with dominant ideals to achieve traction. **Politics Stream:** Involves political elements such as public opinion, party agendas, interest group lobbying, and changes in leadership or governance.
- 2. Policy Window:** A limited chance when the three streams converge, allowing policymakers to approve a plan. Often caused by significant events, crises, or shifts in the political context.
- 3. Policy Entrepreneurs:** Individuals or groups who advocate for specific policies, trying to couple the streams by matching problems with remedies and garnering political support.

Key Features of the MSF Coupling Process:

Successful policy change occurs when the three streams are connected by policy entrepreneurs. **Timing and Opportunity:** Timing is essential; policy windows are typically short-lived and require rapid action. **Agenda-Setting Focus:** The MSF stresses how concerns are brought to officials' attention, rather than how policies are executed.

Criticisms

1. Lack of clarity on how streams work independently or interact.
2. Overemphasis on randomness and insufficient focus on institutional issues.
3. Limited application to non-democratic systems.

2. Game Theory Model

The game theory model of public policy examines how players, or decision-makers, interact when their decisions have an impact on one another using mathematical and strategic concepts. It makes the supposition that every player behaves sensibly to optimize their own utility or advantage while taking other players' possible choices into account. Game theory offers a framework for comprehending strategic behavior in policymaking and sheds light on how people, groups, or governments make decisions in cooperative or competitive settings. Game theory in public policy examines situations in which parties with opposing or complementary interests engage with one another. Cooperative games, in which players cooperate to attain mutual benefits, and non-cooperative games, in which individuals put their own interests first, are two examples of how these interactions can be shown. Common game types include non-zero-sum games, in which the results might be advantageous to all players, and zero-sum games, in which the gain of one player is equal to the loss of another. Key ideas in game theory include Pareto efficiency, which guarantees that no player can be made better off without making another worse off, and Nash equilibrium, which characterizes a scenario in which no player can unilaterally change their strategy to enhance their outcome. These guidelines assist decision-makers in forecasting the probable results of strategic exchanges and creating policies that support group objectives. Game theory has been used in public policy to better understand resource allocation, negotiations, and collective action issues like managing public goods or combating climate change. It offers resources for determining the best course of action, anticipating possible disputes, and creating rewards that promote collaboration or discourage negative conduct. Game theory's methodical methodology helps policymakers better predict and address the intricacies of human behaviour in the formulation and application of policies.

Core Components of Game Theory

1. **Players:** Individuals, groups, or organisations involved in the policy process (e.g., governments, interest groups, citizens).
2. **Strategies:** The alternative actions or decisions available to each player (e.g., support, oppose, negotiate).
3. **Payoffs:** The outcomes or benefits participants obtain based on their selected strategy (e.g., economic gains, political power).
4. **Equilibrium:** A stable situation where no player can improve their payout by unilaterally changing their strategy (e.g., Nash equilibrium).

Types of Games in Policy Analysis

1. **Cooperative Games:** Players work together to obtain mutual benefits. Example: Nations cooperating on climate change agreements.

2. **Non-Cooperative Games:** Players operate in their self-interest, perhaps leading to conflict. Example: Competition between political parties during elections.
3. **Zero-Sum Games:** One player's gain is another player's loss. Example: Allocation of scarce public funding.
4. **Prisoner's Dilemma:** A situation where mutual collaboration benefits all, yet mistrust leads to poor outcomes. Example: Two countries decide between military build-up and disarmament.
5. **Sequential Games:** Players make decisions one after another, considering earlier actions. Example: Legislative negotiations over a controversial bill.

Strengths

1. Provides a structured way to analyse complicated policy relationships.
2. Helps policymakers predict the behaviour of stakeholders.
3. Supports the formulation of incentive-compatible policies.

Criticisms

1. Relies on assumptions of rationality, which may not always apply in real-world contexts.
2. Simplifies complicated policy issues into strategic exchanges.
3. Limited applicability to settings with several uncertain components.

The Game Theory Model of Public Policy offers useful insights into strategic decision-making and stakeholder behaviour. While it has limitations, its focus on interaction and outcomes makes it a strong tool for formulating and executing policies in competitive and cooperative environments.

3. Elite Theory Model

According to the elite theory model of public policy, a tiny, close-knit group of elites, not the broader public, have a greater influence on public policy. According to this view, society is split into two major groups: the people, who have little say in decisions, and the elite, who own substantial wealth, power, and resources. Elites make decisions that benefit them and preserve their control in society, according to elite theory, which holds that policymaking is a top-down process rather than a democratic one. Elites are usually people or organizations with significant clout in the media, business, politics, or academia. To make sure that policies reflect their objectives and inclinations, they can control or influence the policy agenda thanks to their networks and resources. In order to justify their acts, they also use agenda-setting, issue framing, and public opinion manipulation. The elite theory contends that because the general public lacks access to decision-making procedures, resources, and expertise, they have little influence over public

policy. Even though democratic systems include voting and other procedures, these are frequently viewed as symbolic since elite interests define and limit the options available to the general population.

In order to silence critics of their power, elites may also appropriate dissenting or oppositional voices and incorporate them into the system. Elite theory's detractors contend that it ignores examples of popular pressure, grassroots movements, and democratic processes that have the power to shape public policy. Nonetheless, they contend that even in democracies, a small number of people still hold the majority of the power and that decisions about public policy frequently reflect elite consensus rather than popular will. Elite theory is used to explain how some policies, such as tax breaks for the wealthy, corporate deregulation, or subsidies for significant industries, are continuously created to favor powerful organizations. It also highlights the difficulties in attaining fully inclusive and participatory policymaking procedures as well as the persistence of inequality. This theory offers a critical perspective for examining power dynamics and structural inequities in public policy by emphasizing the role of elites.

Core Assumptions of Elite Theory

1. **Concentration of Power:** Power is concentrated in the hands of a few elites who dominate major institutions.
2. **Policy Reflects Top Interests:** Public policies largely serve the interests of the top class, not the broader people.
3. **Limited Public Influence:** Ordinary citizens have minimal impact on policymaking, as elites control access to knowledge, resources, and decision-making venues.
4. **Continuity of Elite Control:** The same or comparable elites maintain control over time, ensuring the maintenance of their domination.

Strengths:

1. Highlights the importance of power and influence in creating policy.
2. Explains the persistence of inequality and the influence of powerful groups in policymaking.
3. Useful for analysing undemocratic or extremely hierarchical institutions.

Criticisms

1. Overemphasis on elite supremacy, neglecting grassroots movements and public influence.
2. Neglects the role of institutions and democratic procedures in policymaking.
3. Assumes elites always act cohesively, overlooking disagreements among elite groupings. The Elite Theory Model gives a critical

viewpoint on government by emphasizing the disproportionate impact of powerful elites. While it gives useful insights into power relations, it may miss the role of public engagement and institutional checks in affecting policy decisions.

4. System Theory Model of Public Policy:

The System Theory Model, established by David Easton, views public policy as a dynamic, interrelated activity that takes place inside a broader system, in which many elements interact and have an impact on one another. According to this concept, society is a complex system with many subsystems, including the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres, which collaborate to create policies. The policy process is influenced by each of these subsystems, and modifications to one of them may have repercussions for the system as a whole. According to system theory, policymaking is a continuous process of feedback and adaptation within the larger social system rather than being linear or isolated. The public, interest groups, political figures, and outside variables like global events or the state of the economy are some of the sources of inputs for this model. Policymakers, institutions, and players process these inputs as they enter the political system. Public policies, rules, and regulations are the results of the political system's subsequent outputs. These outputs have a variety of effects on society, affecting resources, behaviour, and results. Positive or negative feedback from these results subsequently feeds back into the system, affecting subsequent policy choices. The significance of feedback loops, which enable ongoing modifications in the policymaking process, is emphasized by the system theory. The system can react by changing existing policies or enacting new ones if a policy doesn't accomplish its objectives or has unexpected effects. The system's ability to adapt is a crucial component since it permits change while preserving stability.

The theory also emphasizes how various players and components are interdependent, which means that no one component of the system can operate alone. For instance, public opinion, social movements, and economic situations all have an impact on political decisions, and vice versa. The idea of equilibrium, which describes the state in which the system maintains equilibrium while adjusting to new inputs and changes, is another crucial term in system theory. Equilibrium in the context of policymaking could indicate that a specific policy approach has effectively handled the issues it was designed to address, resulting in system stability. The equilibrium is never static, though, because the system is always changing in response to both internal and external dynamics and is susceptible to new influences and forces. The intricacy and unpredictability of the policy-making process are further highlighted by this approach. Policymakers must negotiate these complexities while making decisions because the relationships between many individuals, institutions, and societal influences are frequently unanticipated. The decision-making process is further complicated by system theory's recognition that policies are frequently the product of compromise, negotiation, and the balancing of conflicting interests. All things considered, the system theory model offers

a thorough foundation for comprehending how policies are created, changed, and adjusted within a larger social context. It emphasizes how crucial feedback systems, interconnection, and ongoing adaptability are to the policymaking process. This model provides insights into how internal and external influences shape policies and how they can be modified over time to address shifting requirements and problems by considering policymaking as a component of a dynamic system.

Core Components of System Theory

1. **Inputs:** Demands: Public requests for action on specific concerns (e.g., healthcare, education, security). Support: Endorsements or resources offered by individuals, groups, or institutions to perpetuate the system (e.g., voting, taxes, loyalty).
2. **Political System:** The institutions and processes that translate inputs into outputs (e.g., legislative bodies, executive agencies, and the judiciary).
3. **Outputs:** Public policies, laws, and initiatives geared at addressing the demands.
4. **Feedback:** The answers from society concerning how successfully the outputs (policy) are addressing the demands. Feedback influences future inputs.
5. **Environment:** The broader social, economic, cultural, and international framework in which the system operates.

Process Flow:

1. **Demand and Support:** Citizens or groups offer demands to the political system. Support (e.g., compliance, participation) sustains the system's functions.
2. **Policy Conversion:** Political institutions process requests and support, resulting in policy decisions.
3. **Policy Output:** The system creates policies addressing societal demands.
4. **Feedback Loop:** The impact of policy creates public reactions, influencing future inputs.

Strengths:

1. Provides a thorough understanding of the policymaking process as a dynamic system.
2. Emphasizes the relationship between the political system and its surroundings.
3. Highlights feedback systems to increase policy effectiveness.

Criticisms :

1. Overly abstract and without explicit procedures for policy change.
2. Assumes a balanced system without addressing power dynamics or conflicts.
3. Limited applicability to non-democratic regimes where feedback loops may be poor.

7.3 MONITORING, REVIEW, AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

At the last segment, after addressing meaning, definitions, features, dynamics, and many models of public policy, it is vital to comprehend monitoring, review, and evaluation of public policy. The monitoring, review, and assessment of public policy are critical activities to ensuring policies accomplish their intended goals, remain relevant, and adapt to changing conditions. Public policy monitoring, evaluation, and review are crucial steps in the policymaking process because they offer crucial input on the efficacy, efficiency, and applicability of policies. These actions guarantee that policies fulfil their stated objectives, adjust to evolving conditions, and continue to be answerable to the general public. Each of the three processes—monitoring, evaluation, and review—contributes to the larger goal of enhancing policy outcomes and guiding future choices. The term "monitoring" describes the ongoing or recurring gathering of data and information regarding the application of policies. It emphasizes on monitoring a policy's development, making sure it is being carried out according to plan, and spotting any issues or detours from the intended path right away. Typically, monitoring entails obtaining both quantitative and qualitative data, including stakeholder comments, service delivery measures, and performance indicators. The goal of monitoring is to give program administrators, policymakers, and other stakeholder's up-to-date information so they can respond quickly to issues or make necessary improvements. Because it offers a means of monitoring resource usage, outputs, and results, it also contributes to openness and accountability.

Evaluation, on the other hand, is a more thorough and methodical appraisal of the efficacy, consequences, and results of a program or policy. Evaluation looks at whether the program has met its goals and what the wider impacts have been, whereas monitoring concentrates on following progress. Evaluations are usually carried out at predetermined intervals, such as mid- or end-term, and entail examining both the policy's anticipated and unexpected effects. Evaluations use a variety of techniques, including surveys, focus groups, interviews, and statistical analysis, to determine the applicability, efficacy, impact, and sustainability of policies. The evaluation process aids in determining whether the policy has been a good use of resources, whether it has resolved the issues that have been identified, and whether it has had the intended impact on the target population. It also offers important insights into the elements—such as stakeholder involvement, implementation procedures, and external circumstances—that affected the

policy's success or failure. In the context of public policy, review refers to the regular process of going over and reevaluating policies to see if they are still applicable, efficient, and suitable in light of the circumstances. Reviews are often more complete than monitoring and assessment, as they look at the policy from a broader perspective, incorporating changes in the political, economic, and social context. Policymakers, public employees, interest organizations, specialists, and people are just a few of the many stakeholders whose opinions are frequently gathered during a policy review. A review's objective is to determine whether a policy should be kept in place, changed, or discontinued in light of its effectiveness and the changing demands of society. In order to keep policies adaptable to shifting circumstances, reviews might also address possibilities or new difficulties that were not foreseen when the policy was first formulated. Monitoring, assessment, and review all work together to make policymaking dynamic and flexible. They offer learning and accountability systems, allowing policymakers to gradually improve policies in light of data and experience. While reviews offer a chance for a more comprehensive reassessment and course correction, effective monitoring and evaluation systems enable the early detection of gaps, inefficiencies, or unexpected consequences during the implementation phase. These procedures aid in making sure that public policies not only produce the desired results but also continue to be applicable and efficient in meeting societal demands, adjusting to emerging difficulties, and enhancing the welfare of the populace.

Types of Review:

1. **Mid-Term Review:** Conducted midway through implementation to identify and correct concerns.
2. **Thematic Review:** Focused on certain factors, such as gender equity or environmental impact.
3. **Stakeholders:** Involves policymakers, implementers, beneficiaries, and independent experts.

Evaluation: Evaluation is a systematic, objective examination of a policy's effectiveness, efficiency, and impact after implementation. It decides the overall success, guides future policymaking, and ensures accountability.

Types of Evaluation: **Formative Evaluation:** Conducted at design or early stages to guide development. **Summative Evaluation:** Conducted post-implementation to examine outcomes. **Impact Evaluation:** Focuses on long-term repercussions, including intentional and unforeseen implications. **Cost-Benefit Analysis:** Evaluates efficiency by comparing costs with benefits. **Frameworks:** Logical frameworks (log frames), theory of change, and results-based management.

7.4 SUMMERY

Public policy models, such as incremental, advocacy, and rational models, aid in the analysis of how policies are developed, carried out, and evaluated. These models offer frameworks for comprehending stakeholder influences,

decision-making procedures, and the efficacy of policies. Reviewing policies entails evaluating their applicability, effectiveness, and influence in light of shifting societal demands and difficulties. Evaluation assesses the results of policies using both qualitative and quantitative techniques to identify areas of success and room for development. Constant observation guarantees that policies continue to be efficient, flexible, and in line with the interests of the general public. In order to improve policies, input from individuals, stakeholders, and experts is essential. An organized assessment procedure aids governments in improving policy results, accountability, and governance.

7.5 QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the stage model of Public policy.
2. Explain the institutional model of public policy.
3. Discuss advocacy framework model.
4. What is incremental model of public policy?
5. Explain monitoring, review and evaluation system of public policy.

7.6 REFERENCES

Anderson J.E. (2011) Public Policymaking, (7th ed.) Cengage Learning.

Baraily S. Public policy- Definitions and characteristics and Types of Public Policy. <https://wbsche.wb.gov.in/assets/pdf/political-science/PUBLIC-POLICY.PDF>

Bernier N.F. & Clavier C. (2011), Public health policy research: Making the case for a political science approach. Health Promotion International. 26(1) 109-113

<https://doi:10.1093/heapro/daq079>

Chakrabarty R. & Sanyal K. (2017) Oxford India Short Introductions: Public Policy in India, (1st ed) Oxford university press.

Cairney & Paul (2019). Understanding public policy: Theories and Issues. Bloomsbury Publishing. P.26.

Weible C. M. (2023), Policy dynamics: Insight about policy change, In Peter R. and Bednar J. (Eds), Institutional Dynamics and Organizational complexity: How social rules have shaped evolution of Human Societies.

<https://institutionaldynamicsbook.culturalevolutionsociety.org>

