

Loopholes in Public Policy Making: A Case Study of Pakistan

Iram Khalid, Muhammad Mushtaq and Arooj Naveed*

Abstract

In developing countries, making of a public policy features resolutions of problems entrenched in policy community and policy network. Its formulation does not only require decisions taken only from the highest authority but also includes enticement and involvement of many new actors bringing in additional actors and inducements important for a policy design. The paper attempts to study making of public policy in developing countries. Following the dominant model bureaucratic politics, various approaches, their policy designs, tools of policy, integration and involvement of actors, their discourse related to their policy communities and their networks of policy are studied to understand and learn lesson and important elements necessary for formulation of a policy. Further, reasons for loopholes and failures in public policy formulation have been elaborated by studying the case of Pakistan. In conclusion, the way forward for positive policy outcomes has been detailed by highlighting the concept of citizen participation and focusing on four focal areas of process, quality, structure and politics required for practicing and implementing policies in theory and practice.

Key Words: Public Policy Making, Developing Countries, Model of Bureaucratic Politics, Citizen Participation, Process

Introduction

Policy making clearly is a decisive stage in the process of policy, also a precise subject matter of policy design. The movement of the science of policy making remained distressed regarding correlation linking knowledge, the making of a policy and power. The subject was the work of Harold Lasswell, the founding father of public policy. He considered democracy to be a continuous process in which one of the particular challenges faced by modern democracy was to guarantee that policy making remained informed by a new-fangled interaction among those producing knowledge and those using it (Torgerson, D, 1985). Formulation of public policy is deemed as a part of the pre-decision stage of policy creation include creation of goals, main concerns, opportunities and cost and advantages of every option. It includes identification of a number of policy options and means of public policy concentrating on a problems resulting in an organized set of resolutions completed for lasting solutions under which the decision maker essentially makes choices by make judgments concerning the feasibility, political

*Authors are Professor of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Associate Professor and Research Assistant at University of the Gujrat – Pakistan.

recognition, cost and gains. Policy formulation also is entrenched in *policy community* described by Pross (1989) as an association of personalities, groups, government section, institutes and agency directing decision making in a particular field of policy *and policy networks*. Conversely, the development of policy formulation requires incentive and contribution of many actors bringing in new actors and initiatives that play an essential role in the development of designing a policy.

The Making of Public Policy in Developing Countries

The socio-economic and political circumstance of any country establishes or outlines the arrangement of a certain policy. Governments of the developing countries necessitate participation from the business and civil community if they are to develop the transparency, excellence, efficiency, legality and plans of their public policies.

According to Hai Do (2010) formation of a policy incorporates the dominant model of *bureaucratic politics* between the “interrupted equilibrium, organizational process and rational actors.” Combining Rhode’s analysis of eight essential kinds of subsystems presented by Atkinson and Coleman (1992) and detailed by Frans Van Waarden (1992) seven criterion on variation of networks which included

- Quality and different kinds of actors
- Purposes of networks
- Structures
- Institutionalization
- Rules of behavior
- Relationship of power &
- Strategies of actors

Howlett (1998) and Ramesh (2003) kept on constructing the taxonomy of the discourse (a reference to conversation, words and statements within the policy society) community, two dichotomous elements in a prevailing set of thoughts and their numbers which are to pertain realistically in policy formulation. Additionally, other variables outlining the formation and conduct of policy network include having knowledge regarding the *networks and taxonomy of interest and the quantity of members*. In developing states, these two elements in addition to the principal set of thoughts and the association of ideas are utilized for conferring the process of public policy making.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Approaches Taken By Developing States in Public Policy Making

The economic progress of any country is dependent on the features of its policy framework and decision making, principally the practice which is occupied in the formation of every decision. Another established fact is that in every part of the world, developing countries differ significantly in their ability and willingness to construct and implement policies making progressive performance with regards to development (Corkery, J, Land, A et.al, 1995). In the world of public policy making, formulating a policy is a component of the phase of pre-decision making. The task embraces recognition of a number of public policy options for addressing the socio-economic troubles and the process of selection narrowing solution for subsequent stages. Cochran and Malone (1996) state that the preparation of a policy deals with the setbacks , purposes , priority , alternative for solution , analysis of the cost and profits , negative and positive externalities and substitutes related to them. These stages currently are accepted and have set in the developing countries. Therefore, the formulation of a policy is a relative purpose instead of a phase in which the governing actors and their set of proposals shape their path of action. The purpose is more applicable for the developing states where institutions may be weak, their regulatory capability may be narrow, there is less responsibility, contribution and accountability for the subsystem of government. Attention to policy formulation also is implanted in the efforts resting on subsystem, sponsorship, partnership, systems and policy community (Weible and Sabatier). Therefore, in developing countries identifying the policy actors, comprehending their conviction, inspiration, rulings of practicability and their observation regarding the political framework is significant for them (Howlett and Ramesh, 2002). In Conclusion, *formulating a policy defines the purpose of policy making and it is the authentic practice oriented for making of a policy in the developing world. Additionally, in developing countries actual policy is an imitation of policy construction within the policy community and the policy complex, reflecting the frail situation and competence of the institutions within the community and its networks.*

Developing Countries and Policy Formulation

1. The Policy Design

Many theorists designing a policy state that underlying sequence is the major reason for the accomplishment or failure of a policy because the design of a policy leads to the results of a policy (HaiDo, 2012). *Firstly*, the design of a policy would identify the list of policy mechanism i.e. institution-building (Weimer, 1992). While scholars like Fisher (2000) and Rixecker (1994) see

modernism and ingenuity as voices contributing to policy dialogue further scholars like Forester (1993), Rochefort and Cobb (1994) concentrate on policy dialogue and leading ideas. It embraces contending endeavors for making meaning. Ingraham (1987) , Linder and Peters (1985) explain that as for the technical endeavors, this leads to a characterization of policies as being “well” or “poorly” proposed. These technical concerns are accepted in the developing countries. Scholars like Bobrow and Dryzek (1987), Kingdon (1995), Schneider and Ingram (1997) and Stone (2001) have explained that a policy was well-made if a vigilant analysis regarding the relationship of the means and ends had been made. Thus, the trend of *recognizing the design of a political procedure comes first to the choice made for each policy* (Bobrow and Dryzek 1987; Kingdon, 1995; Schneider and Ingram 1997; Stone, 2001). Nevertheless, choices addressing the objectives of a policy and the instrument category necessitate the injection of new ideas and judgments into the policy process (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). While suggestions for changing programs and policies tend to come up with new actors changes relevant to the types of instruments and their elements with their altered preference tend to come about from the existing actors (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). While making a policy the concerned actors usually are limited to associates of the policy subsystem because participation at this stage in the process requires having a certain level of minimum knowledge in the concerned area of the subject, permitting comment from an actor (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003).

2. Policy Tools

Tools of policy are instruments of governments used by them to put policies into outcomes (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003). Eventually, the subset of the literature on policy focuses unequivocally only on the tools of policy. Bardach (2005) presents an eight-step agenda on policy analysis recounting taxes, instructions, allowance, service, finances, information , rights and other tools of policy making. He further proposes why and how each policy tool is to be used and what could be some of the potential drawbacks intending to kindle creativity for crafting a certain policy. Further details on tools of analysis have been given by Hood (1986) for exploring an array of governmental instruments with the definitive intend of making meaning for governmental intricacies, generation of ideas for designing a policy and facilitating assessment across governments. Many scholars use the documents of policy tools for trending afar from undeviating services of the government and taking measures which drive the officials of the government into the intricate joint relationship with other actors i.e. actors in the private sector and non-governmental organizations. These agreements gave the parties of the government much greater say in judgments and directives of the past (Salamon, 2002).

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Research regarding policy making highlights their political importance. In addition tools entail certain unique set of organizational proficiency and knowledge; hence the preferences of tools in due course control the nature of public management (Howlett and Ramesh 1998, 2003). In developing states, the choice of policy tools becomes a significant stride in the process of policy making; nonetheless the alternative of policy tools regularly is limited owing to the inaccessibility of instruments. These sets of limited tools of selection direct weakened competence of policy makers and their institutional structure of policy making.

3. Involvement in Integrating Actors and Institutions of Policy Making in Developing Countries

In a policy of sub-system (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003), actor and institutions subsist in a shared correlation. State actors consist of the elected and employed officials, actors in a business, labour, the public, think-tanks, and organizations of research, political parties, mass media and the interest community (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003. pp. 65-84). Peter P. Houtzager, Adrián Gurza Lavalle and Arnab Acharya (2003) elaborate that in developing states, after examining the functions of actors in various case studies and divisions, it was revealed that there were differences in the character, motivation and community participation, whereas in the process of policy making, the state and the business community regularly kept their leading roles. In fragile developing countries, collectively involving the actors of the civil society for formulation of policy depends upon the space provided by the institutions. It is believed by many political leaders, policy creators and researchers that 'direct citizen partnership' can help to democratize and rationalize the state giving the politically marginalized population a chance to input their ideas in making of a policy (Houtzager, P.P; Lavalle, G.A., et.al, 2003). This institutional means of 'participatory policy making space' considerably impacts those who contribute. This impact differs from the kind of actors of the civil society, although no facts exist that the "wealth" of combined actors controls participation (Houtzager, P.P; Lavalle, G.A., et.al, 2003). Bridget Hitter (2012) writes that in developing states having democratic regimes, there is a growing recognition of regulations not being a limited realm of the state alone since the regulatory capability of non-governmental actors are being enhanced and on instances being designated by states. Many actors from the civil and the economic society make their contributions in collecting information, setting their standards and modifying their behavior for control of regulations. In democratic developing countries the shifting evidence-based policy development has given opportunities for improving inclusiveness and involvement in the cycle of policy making winning transparency among many state and non-state actors (Hai, Do, 2010). For

example, a mechanism of transparency and responsibility preferably can include the poor, empowering them to value their competing concerns and probable allies (WB, 2007) collectively bringing together stakeholders at various levels participating in the workshops of stakeholder analysis and other kinds of group evaluations creating more space for the institutions discussing changing policy.

4. Developing Countries and the Discourse of Policy Community

Hugh T. Miller and Tansu Demir have written that the policy community plays an essential role in the process of making public policy with the foremost related to the task of integration carried out. The phrase policy community is an element of the idiom employed by 'policy researchers, political scientists and the management of the public scholars signifying the extra-formal dealings occurring ahead of or exterior to the formal governmental procedure among agencies of the government, interest associations, corporations, industrial associates, selected officials, other institutions and individuals. These associated terminologies were further defined by Wilks and Wright (1987) who suggested a three-fold typology to include "policy universe", "policy community" and "policy network" *Policy Universe* takes into consideration the large number of population and probable actors giving out a common interest in the industrial strategy, many contributing regularly into the process of policy making (Mill, T.H. and Demir , T. p.20). Conversely, *Policy Community* is a reference to a disaggregated system concerning actors and impending actor sharing interests in an exacting industry interacting for mutual gains. *Policy Networks* concern thinking making it become a mechanism for creating linkage between and among the policy communities. Mara S. Sidney(1998) states that *in the developing world, policy community* is a reference to a particular type of social formation where communication and control might flow into patterns of non-hierarchy correlated with fragmentation of the government. This is indicative of a policy, procedure in which organized interests and actors of the government have a chief role in outlining the route and the effects of public policies (HaiDo, 2009).

The discourses are "taken as an example of the capture and the exercise of power by some sorts of people, arguments and organizations against others through specific happenings, in particular arenas, over various periods of time" (Apthorpe, 1986). Communities of discourse have a familiar level of considering a crisis, its definition and its reasons. All through the discourse, taking a dominant set of ideas employs viewing a culture of communicative experience relating discursive appointment acutely controlled by social and economic inequity. The authors consider the example of resistance against poverty as much of a cultural practice than that of a political and economic

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

one. They evaluate important examples of discursive space like the public meetings in the democratic village of India and assortments to beneficiaries of anti-poverty programs. They have studied the democratic villages of South India to exhibit the creation of the culture of civic/political meetings with the poor and how the meaning of poverty and the criterion of beneficiary selection are understated and investigated within them. In the course of this investigation, they emphasize the practice through which the democratic villages make easy attainment of important cultural capacities like discursive proficiency and civic society by groups who are at a disadvantage or are poor. It demonstrates how those who are poor and generally marginalized deploys their discursive skillfulness in an environment which has scarce resources and are publicly stratified (Vijavendra R, Paromit, S, 2009). Therefore , the interaction of 'poverty, culture and deliberative democracy' is a subject of extensive relevance focusing on the cultural progression influencing public action in a way assisting to make better the voice and organization of the poor (Vijavendra R, Paromit, S , 2009).

5. Policy Network

According to Wilks and Wright (1987) policy network differs according to their integration level, restraining of relationship, degree of insulation from further networks, the public, type of resources they direct along with five added elements; "the interests of the members of the network, the membership, the extent of members', interdependence, the extent to which the network is isolated from the other networks, the variations in the distribution of resources between the members". Enrique Mendizabal (2006) examined the type and purpose of these policy networks in the developing countries, concluding that these networks were increasing in figure in developing states and among the developing and developed states. The structure of membership and socio-economic standards are important for policy networks to carry out various functions.

Taveekan (2010) researched that where the intensity of the capacity was low, the policy networks can help the local government regarding the creation and execution of the policy network. For example, in the Thai village the communities by analyzing their performance had an outcome of local government's performance and democratic governance, focusing on the relation among the segments of the policy process. In **Thailand**, mostly, the local government and factions of the civil society took an initiative in 1997 by adopting approaches of good governance. Although adoption of the policy network is in its early period, this program has seen new intervention at the local level of comprehensive governance among organization of the state and other actors having greater participation in the process of policy making. It

was society groups and the representatives of the central government “all responded in a positive manner utilizing their performance altogether. Conversely, local governments also have modified the manner in which they use to work, **i.e. they have moved from a top-down approach towards a bottom up approach.** They also promote the social and business segments to participate in the practice of policy making. By playing their part in policy networks, groups of the public and the civil society also have involved themselves in the process of policy formulation. This network of policy effected altering of the local governance, encouraging public participation paving greater local accountability, developing direct political prospects. Additionally the relationships among local government and factions of the civil society have also transformed. It has been stated that ever since 1997, their correlation was restructured from that of ‘separation and command’ towards that of ‘integration and dialogue’ only possible with the thought of network and good governance.

In **Vietnam**, according to Mai Thi Truong (2011) in any state, the socio-economic planning of reducing poverty is one of the significant policies of social security receiving consideration of the whole community. It has facilitated in maintaining stability among economic development, impartiality and social advancement contributing towards maintain social constancy and sustainable development fulfilling Vietnam’s international pledges. In several years, endeavors by Vietnam for reducing poverty have set a good example for implantation of the Millennium Development Goals. Accomplishments by Vietnam have been appreciated by the public in the world and its people. The case of Vietnam illustrated how effectively policy networks, in this case donors working in collaboration with the national and local actors. It was seen how government’s dominant actors in the policy networks realizing their responsibility for formulating a policy to reduce poverty led to the accomplishment of wide cutback on poverty, having worked with members of the organizations and people at the grass root level.

Loopholes and Failures in Public Policy Making- The Case of Pakistan

In general, public policy is described as a set of governmental actions taken to resolve the problems being faced by a nation. The making of public policy in Pakistan has three elements, i.e. *the problems, its players and their policies.* *The problem* is the identified subject which needs to be addressed while *the players* are individuals or a crowd of people who need to deal with the issue which has been identified (Dye, T.R. 2012). As shown in Figure 1 below, experts on public policy present *five steps* needed in the making of public policy.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Figure 1: Five Steps of Public Policy Process



Source: Dye , T.R . (2012). *Understanding Public Policy*. 14th Edition, Pearson; 14 Edition, January.

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	POLICY FORMULATION	POLICY ADOPTION	POLICY IMPLEMENTATION	POLICY EVALUATION
This is the first step in making of the public policy in which the nature, the issue and its history are identified. This process entails how much awareness does the public have with reference to the problem,	This is the second step in making of the public policy for resolution of identified issue. This process entails discussion and debate among the officials of the government, an individual civilian and the interest	This is the third step in which the policy analysis takes place. In this procedure alternative policies are evaluated intending to lessen society's socio-economic problems. It helps the	This is the last step in which associations and organizations get involved assigning each agency their part of the responsibility. In this stage intimate communication and coordination between different actors is needed and part of the	In this step , a particular policy after its implementation is evaluated to know to what extent has it been successful in resolving the issue of a society. This section of the procedure in general is applied by co-operative attempts amongst policy managers and

<p>who gets influenced and if the policy is a long or short term policy. Issue recognized would have to be clearly defined with the potential classified actors</p> <p>(Dye, T.R. 2012).</p>	<p>groups looking into the best possible means for resolving the issue. A profound discussion on different solutions and their prospective leads to the formulation of a policy</p> <p>(Dye, 2012).</p>	<p>decision makers to make the finest selection among the options. The outcome of every policy preference is to be calculated and compared for selection of a workable alternative</p> <p>(Dye, T.R.2012).</p>	<p>implementation is executed by various agencies of the departments.</p>	<p>independent evaluators. The impact and its complete policy impact are also calculated.</p> <p>(Dye , 2012).</p>
--	---	--	---	--

Historically the practice of public policy making in Pakistan has exposed that the country never was able to espouse an appropriate system for making its public policy. Policies related to the benefit of the public always have been introduced without public consent and essential information on the ground. To build up a sustainable policy, it becomes imperative that participation of various stakeholders gets included (Bichard, M. 1999). Some of the loopholes and failures in the making of public policy include as below

- 1. Relationship of Hostility between the Academia and government:**
 While making a policy professor of a university can play an important role in devising and planning a practical policy. It is unfortunate however that the understanding and abilities of these professors remain insufficient. The continuing hostile relationship involving the government and university academia has led to the development of such state of affairs where there is an absence of consistent information required for the formulation of workable policies. Therefore, there is a need to reinforce the *information base* for advancing the framework of policy making in developing countries like that of Pakistan. Being defiant on the information base would obstruct the policy makers to clearly work out their policy ambitions, its implementation and instrument for evaluations (Bullock, H, et.al. 2001).
- 2. Commitments by the Leaders:** In a country which upholds a system of democracy, a countries political leader has an important role in

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

developing workable public policies benefiting its people. It is, however ill-fated, that in Pakistan the ineffectiveness and individual interest of the political leaders has led to the process of public policy being dominated by one individual. The making of public policy mainly is the work of the elected legislators in the national and provincial legislative body. In Pakistan with almost 90% of the parliamentarians being not well educated and lacking the vision for resolving problems lesser thoughtfulness is put into the practice of policy making. The political leadership remains uncommitted while ministers do not have a vision. The formation and execution of a policy are vitally dependent upon constant sustenance from its pinnacle political leadership and the bureaucracy (Edward, M, 2001). While considering the case of Pakistan many a time the government fails to obtain the required political support, every government discontinues the linked agenda with the preceding government, the elected representatives remain uncommitted to problems in their constituencies and as for the parliamentarians, since none of them are certain concerning their term, they generally remain occupied in reinforcing their prospects of re-election. *Inefficient political sponsorship* causes considerable damage towards objectives of projects related to development and societal transformation (Ahsan, 2003).

- 3. The Structure of Government:** In Pakistan governmental structures is seen as being among the most important impediment for preparing and putting into practice policies. Lacking liability, exploitation of their authority, corruption, problems related to governance, lack of trust connecting various organs of the government, their political representatives and their officials has paved the way for lack of coordination. The study indicates that inherent *cooperative achievements involving multiple actors* are another hindrance in policy making. *Sri Lanka* has a better experience with implementation and formulation of policies because of incorporation of lesser agencies of the government (Geurts, T, 2010). Introduction of the system of devolution has generated problems involving the district and the government since there is no transparency on their positions and powers causing difficulties at the district and divisional levels (Jamil, B.R and Qureshi, T.M. 2002). Among the crucial predicaments of government structures is that of *'centralization in decision making.'* Making *well-timed decisions* play an essential role in the public policy creation and its implementation. Since policies are constructed in the capital they fail to take into consideration alteration related to proposals from the grassroots level. These detachments on behalf of the policy makers do not only become a reason for failure of a policy, but it also establishes dissonance among other aspects of the similar

policy. The example of making of a policy in *Thailand* all the way through its stage of planning is the strongest reason for the accomplishment of its policy implementation (Edward, M, 2001).

4. **Scarcity of Resources:** In making and implementation of the public policy, the fiscal, procedural and human sources have an important role to play. At each stage of the progression on policy making policy success and its implementation necessitate suitable accessibility of these resources (Gerston, L.N. 2010). Pakistan has always been deficient in financial resource for employing its projects of public wellbeing and in every field of development its resources are not accurately made use of. Issues of government dishonesty and its inefficiency direct negligence and underutilization of the resources. A prejudice policy on taxation is the foremost motive for the scarcity of the country's financial resources. If public policies are to attain their wanted objectives, there needs to be adequate resources for their formulation and execution (Haq, S).
5. **The Role of Bureaucracy in Public Policy Making:** Policies related to good governance have been compromised to a large extend because of policies having been made on predilections. The politics of Pakistan have primarily remained in the hands of *interest groups which have included smaller factions of the elected official, great businessmen, civil and military representatives and the feudal. The end result is an approach founded on their interests towards governance and a failure of institutional building capabilities.* Personalized decision making at the expense of power has dominated the well-planned process of institutionalization. Furthermore, continuous altering political regimes have had a damaging effect in the process of policy making. Especially, during the period of the 1990's, when the new government came into power it immediately discarded the strategy and project of its predecessor. In general, policy implementation takes more time, henceforth any discontinuity before they get established is to result in greater losses than benefits (Dr. Ishrat Hussain).
6. **Economic Policy Failures:** In its internal affairs, the economy of Pakistan has been encountering insecurity, high price rises, and negative balance of payment, escalating unemployment, reduced public checks and mounting poverty. Political instability in the country has contributed seriously to regretful circumstances. The management of public financing remained to a greater extend under control of the military and its technocrats, who joining hands with the military entered the field of policymaking. With most of them belonging to the background of international financial institutions, they guarantee solution to the problems of Pakistan rather than a policy of public

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

participation. Pakistan has been providential in having adequate bureaucrats who have served central banks and ministers of economy. The government only needs to pay attention to suggestion given by them and pave policy, in accordance (Kalia, S).

7. **Foreign Policy Failures:** On the foreign front, Pakistan's foreign policy have chiefly remained in the hands of the military. The monopolized transfer of information and construction of a decision stays inside the GHQ. For example, both wars of 1965 and 1971 have had their roots in arguments intensified during the rule of the military. Today, issues like that of the Taliban and the darkness of the Mumbai attack have posed considerable diplomatic confronts for the government. The country's democratic government is still dependent on the military and its organization for providing them with information and direction on matters concerning foreign policy (Kalia, S).
8. **District Government Failures:** After an improper implementation of the 2001 Order of Local Government, the district administrations delivered uncertainty in the responsibilities of the local and district governments leading to implementation malfunctioning and indecisions (Kalia, S).
9. **Energy Policy Failures:** One of the main drivers of the economy is energy. Pakistan faces an energy predicament which is a major cause of turmoil for its people. Steps taken like those of scheme related to projects of rental power have not provided with long-lasting solutions and there exists a massive space in research and advancement which can guide making of a policy in this field giving sustainable resources of energy (Kalia, S).
10. **Incompetence of the Civil Servants:** The historical analyses of Pakistan exposes that presently civil servants have become exceedingly inept and controlling. Their politicization damaged their recital many a times. Many a times they even lacked the necessary administrative power on issues like those of controlling prices, elimination of encroachments and imposition of the municipal laws (Kalia, S).
11. **Ineptness of Civil Servants:** With civil servants lacking training and ineptness, policy implementation and its formation has remained improper. They have an inclination of imitating structures of the developed countries, not adapted to the country's local state of affairs. Other countries financial and budgetary plans, their structural, technical and relational practices are imitated without evaluation of their success (Kalia, S).
12. **Inter-Services Competition:** Inter-Service competition has diverted attention of the civil servants from policy making. Predominantly the arena of federal secretariat has become a ground of struggle and

resentment. As a 2010 report on “Reforming Civil Services in Pakistan” from International Crisis Group states:

“Decades of mismanagement, political manipulation and corruption have rendered Pakistan’s civil service incapable of providing effective governance and basic public services. In public perceptions, the country’s 2.4 million civil servants are widely seen as unresponsive and corrupt, and bureaucratic procedures cumbersome and exploitative.”

The Way Forward- Enhanced Citizenship Participation in Policy Making

Involving citizens in public matters “seem to hold a sacrosanct role in U.S. political culture’ (Day, D, 1997). The interest of engaging citizens in the democratic practice of decision making is not bounded to the U.S. alone since there are many other countries that have taken broad scheme on involving citizens in the practice of governance (Nylen , W.R. 2002 , Trenam ,K. 2000, et.al). The main precept accorded to citizen participation is the credence that linking citizens in a Jeffersonian democracy on the administrator’s part would lead to additional public preferred decision making while on part of the public it would lead to improving the larger public society (Stivers ,C, 1990, Oldfield, A, 1990 et.al). Arguments favoring enhancement of citizen participation spotlight the advantages of the method itself. For example Nelson and Wright (1995) focus on the practice of participation as a tool for *altering social changes*. Additionally, involving citizens intends to lead to improved decisions and competence benefiting the rest of the society (Beierle 1999 and Thomas, 1995). Figure 2 shows the advantages and while Figure 3 shows the disadvantages to citizen participation.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Figure 2: Benefits of Citizen Participation in Government’s Process of Decision-Making

	Advantages to Citizen Participants	Advantages to Government
Decision Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education (learn from and inform government representatives) • Persuade and enlighten government • Gain skills for activist citizenship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education (learn from and inform citizens) • Persuade citizens; build trust and allay anxiety or hostility • Build strategic alliances • Gain legitimacy of decisions
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break gridlock; achieve outcomes • Gain some control over policy process • Better policy and implementation decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break gridlock; achieve outcomes • Avoid litigation costs • Better policy and implementation decisions

Source: Irvin, A. R. and Stansbury, J. Citizen Participation in Decision-Making: Is it Worth the Effort?

Other elements having an effect on the outcome policy of citizen participation include

1. **Education of a Citizen:** Well-informed and engaging citizen experts understand the technical state of affairs and considering the hostile community can give community-based solutions. The administrators are able to detail better reasoning for pursuing a particular policy which at the first glimpse would not be accepted by the general public.
2. **Political Suasion:** Thomas (1995) explains this factor as “More often than not, the impetus for public involvement comes from a need to obtain acceptance as a prerequisite to successful implementation.” Further, Rourke (1984) gives a great example of a bureaucracy unwilling for surrendering their powers.
 “The truth of the matter is that agencies in the field of national security affairs give a good deal of lip service to the idea of consulting with the public, but in practice this consultation commonly consists of getting

groups of citizens together so that they can be indoctrinated with the official point of view.” What is true is yet to be seen, however a key supposition in the success of political suasion is a citizens social control. The influence of the powerful members of the community, not necessarily the elite would broaden all the way through the community with the opposition disseminated (Howell, Olsen, et.al, 1987).

3. **Empowerment:** Applegate (1998) enlightens how a citizen consultative board gives “ ‘opportunity to meet face to face with and personally persuade decision-makers’, while the rest of the citizens sponsor participation as a method of teaching the feeble citizens to interrelate with other members of the group , acquiring authenticity as political players (Fox , 1996 and Valadez , 2001) .
4. **Breaking Gridlock:** In some communities, conventional political discourses can fragment into obstructionist maneuver making decision-making come to a close down. Weeks (2000) elaborates how a thriving deliberate democracy scheme compelled headstrong affiliates of the city council to employ some excruciating budgetary cuts from hundreds of citizens authorization from workshop and rejoinders from the surveys. In such cases, a participatory program having poised efforts from citizens would allow for concession helping to find resolutions to obstinate problems.
5. **Avoiding the Cost of Proceedings:** O’ Leary et.al (1999) considers the cost of participatory procedures , however , he explains that ‘Managers should expect stalled negotiations, breakdowns in trust, and outcomes into which not everyone will buy. Indeed, disgruntled stakeholders may walk out of the process or still go to court over the outcome. But compare these possibilities to the higher potential of lengthy litigation delays should an organization eschew meaningful stakeholder participation altogether’.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Figure 3: The Disadvantages of Citizen Participation

	Disadvantages to Citizen Participants	Disadvantages to Government
Decision Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time consuming (even dull) • * Pointless if decision is ignored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time consuming • Costly • May backfire, creating more • hostility toward government
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worse policy decision if heavily influenced by opposing interest groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of decision-making control • Possibility of bad decision that is politically impossible to ignore • Less budget for implementation of actual projects

Source: Irvin, A. R. and Stansbury, J. Citizen Participation in Decision-Making: Is it Worth the Effort?

The process of citizen participation is not without its disadvantages. However, with *if resources are not scarce; they can be prevailed over through successful structuring*. The rest of the difficulties are related contextually, signifying the few societies have meager candidates who can be included for proposals on citizen participation. In this case, considerable results might better be accomplished with other means of decision making.

Other important features which are to be taken into consideration in the process of policy making have been detailed in a *Report entitled: Policy Making in the Real World Evidences and Analysis*. Authors Michael Hallsworth with Simon Parker and Jill Rutter elaborate that regardless of prolonged endeavors on improving the manner in which policies are made, academicians, politicians and servants of the civil services continue to show worries with respect to policy making and if it is ready to convene challenges of the future. The potency of policy making is essential for strengthening the government and the country for failure of a policy is significant. Politics as has been famously defined by Lasswell is “who gets what, when and how.” These four feature symbolize the ‘what, how, who and why’ of the policy process, but it is considered that for each of these characteristics the latest reforms have not been successful in addressing the actuality needed for policy making.

Efforts for improving the making of policies have experienced a gap between theory and practice since either have they presented impractical models for the making of policies or they have fallen short of providing support needed for turning the wanted practice into a reality. Often servants of the civil society do know what is needed to be done, however they face difficulties when putting things into practice. Those successful find informal solutions to problems. However, falling short on realistic processes much is left on prospect, personality and individual proficiency. Efforts needed for advancements in policy making have differed in range and focus, regularly extended beyond or combined with one another. Up till now there have remained four focal areas, reinforcing the activity. This embraces *process, quality, structures and politics*.

Process: Policy cycles have been disconnected from reality and many academicians have agreed to the judgment. During 1999, cabinet officials openly disallowed the utilization of policy cycles on four basic grounds

a) Policy Making does not occur in distinctive stages

The stages of policy making often are inseparable. In reality, policy predicaments and policy resolution often emerge together, relatively than in sequence. Conversely, there may be plans at identical time or earlier than an act has been recognized. It can lead to inadequate envisaged policies if the ministers give a fait accompli resolution, which is mistaken or whose affiliation to the policy dilemma is uncertain. The contemporary policy process is not sufficient for addressing these complexities. Better methods are needed for making certain that policy problems have been considered entirely and their options assessed properly.

b) Policies need not only to be designed ,but they also not to be visualized

The present procedure of policy making greatly miscalculates the significance of policy plan. Greater importance on policy design would assist in ensuring that a planned arrangement embodies realistic and practical means for realizing policy goals. The process of policy making still does not make available sufficient systematic support. The complexity of contemporary governance implies policy designation as not happening methodically. Henceforth, those implementing policies need the capability and prospect to adjust to local or shifting circumstance.

c) Policy Making regularly is designed by event

Policy making does not occur in the void, where the agenda in total is controlled by the government. Resultantly, overwhelmed happenings can direct quick discontinuities and unreasonable choices. Not all affairs are the outcome of an external world, influencing the policy makers; some events are

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

'self-generated.' It was made certain by many of the interviewers that the aspiration for capturing the news schema, generation of headlines, spotlight acting could direct reckless announcements.

d) The end product of policies has frequently been indirect

The end product of policies often are not direct, they disseminate and take time to materialize. Present guidelines for resolving explicit problems in terms of policies focus on 'discrete interventions.' The outcome can then be computed and calculated in a reliable manner. Evidence, however, suggests that these interventions are to be intricate, extensive and unintended. The government may be unable to deal with the complexity of the problem for it is improbable that a policy would result in outcomes measurable and attributable. Policy has to have a collective impact for which there needs to be a policy process capturing the impacts and being responsive interconnected policies. There is much about the suggested process, only one requires a process closer to reality.

Qualities: The needed qualities for making of a policy are understandable however there is a lack of recognition of the manner in which they can be accomplished. Research has shown that these setbacks continue because of systematic obstacles. Recent efforts for reforming the process of policy making have still not been able to deal with these barriers. There are guidelines on efficient detailing what needs to be done, but no one knows how it is to be done. A civil servant explains this dilemma in these words: *"If you've got to be evidence-based, and inclusive, and joined up, and consultative, and outward-looking, you can't deliver a policy in a week - but ministers want policies tomorrow."*

Lessons learnt from evaluating a certain policy often are not fed back into the policy design or formulation of a problem. Evaluations often are commissioned, but disregarded. Reasons include

a) Central government culturally remains uninterested in past events

Some ministers remain uninterested in knowing how successful were the policies of their predecessors, even when belonging to the same party. Likewise, civil servants regularly consider looking for their next big policy.

b) The Time period for evaluation and policy making are not in synchronization

Many common complaints have been found regarding evaluations taking longer periods. There were many moments when evaluation got published

several years after the policy was surpassed. Responsibility for immediate implementation of a policy is also needed, which is flexible and autonomous.

c) Evaluation remain un-build in policy design or are weakly executed

Evaluations not being part of the policy design create another problem. Here systematic pressures repeatedly weaken good intentions. In the process of policy making the focus is on civil servants delivering a certain policy, leaving evaluations for another day. However, if room for evaluation remains in the process of making a policy, these can be inadequately build.

d) The findings of the evaluations are not well-managed restraining governmental learning

There is little evidence to suggest that evidences for departments were collected and provided as a knowledge depository. Absence of cross-departmental possessor and their changeable formats made it complicated to cumulate lessons for building consistent understanding.

Structures: *Structural changes have remained disjointed and partial:* For better policy making efforts have been made for altering the organizational structures. Improvements have been made but at a similar time they have led to uncertainty and illogical arrangement, both inside central government and between the centre and their departments. Two basic reasons explain these arrangements. *Firstly*, there is no realization of plans in action. *Secondly*, there is no formulation of rational plans. For example, in the Whitehall, many difficulties were founded by personalities.

Politics: In many languages terms like “policy” and “politics “are not separate since in policy making, politics is its integral part. Nevertheless, many endeavors for developing policy pay little consideration to the task of politics or ministers focusing only on technocratic advancements. Policy is seen as something external to the procedure of policy making. Good quality policies materialize from an arrangement of political (mobilization of support and management of opposition, give a visualization and set strategic objectives) and technocratic (support of what works, vigorous design of policies and practical plans for implementation). These two poles embodied by minister and the civil servants recognizing their responsibilities need to produce working affiliation for positive contributions.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

Conclusion:

The making of public policy being designed by events is a continuous process requiring visualization to the number of old and new problems. Hence, the best outcomes for the best solution can be attained by policy of various societal actors and comprehending and executing the concept of citizen participation.

References:

- Applegate, J. S. (1998) Beyond the Usual Suspects: The Use of Citizens Advisory Boards in Environmental Decision making. *Indiana Law Journal*, 73(3), 903-957.
- Bullock, H. et al. (2001). *Better Policy Making*, London: Centre for Management and Policy Studies, Cabinet Office.
- Bichard, M.(1999). *Modernizing The Policy Process*. Public Management and Policy Association Report London.
- Beierle, T.C. (1999) Using Social Goals to Evaluate Public Participation in Environmental Decisions. *Policy Studies Review*, 16(3/4), 75-103.
- Day, D (1997). Citizen Participation in the Planning Process: An Essentially Contested Concept? *Journal of Planning Literature* 11(3), 421-434.
- Dr. Isharat. H. "Retooling Institutions" in Ed. Lodhi Maleeha. *Pakistan Beyond a crises state*, op.cit., 150.
- Dye, T. R. (2012). *Understanding Public Policy*. 14th Edition, Pearson; 14 Edition, January.
- Edwards, M. (2001). *Social Policy, Public Policy: From Problem to Practice*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Fox, J. (1996) How Does Civil Society Thicken? The Political Construction of Social Capital in Rural Mexico. *World Development* , 24(6), 1089-1103.
- Geurts, T. (2010), *Public Policy making: The 21st Century Perspective*. Beinformed., Wagenrustlaan, DL, Apeldo, Netherland.
- Gerston, L. N. (2010). *Public Policy Making: Process and Principles* Routledge: London.
- Hallsworth, M , Parker , S et.al *Policy Making in The Real World*. Retrieved September 15 , 2016 from:
<http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Policy%20making%20in%20the%20real%20world.pdf>
- Hai Do, 2010. "the Policy process in Vietnam: Critical roles of different actors". Social Publishing House of Vietnam. 2010.

Loopholes in Public Policy Making

- Howlett and Ramesh, 2003. "Studying public policy". Oxford University Press.
- Haq, S (2015) Public Policy Process in Pakistan: Key causes of Public Policies Failures. *Economic and Social Thought*, 2, 127-131.
- Howell, R.E., & Marvin E. O, & Daryll O (1987) *Designing a Citizen Involvement Program: A Guidebook for Involving Citizens in the Resolution of Environmental Issues*. Corvallis, OR: Western Rural Development Center.
- International Crises Group, "Reforming Pakistan's Civil Service", op.cit.
- Jamil, B. R., & Qureshi, T. M. (2002) *Policy Dialogue on Decentralization*. Paper presented at the Research and Policy Dialogues on Key Issues in Education: Decentralization in Education, Karachi.
- Joan Corkery, Anthony Land, and Jean Bossuyt, 1995. "the Process of policy formulation: Institutional Path or Institutional Maze?", European Centre for Development Policy Management. 1995
- Kalia, S. *Bureaucratic Policy Making in Pakistan*. From http://www.gurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/The%20Dialogue/8_2/Dialogue_April_June2013_156-170.pdf
- Nylen, W. R. (2002). Testing the Empowerment Hypothesis: The Participatory Budget in Belo Horizonte and Betim, Brazil. *Comparative Politics*, 34(2), 127-145.
- Nelson, N & Susan W (1995). *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice* London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Oldfield, A. (1990) *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- O'Leary, R ; Robert F. D; Daniel J. F & Paul S. W. (1999). *Managing for the Environment: Understanding the Legal, Organizational, and Policy Challenges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peter P. H, Adrián G.L. and Arnab A (2003) Who participates? Civil society and the new democratic politics in São Paulo, Brazil. Institute of Development Studies; Brighton, Sussex BN1 9RE, ENGLAND.

- Rao Vi, Sanyal, Paromit (2009) Dignity through discourse: poverty and the culture of deliberation in Indian village democracies. The Impact of Panchayat in India.
- Rourke, F.E. (1984). *Bureaucracy, Politics and Public Policy*. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Stivers, C. (1990) The Public Agency as Polls: Active Citizenship in the Administrative State. *Administration & Society*, 22(1), 86-105.
- Thomas, J.C. (1995). *Public Participation in Public Decisions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Torgerson, D. (1985), Contextual orientation in policy analysis: The contribution of Harold D. Lasswell , *Policy Sciences*, 18(3), 241-261.
- Trenam, K. ((2000) Public Consultation in Local Environment Agency Plans (LEAPS). *Landscape Research*, 25(3), 382-385.
- Taveekan, T (2010) *Policy Network and Local Governance: Evidences from Thailand*. A paper prepared for the 14th IRSPM Conference - The Crisis: Challenges for Public Management Berne, Switzerland / 7-9 April 2010 - Panel: New Researchers Panel (Doctoral Panel).
- Valadez, J. M. (2001) *Deliberative Democracy, Political Legitimacy, and Self-Determination in Multicultural Societies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Weeks, E. C. (2000). The Practice of Deliberative Democracy: Results from Four Large- Scale Trials. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4), 360-371.