Decoding Public Policy Making: Unraveling the Variables and Analytical Questions for Systematic, Comprehensive Analysis

Lina Alswaiti

IPRJB

Decoding Public Policy Making: Unraveling the Variables and Analytical Questions for Systematic, Comprehensive Analysis

[1*]Lina Alswaiti

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law and Public Administration, Birzeit University – Palestine

How to cite in APA format:

Abstract

Purpose: This study highlights the intricate nature of public policy processes and emphasizes the importance of well-rounded governance systems that promote transparency and adaptability to social demands. Gaining insight into the responsibilities of different individuals and utilizing suitable approaches can improve the efficiency and credibility of the process of creating and executing public policies. The process of developing and governing public policy involves complex interactions between government agencies, non-governmental organizations, political parties, interest groups, and public opinion.

Methodology: This study utilizes a qualitative research methodology, employing methods such as literature review, document analysis, case study analysis, thematic analysis, and content analysis. The main objective is to investigate the impact of political players on public policy.

Findings: The results demonstrate the varied functions performed by different players, wherein government agencies are responsible for policy formulation and execution, while non-governmental entities, such as interest groups and political parties, also wield substantial influence. The significance of public opinion becomes evident, especially in democratic contexts.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: Theoretical frameworks, such as institutionalism and rational choice theory, facilitate the comprehension of these dynamics. Suggestions for improving public policy governance involve promoting openness, accountability, and stakeholder participation.

Keywords: *Public Policy, Governance, Interest Groups, Political Parties, Ideology*

INTRODUCTION

Public policy development and implementation are critical components of global governance, intimately linking the acts of many political actors and institutions to shape the fabric of societies around the world. Understanding the subtle interplay between these entities is critical for understanding how political regimes create, implement, and uphold regulations that control various aspects of public life.

This article delves deeply into the diverse responsibilities that legislative bodies, executive authority, judiciaries, and non-governmental organizations play in the control of public policy. We strive to understand the complicated dynamics of policy-making processes and the complex relationships that underpin governance structures.

Our analysis begins by examining the duties and compositions of legislative bodies in various political systems, including unicameral councils, bicameral assemblies, and centralized to federalist institutions. By diving into the responsibilities and powers given in these organizations, we seek to highlight their importance in enacting laws and regulations that reflect the values and ambitions of the societies they represent.

We also look at executive power, namely how presidents, prime ministers, governors, and administrative agencies influence policy development and implementation. we aim to discern the strategies through which executive leaders wield influence and navigate the complexities of governance.

Furthermore, our study looks on the influence of judiciaries on public policy outcomes, particularly in places like the United States, where judicial authority wields significant power. We aim to shed light on the complex relationship between legal interpretation and policy creation by examining key court decisions and their implications for policymaking.

In addition to that, we investigate how non-governmental organizations, such as interest groups, pressure groups, and political parties, influence the development and implementation of public policy. We seek to understand how these organizations shape policy agendas and impact decision-making processes by examining their advocacy and lobbying efforts.

In conclusion, this study seeks to improve our understanding of the mechanisms that drive public policy governance, as well as the implications for governance and society. By drawing on empirical research and theoretical frameworks, we hope to shed light on the complex dynamics of policy-making processes, as well as guide future research and practical applications targeted at enhancing societal well-being and fostering informed decision-making in public policy.

Research Questions

1. When creating, implementing, and assessing public policy, governments should examine the complex interaction of ideology, technology, and politics to enhance well-being. How can equilibrium and adaptability be integrated?
2. What are the main characteristics of public policy and how does the purposeful process of policy creation affect its stages, from conception to review, taking into account changing societal demands, political aims, legal requirements, and external influences What influences public problem management in this changing environment?

3. How do various political actors, including legislative bodies, executive authorities (such as presidents, prime ministers, and governors), courts, and non-governmental entities (such as interest groups, pressure groups, and political parties), function within different political systems, and what role do they collectively play in shaping public policy formulation and implementation?

Public Policy Concept

Public policy is government action to address social concerns and attain goals. It entails developing, executing, and evaluating public health, well-being, and social policies. Healthcare, education, environmental protection, and economic regulation may be covered.

Public policies affect social, political, economic, and other aspects of life. Major social challenges are addressed by government policies.

Thomas Dye describes public policy as the government's deliberate actions and inactions to address a problem. Public policy involves government action and inaction. Some scholars describe public policy as government actions that address social and political needs Gerston, 2014).

Lasswell defines it as the entity that acquires, times, and directs resources or benefits. Through priority-setting public policies, the state oversees the economy. Public policies are the concepts and procedures that allow the government to define future goals to increase common welfare (Lasswell, 2017).

Public policy and public administration are interconnected, with policy outputs impacting the other. Society is tied to State policy-implementing institutions and their creators.

The public good is served by public policies, which are "governmental actions or decisions necessary for implementing programs to achieve political, economic, and social goals." The private and public sectors review them to understand and express the government's intentions.

Governments choose and implement laws, rules, decrees, plans, acts, and conduct to run societies (Lascoumes& Le Galès, 2007). Public policy is usually made by governments. Executive regulations, ordinances, and decrees with legislative bodies show this engagement. Executive departments then clarify these rules with precise instructions and processes (Bengston, et al., 2004).

A nation's local government enforces compliance among persons and organizations through public policy (Blair, 2000). Public policy is government law that affects society (Majone, 1997). Public policy is a collection of intellectual movements that the government uses to attain its goals. Public policy can provide transportation networks to deliver numerous community services (Litman, 2015).

According to University of Texas Department of Policy Studies head James Andersen, public policy is "a deliberate course of action undertaken by individuals or groups in order to effectively tackle a problem or handle a certain subject or topic" (Anderson, 2010).

The famous American comparative policy scientist Gabriel Almond believes public policy is the result of a complex process. The state provides strategic inputs and foundations to meet vital needs. Implementing public policy involves support, resources, fiscal concerns, and government decisions. Policies achieve strategic plans' objectives. Performance management aids strategic planning and policy development by monitoring and evaluating policy execution. Public policymaking involves resource allocation and political system actors' actions.

Policymaking is influenced by political culture, social and economic conditions, and formal and informal forces (Almond, 1990).

Policymaking is tied to State Establishment and the Governmental System, Which Uses Government Institutions

This alliance was vital after WWII and many countries' independence. These conditions allowed the government to devise methods that effectively implemented its programs, stressing its role in civilizing and protecting people. Scholar Lasswell introduced public policy in the second half of the 20th century (Plant, 2007).

Analyze the Logic for a Policy

A thorough strategic plan may seem enough for the government to fulfill its aims, but it is not. Annual planning cannot establish all the policies needed to implement the strategic plan. Policy design, consultation, implementation, and adjustment must extend beyond annual planning (John, 2013). The state's vision, Executive Council initiatives, societal demands, strategic plans, federal mandates, legal provisions, public or customer pressures, international initiatives, the need for a new policy, external events or a dynamic environment with technological advancements, adjustments to other departments' policies,

Policies are defined by Their Traits

These traits are needed to assess policies

1.3.1. Public policy serves residents' needs and protects their rights to improve the nation. Everyone must recognize that public policy impacts them.

1.3.2. Public policy requires meticulous planning and execution to attain its aims.

1.3.3. Public policy achieves goals with human, natural, and industrial resources.

1.3.4. Government agencies must be coordinated and assigned tasks to implement public policy.

1.3.5. Each policy goal includes criteria for success.

1.3.6. The requirement applies regardless of engagement.

1.3.7. With clear objectives and actions, the process is complicated.

1.3.8. The technique yields practical findings and suggests future timelines.

1.3.9. Improves capabilities or resources (Rotmans, et al., 2001).

Social sciences and humanities, notably politics and government administration, emphasize decision-making. Political scientists and academics, especially in developed nations, are interested in models, procedures, and theoretical frameworks that simplify institutional decision-making and execution. They look for realistic techniques and concepts employed by administrators and politicians in important situations. Political science has also benefited from behavioral sciences' decision-making and organizational behavior analysis methods. Official and informal government agencies consult on policies. Government programs efficiently implement these policies (Cerna, 2013). This complicated process seeks political and social change.

Public Policy Stages

Government agencies stage policy design, implementation, and evaluation.

Public policy begins with identifying its type for society. Political plans, implementation resources, and social conditions are linked.

Politics are used to implement public policy. This strategy uses current resources and specifies explicit expectations and possibilities to create and implement public policy.

Public policy proposals are implemented in society through all political acts.

Public policy follow-up and evaluation, the final step of the policy cycle, ensures effective implementation and corrects errors (Soule& King, 2006).

Public policy involves multiple steps. Problem definition precedes political agenda setting or public policy scheduling. Public policies are established, accepted, and authorized in stage four. Fifth, execute these policies; sixth, evaluate their efficacy.

Policymakers in the public sector design and implement policies. Lawmakers, executives, administrative agencies, and judges are involved. Political parties, media lobbyists, and citizens affect policy (Golden& Moreland-Russell, 2016).

The says all parties—policy players and implementers—must participate in public policy formation and execution to succeed. It's challenging to identify major challenges that demand public policies and design and implement them without values. Remember that poor policymaking produces poor policy results (Box, 2014). Public policymaking involves public and institutional values needed by government officials to implement policies. Long-term labor strategies should incorporate short-term public measures to offset specific issues, obstacles, or reforms, whether administrative or economic. Implementers and policymakers must consider this. Long-term government programs take time. Policymakers often lack competence and ask the public for solutions. They may not understand public interest. Short-term policies are needed to mitigate the problem's immediate effects. Policies that foster good values can help public policymakers (Thacher& Rein, 2004).

Policies are at Stake

When societal needs change and communities are unhappy, public policymaking is difficult. Smith (1964: 604) argues people seek government aid to alleviate their pain. Policymakers should address crime, unemployment, inflation, epidemics and diseases, agricultural pests, environmental degradation, food scarcity, transportation infrastructure issues, roadway congestion (Smith, 1964), inadequate public services, pervasive corruption, and favoritism. Due to public sensitivity, some issues require extensive investigation and analysis to resolve. An entity's social or political groups can impact civilization.

Problem: unmet desires and comprehensible values that government can address or attain (Michelman, 1979). Several analytical methods can also help comprehend and solve the problem. It is important to note that public problem resolution professionals often struggle to provide successful policy solutions. Their inability to recognize public issue causes is the key reason (Head & Alford, 2013). Accurate problem definitions usually yield accurate solutions. Knowing the condition helps prescribe the proper treatment. Professionals develop and assess public policy. These issues are viewed as problems because their results are visible. Businesses and governments have "frequent absences or high turnover rates". Some mistake these outcomes for the problem, neglecting the reasons of absenteeism or job departure in public enterprises.

Public policies are complex, making it hard to agree on their parts, causes, and solutions. The difficulties include inflation, deflation, unemployment, crime, poverty, pollution, and others. People having a vested interest, concern, or specialized knowledge often have different views on these and similar problems than the public. Some regard these issues as public issues that need answers, whereas others consider them as personal ideals and wants, denying their public nature. Some say technological and cultural improvements make it inherent in modern cultures. They say this state doesn't need attention, resources, or organization (Furtado, et al., 2015). Some perceive it as a societal issue that impacts everyone and requires realistic solutions to address big issues, yet this project depends on multiple elements, including Examine pollution from economic, administrative, social, and health perspectives. Industrial chimney gasses and car exhaust pollute the air. Poor waste disposal and contaminated river and stream discharge also contribute to this environmental issue (Kolawole & Iyiola, 2023).

Policymakers cannot solve all problems without clear definitions. This issue causes anxiety in each community, leading to lawbreaking.

This means public policymakers select topics depending on their importance and impact on major social groups. Thus, some citizens may live in an insufficient environment without criticizing or campaigning for improvements because they are happy with their life or believe they cannot alter society. Since the issue has not been collectively demanded or defined as a government problem, our definition excludes it. Clear communication with government authorities is essential (Head, 2010).

Another question needs answering: Does the problem arise from individuals impacted or from others? Indeed, non-affected parties can make demands or issue (Al-Dulaimi & Al-Taai, 2021). Policymakers often focus on these concerns. To solve concerns like increasing groundwater levels or traffic accidents, newspaper editors, interest groups, and politicians may build massive networks (Fraussen, et al., 2021). These issues become critical and require care, often beyond residents' or traffic accident victims' concerns. Characteristics of public policy issues help identify them from others:

Reciprocity links governmental policies and their issues. Interconnected policies form a system.

Public policies are shaped by policymakers, analysts, and experts' experiences and perspectives. This subjective aspect strongly impacts public policy interpretation, evaluation, and solution. These folks interpret subjects based on their personality and preferences.

Public policy challenges originate from individual or group actions in any situation, including human congregations. Public policy challenges are "dynamic" because they have multiple solutions, making it impossible to identify boundaries or prescribe a particular treatment (Korol, et al., 2023).

Classifying Public Policy Issues

Comprehensiveness, resources, and breadth are the best ways to identify problems from requirements. Comprehensiveness classifies these difficulties as specific or generic. Personal or community challenges are special obstacles. Personal concerns do not affect others (Swinkels, 2020). Without drug availability, just the individual suffers. Employment termination and dismissal only effect the affected worker. General difficulties touch many people. As more people are affected, policymakers and implementers must address these challenges. The instance shows how a significant number of people refusing medication might

scare the public. Terminating enough public or private personnel may take them from privacy to inclusivity, making the topic a public concern.

Remember that personal matters can become public as the number of affected persons rises. People who sympathize. A parent's complaint to the Directorate of Education or their district representative in the National Assembly about a teacher physically disciplining their child in class is unlikely to address the matter. Because policymakers don't care. This father might convince the remaining followers' parents that their children would be physically punished. If people don't act and one person persuades them, gets their support and empathy, and submits a memorandum on behalf of the group to the media and relevant government agencies to inform policymakers, the issue becomes a public issue.

Resource allocation splits problems into three categories. As stated by Lowi (1964: 682)

1.5.1. Distributional issues concern resource allocation to individuals, organizations, or regions. Examples include a city's flood management, water scarcity, importers' demands for lower customs tariffs and local producers' demands for higher taxes.

1.5.2. Managing public initiatives, reducing external influence, and stopping them are organizational issues. Businesses and manufacturers want trade unions to be less powerful.

1.5.3. Redistribution difficulties include transferring resources between areas or allocating resources within an area to improve social fairness and reduce inequalities. As an example. The proposed system transfers skilled labor from the capital city to other governorates and university professors, experts, doctors, and engineers to needy universities, regions, and organizations. Build industries to address unemployment or joblessness in specific areas (Bache, 2007). Income disparity could be reduced via progressive taxation, these are some possible strategies, they can be divided into two groups based on their extent:

- Internal challenges include issues affecting state residents, such as health, education, security, taxation, transportation, communication, environmental concerns, agriculture, and others.

- External challenges originate from a state's contacts with other nations, notably neighbors. Rivers, international waters, maritime navigation, territorial borders, fishing rights in seas, international rivers, and smuggling are among these issues (Sadowski, 2010).

Policy Priorities

Despite its material, human, and economic resources, no state or government can satisfy all its inhabitants' wants or address all their problems. Addressing the most critical concerns requires a priority system. To address population demands, a political agenda ranks problems by importance, urgency, and impact on affected groups or individuals (Peters, 2020). Several issues or demands are neglected and not prioritized, while others are embraced and subject to trade-offs. Politics dictate issue prioritization. This study's introduction mentioned this. Thus, the agenda's main focus: Government agendas list concerns, challenges, and societal demands that must be addressed. Various legislative, executive, judicial, and municipal government tables exist. It changes with perspective and position. Parliaments may prioritize differently from executive and judicial entities. Governorates and regions may have various goals. Each entity is distinguished by its content, precedence, and methodologies for discussing priorities. Public sessions of parliamentary bodies, which include public representatives, and media channels that broadcast speeches and statements by legislative, executive, and judicial branch members, local governments, and relevant government officials disseminate this information. The following variables frequently prioritize concerns and requests:

2.1. Government agencies must do more to stop elites from compromising their interests for others and inspiring them to realign (DFID, 2011). Domestic producers actively press the government for customs tariffs to decrease import competition.

2.2. To win public favor, political party leaders aim to match popular desires and transmit them to legislators. Government leaders may share goals (Everingham, et al., 2011).

2.3. Urgency, extensive impact, and severe penalties of neglect make issues or demands important. This requires prioritizing these concerns in the hierarchy and acting fast. Severe rains, floods, earthquakes, and acute epidemics and infectious diseases are major issues (Du, 2010).

2.4. Political opposition or professional strikes like port workers, fire brigades, and miners may affect public policy. They raise awareness and put their needs on public policy agendas (Lipsky, Michael: 1968: 54).

2.5. Written, aural, and visual media successfully communicate issues and requests to public policy makers, assuring their priority on critical matters (Carlsson, 2019).

Not all public issues and demands reach public policymakers or make it onto their priority agendas due to several variables, such as:

2.5.1. Policymakers and implementers may disagree on specific demands or concerns.

2.5.2. Group influence on government institutions, mass media, and political parties, especially in growing nations with multiple nationalities and religions (Bawn, et al., 2012).

2.5.3. Lack of information, awareness, and political/social development hinders people's ability to understand issues, formulate concerns, and communicate them to stakeholders. Many rural and village people in developing nations struggle to communicate their difficulties to urban residents or other relevant parties (Bertot, et al., 2012).

2.5.4. Public policies include both government actions and regulations, as well as omissions or abstentions in legislation.

Political Leaders

Public policy makers create and implement public policies, there are two main sorts of public policymakers:

A- organizations and formal or informal groups.

B- Government-established political parties (Popoola, 2016).

Firstly: It is important to consider official government agencies as a primary source of information. These people have authority to make public policy. They include legislative, executive, and judicial branch members and government agency administrators. Their engagement in public policymaking and decision-making may vary.

According to procedures, official parties are divided into several groups:

The Legislature

As the official government entity that passes laws, rules, and statutes, the legislative authority is crucial. It defines rules that govern political, economic, social, health, and other aspects of state life. The development, role, and impact of legislative authority on public policymaking vary substantially between countries (Carmona, 2017). Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, Russia, and others have single legislative councils. In this arrangement, a single chamber represents all

citizens and political parties and has legislative power. Canada, Britain, and the US use bicameral systems. The Houses of Commons and Lords make up the legislative branch in the UK, although other nations have similar institutions. France, Syria, Egypt, and Libya have centralized legislative power. This legislative body might be unicameral or bicameral. The fundamental duty of this institution is to promulgate rules, enact legislation, and make laws in accordance with the state constitution. Popular social norms are durable and stable. Federalism can also be seen in nation-states like the United States or republics like the Soviet Union (El Amrani, 2010). The legislative body in these systems is divided into federal and regional institutions. The first is creating national policies that regard the federal state. The second factor involves regional or state lawmaking to ensure fair and impartial representation in the initial legislative body.

Several recent studies have examined how European legislatures shape public policy. This research shows that legislators' roles vary by political system. This examination explores the power of political elites, parties, and interest groups, as well as the executive branch's ability to represent a single party or a coalition. The ruling majority party dominates the decision-making process, making the British House of Commons less effective at shaping public policy (Grant, 2021). Furthermore, a substantial portion of House of Commons members also hold positions within the executive branch, thereby limiting the chamber's role to primarily discussing matters related to the qualifications and employment of its members. In contrast, the United States Congress, particularly through its various committees, plays a more prominent role in shaping the overall policies of the federal government (Rockman,1984).

Executive Authority Includes Government Bureaucrats from Various Organizations, Bodies, Committees and Administrative Agencies.

These entities generally implement public policies, although they also shape them. Executive authority is important now because public policy development and implementation depend on executive leadership (Anderson, 2009). In some presidential systems, the President of the Republic oversees both the executive and legislative processes. Many developing nations use this structure. The US President uses interventionist powers to prevent rival committees and partisan factions in Congress from disrupting program and policy approval. The US President can participate in public policymaking via the Foreign Trade Regulation, which grants wide tariff authority. The Economic Stability Regulation of 1870 and goods importation are discussed. In addition to constitutional powers over diplomatic and military matters, the president was given broad price-regulating authorities to reduce inflation. It is no surprise that the president shapes American foreign policy (Litwak, 2000). Ghana, Thailand, Syria, Algeria, and others have prime ministers who shape their foreign policies (Basrur, 2017). Governors at the state and local levels have similar responsibilities to the President of the Republic. Their duties include creating and implementing state or governorate public policy.

Public administrative bodies and their committees often formulate and debate public policies, influencing their implementation. These bureaucratic institutions help implement such policies. Some believe these agencies can slow decisions, whereas others disagree (Krause, 2009). Legislative authorities sometimes delegate responsibilities to administrative organizations due to the complexity of issues and demands that require technical knowledge in policy creation. This delegation is typically attributed to legislators' lack technical knowledge. Administrative entities are tasked with creating public policies and making decisions that affect society in areas including military, pollution, highways, international relations, and more (Tannenwald, 1997).

Courts—National, Regional, or Local—In Governorates, Regions, and States are Called "Judicial Authority".

The legal system creates, interprets, and evaluates laws and regulations for constitutionality. Additionally, it can rule on government infringements against people. The judicial system enforces the law, resolves disputes, and adjudicates numerous infractions and transgressions in addition to maintaining justice. In some governing systems, like the US Supreme Court, the judiciary shapes public policy. When offered for advise before voting in the US Congress, this court reviews legal regulations. If these regulations violate the federal constitution or statutes, the Supreme Court may change or nullify them. Congress is cautious when handling subjects that may be challenged in court for constitutionality or illegality. The US judiciary has influenced economic policies in areas like property disputes, contractual matters, and worker-labor union relations and factory owner relations (Simon, et al., 2019).

Germany, Canada, the UK, and Australia have followed the US's lead. In developing nations, the judiciary's role in policymaking is limited (Pratt, 1993).

Government agencies must be accountable for public policy development and implementation through strong judicial monitoring. This monitoring prevents administrative arbitrariness by annulling unjust administrative decisions against citizens and compensating damages.

Second: Non-Governmental Entities Public policy development goes beyond official entities and authorities. Additional non-governmental (informal) entities impact policymakers and

implementers. These include pressure groups, political parties, and people' opinions. These organizations affect public policymaking (Roy, 2013).

Interest, Advocacy and Pressure Groups Shape Public Policy. This Group Usually Represents Sector Interests.

Pressure groups are groups of people with similar goals, attributes, or features that petition decision-makers to meet their requirements (Becker, 1983). These groups influence decisions to benefit themselves. Federation of Industries, Chambers of Commerce, and Bar Association are professional associations. Trade unions, churches, corporations, and banks. These groups want decision-makers to prioritize their issues and follow public policy to advance their goals and interests. Power and influence come from their complex and linked interactions with politicians (ILO, 2010).

Public policymakers and these groups must interact well informally and formally. It permits quick and effective communication of their requirements and convincing argument for public policy initiatives and regulations. Better-organized, well-funded, and strategically led groups influence public policy more than less organized groups with fewer resources and opportunity. The likelihood of favorable decisions depends on a group's social position, coherence, competition, government responsiveness to their requests, political system decision-making process, and other elements. Interest groups originate, gather, and spread demands and support public policy alternatives that benefit them. They also give implementers objective, confirmed data about their subjects, especially technological ones. Thus, they add rationale to public policy (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). This group influences public policy in various countries and political systems using various means. Involve their representatives in regulatory and policy talks. Influencing public opinion to mobilize legislative and executive authorities or reduce resistance to their goals (Murphy, 2009).

Democratic Systems Depend on Political Parties. These Organizations are Founded by People with Similar Political Views.

Party is a political body with lasting qualities and a power plan. It has also been described as a group having particular relationships, shared interests, and authority goals. Pomper (1992) defines the political party as an informal social entity formed by a group in response to circumstances and time. Community political leadership may be one of its key purposes. Many modern political systems worldwide follow a consistent pattern, regardless of political party philosophy. First, authority controls national politics. The opposition, which operates outside the political system, closely monitors the first group's operations and highlights any perceived flaws (Deschouwer, 2006). The opposition wants to shift public opinion against the administration to garner support for its programs. Public and commercial media and electoral campaigns propagate these ideas and policies. Multiparty systems exist in France, Lebanon, India, Pakistan, Argentina, Canada, Federal Germany, etc.

Single-party nations like China, the former Soviet Union, and others don't trust many parties. The ruling party controls the legislative, executive, and judicial institutions in these countries. Thus, he manages these government agencies and formulates public policy. However, some countries have other factions or organizations that manipulate public mood covertly to achieve their goals. The government faces enormous pressure to meet these political parties' demands and issues, which often reflect public interests.

Political parties represent public opinion, assist policymaking, unite interests, socialize people, and legitimate governance. Political parties can affect policy beyond totalitarianism. Political parties advocate for public interests during governance, mobilize public opinion, and persuade people to influence government decisions. Political parties influence public policy. First, they renew or change power, then set policies. The ruling party's philosophy and intelligence guide this course. Political parties, regardless of power, usually observe each other. Government policy is closely monitored by opposition parties. The ruling parties justify the government's actions to convince the public they serve the public benefit (Burstein & Linton, 2002). Political parties advocate public or inclusive policies, unlike interest groups. Interest groups focus on member-preferred issues (Allern, 2010).

Political parties influence public policy internally and externally. Political parties influence legislators through popular pressure. In multi-party democratic systems like Turkey or India or one-party states like China and the former Soviet Union, political parties dominate the three arms of government and influence public policy. Citizen opinion substantially influences certain areas of society.

Citizens' preferences impact public policy, especially in authoritarian or dictatorial nations (Norris, 2011). Medieval administrations respected their subjects' opinions and handled specific issues to prevent discontent and social unrest despite their brutal rule. The individual's great willingness to meet customer requirements and implement them into production tactics in the final years before their downfall shows how regimes, regardless of kind, respond to public discontent. Public opinion may not represent the majority. An individual or small group's opinion on a demand or issue in a certain environment and time may be shown. Contact and discourse may transmit this stance to public opinion.

Public opinion affects policymaking two ways: Public opinion controls government and policies. The second issue is that some public policymakers and implementers fear taking unpopular stances (Glynn & Ostman,1988).

Almond argues public opinion sets ideals, standards, and expectations for democratic societies' policies. Specialized groups create these policies at decision-making institutions. As public opinion representatives, citizens choose and are affected by government policy. Public leaders must examine public opinion trends and expectations for fundamental issue resolution (Almond & Coleman, 2015). These tendencies influence policymakers' views of decisions and policies' success or failure. In democracies, competing parties incorporate residents' concerns into their plans to win votes. Scientists, sociologists, economists, politicians, and other noteworthy figures impact public policymakers' views and decisions throughout policy formation and execution. Martin Luther King's 1960 civil rights struggle for African Americans illustrates this (Anderson, 2013).

Public policy impacts external players and official and non-official bodies. IBDR, OPEC, the UN Security Council, and the Atomic Energy Organization are foreign actors. Important states and international organizations like the EU and the Council of the Arab League can also affect this. Actors impact many situations. Turkey enacted adjustments to meet EU membership requirements. The US and its allies also militarily changed Afghanistan and Iraq. OPEC affects member oil production and pricing. The victorious Allies imposed military policies on West Germany and Japan following WWII. The examples explain how actors affect different sectors (Viennet & Pont, 2017).

Theoretical Framework

Public policy and governance cover many topics and theories. Understanding public policy formation and implementation demands a good grasp of its fundamentals and theory.

This study studies public policy—government acts, policies, and efforts to address social issues and achieve goals. Political actors' and stakeholders' values, priorities, and interests impact public policy, which advances governance and society. Governments include laws, institutions, and processes. Government, non-government, civil society, and others shape and implement policies.

These theories help analyze public policy and governance:

Institutionalism holds that formal and informal institutions affect politics. Institutionalist public policy relies on legislative, executive, and judicial cooperation to create, implement, and enforce policies. This framework addresses policymaking norms, methods, and outcomes. Organizations should assess cost-benefit, according to Rational Choice Theory. For maximum utility, government officials, interest groups, and voters support policies that represent their preferences and interests. Rational choice theory describes policymaking through actor incentives and limitations. The advocacy coalition framework examines interest groups, coalitions, and subsystems' public policy implications. This paradigm views policymaking as conflict and negotiation between coalitions of players with different goals and attitudes. By studying coalition interactions and policy outcomes, the advocacy coalition paradigm illuminates policymaking. Political processes theory links governance and public policy to different subsystems and participants. This paradigm explains policy outcomes with feedback loops, complexity, and adaptation. Systems theory examines governance structure dynamics through policy system component interactions.

These theoretical perspectives and frameworks examine how legislatures, executive authorities, courts, and NGOs affect public policy. We study fundamental ideas and theoretical advancements to understand government.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative research approach to examine how political actors influence public policy. Qualitative approaches are ideal for studying complex social phenomena and gathering governance stakeholders' different perspectives and experiences.

Data Collection Methods

Literature review, document analysis, and case study analysis collect data. A comprehensive literature review covers public policy, governance, legislative, executive, judicial, and non-governmental duties. To comprehend policymaking, document analysis analyzes policy papers, legislative records, judicial opinions, and other sources. To assist people, understand governance, case studies show essential principles and processes in real life. Qualitative data analysis methods, such as thematic and content analysis, are used to analyze acquired data. Thematic analysis identifies data themes, patterns, and linkages to discover essential elements influencing public policy formulation and implementation. Content analysis codes and categorizes textual material to uncover trends, contradictions, and important findings.

Data Sources and Sample Selection

Purposive sampling selects documents, cases, and examples relevant to study objectives. Academic publications, government papers, policy documents, court rulings, and other public policy and governance authorities provide data. Using case studies from different political systems and circumstances provides a complete understanding of governance dynamics.

Although accuracy and validity were addressed, this study had considerable limitations. Secondary data sources may reduce information and analytical depth, limiting findings. Qualitative research provides valuable insights but may be context-specific, making them difficult to generalize across political contexts. This study acknowledges these limits and uses a rigorous approach to data gathering and analysis to illuminate public policy governance. However, the study has drawbacks. It may not include all policymaking factors, requiring further research. Despite these constraints, the findings emphasize stakeholder engagement, transparent communication, and adaptation in policymaking.

RESULTS

This analysis illuminates the complex roles of legislatures, executive power, judiciary, and non-governmental actors in public policy regulation. Legislative bodies in different political systems make laws, set policies, and follow constitutional principles. Institutional structure and political party dominance affect legislative effectiveness. Executive authorities intervene in policymaking, negotiate approval, and address social issues. Comparative examination shows that executive authority varies across political system, emphasizing the complex relationship between leadership and governance. Courts' legal interpretations keep the government accountable, protect constitutional ideals, and shape policy. Their rulings affect politics and society, especially in the US. Through lobbying and mobilization, non-governmental organizations like interest groups and political parties shape policy. Ideology and technology shape policy importance and efficacy, stressing the need for flexible policy frameworks. This study illuminates the complex relationships between political players and institutions, helping us understand governance processes that shape policy outcomes in numerous political circumstances.

The study shows how politicians and institutions affect policy, emphasizing the need of understanding government procedures. Strong legislative procedures, executive leadership,

judicial supervision, and civil society involvement in policy formation are crucial. The research underlines the importance of well-regulated governing systems that prioritize transparency, responsibility, and adaptation to society demands and wants. Examining inconsistencies and unexpected outcomes shows how complex governance methods are, needing socially relevant policy responses. Complex governance dynamics theories and literature support this study's findings. Institutionalism, pluralism, and elite theory contextualize political systems and their evolution.

Discussion

4.1. Public Policy Analysis: The integrated model

Public policy analysis includes a foundational and updated framework for collective interventions in various sectors, the government's methods and mechanisms, the necessary information and methodological processes in policy formulation, and the outcomes, evaluation, and monitoring of these policies (Dunn, 2015).

4.1.1. Variables affecting public policy:

First, peripheral variables include a variety of human and natural material components arranged into diverse modalities. These variables are assessed for sufficiency, efficiency, adaptability, homogeneity, and balance, focusing on human resources. It's important to distinguish between the adequacy constraints needed to define the system's core prerequisites and those needed to assess its capabilities and ability to accomplish its necessary operations.

The abundance and variety of natural resources raises various questions: Does their diversity help achieve integration conditions?

Concerning human resources, how diverse are their skills and experience?

Ability to meet functional integration criteria (Room, 2011).

The importance of resources for management and development depends on development policies. Determine whether these policies cover medium- and long-term development or just annual programs. Do these plans cover all industries or just some? This is crucial because comprehensive development programs that focus on whole well-being raise material resource demand.

Second, intermediate variables are fundamental to programming and calculation. These variables contain temporary values or intermediate results during program execution (Sharma, 1998).

Modern societies have changed due to the industrial and technological revolutions. These changes have caused a significant divide between the center and political parties, threatening democratic procedures and the center's ability to regulate the situation. Thus, this threatens public policy efficacy and safety. Democratic studies emphasize the importance of direct contact between the central authority and its peripheral units. This method is essential for organizing and communicating information. Engaging with the peripheral helps the central authority comprehend these entities' operations and advancements (Gerring& Thacker, 2008).

The proximity of parties to power centers, official organizational structures, or events like disasters or demonstrations that directly reflect their demands impact these decisions and policies. The authority's direct acceptance of these demands also depends on the system's democracy. One must understand the medium's decision-making variables to understand a communication channel's role and elimination. This medium controls the flow of incoming

information, deciding whether to transmit it or not and whether to alter it. The medium can also affect whether communication is immediate or delayed (Lee, et al., 2023).

Are inputs switched automatically and directly? Should we create specific channels for these encounters, develop and clarify the ideas, and then give them to the central authority for dissemination? What would be the expected function adjustment and correlation of such channels? This occurrence or existence may have what consequences?

The primary catalysts that establish connections among the components of interaction within this process, which manifest as channels of communication and structure the interaction process, are crucial to the developmental process and align with political dynamics. Simple description of these engines:

1- Political parties gather people with similar views and goals. Democratic systems depend on them to allow citizens to engage in:

2. Compression forces

3. Bureaucracy and municipal governance.

4- different media outlets.

5- public opinion, which is the public's views on a subject. It is essential to democracy (Fischer & Miller, 2017).

Political parties have two main functions, regardless of their characteristics:

1- Political parties are essential for political and social engagement.

2- Dual communication functions between the central authority and other parties as a key political catalyst and public opinion vehicle (Parsons, 1963).

The political authority's role is vital in shaping political results. This authority's strengths and weaknesses depend on the party system (Rose & Miller, 2010).

Pressure organizations convey various interests and demands to the government. Pressure organizations also influence public opinion and mobilize stakeholders to support or oppose government policy.

Third: Integrative factors affect the entire system, including other systems. These variables are interrelated and can affect the system. Ideology and technology are integrative variables (Commuri & Ekici, 2008).

Ideology and technology are systemic and linked to society.

Technology allows society to regulate the natural world.

While there is no common definition of ideology, it can be broadly defined as a framework of reasoned ideas and conceptions that aims to explain complex social phenomena and eliminate political and social inequities for excluded groups.

The cognitive process of articulating a given social stratum's underlying interests and priorities is another perspective. Different thoughts and perspectives exist on the relationship between these two events. A substitutionary relationship, where one phenomenon replaces the other, is debated. Thus, several issues need elucidation. The two events are dialectically related. Existence of one entity presupposes another. How does one adjust to new and renewed transformation (Fischer& Miller, 2017)?

Technology has become society's cognitive framework, with each instance containing a dynamic feature. The practical process assumes that ideology is linked to the system's moral and value framework and technology to cognitive progress. The technology revolution has presented enormous challenges to varied social systems, whether free or dictatorial, modern, or backward. These issues mostly emerge as a deep separation between cultural and value formation, and material and cognitive development. This divide shows the former's relative backwardness and inability to keep up with the latter's progress (Koford, 1983).

Two Approaches can be used to Examine Ideology, Technology and Politics

1. Individuals and public politics.
2. The Political Process Connection

Free capitalism has emerged from Western nations' industrial shift. This change has affected many aspects of society and led to conflicting views.

Regarding the association with the political process, a comprehensive examination of the matter reveals three primary perspectives:

- Input angle and basic forms
- The angle of the compressive forces (authority).
- Output angle and feedback

The theory emphasizes ideological and technological factors in political and social dynamics. How these occurrences connect is critical, emphasizing the need for ideological adaptation that accepts technological rationality. Technology must also retain a moral influence that balances varied social systems (Benkler, 2022).

The role of ideology in administration and development presents several questions. Ideology significantly shapes the systemic development process (Hawkesworth, 1988). It is unclear if any philosophy can produce different results. Is a philosophy that can do this alone necessary?

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study found that public politicians must understand residents' needs and efficiently allocate few resources to overcome hurdles. Political parties, interest groups, elites, and the public all participate in public policymaking, making it complicated. The multi-step process identifies needs, prioritizes options, and chooses policies that address them.

This study emphasizes the complexity and diversity of public policy analysis and policymakers' vital role in navigating it. These principles are crucial for improving public policy creation, implementation, and assessment and ensuring they meet evolving societal and technological needs.

This study reveals the complicated interactions between peripheral and central factors in public policy creation. The complex nature of public policy and governance makes this resource essential for policymakers, researchers, and others. It also lays the groundwork for important discussions on the complex relationship between ideology and technology in the ever-changing socio-political environment.

This work enhances public policy and political science by illuminating the various dynamics that shape policymaking. I suggest distributing this material to scholarly institutions, research groups, and decision-makers to encourage further discussion and exploration of the ideas presented. Future research could also include empirical case studies that demonstrate these

characteristics in real-world settings. Practical examples would improve policymaking and implementation. Taking in consideration these suggestions:

- Complete factor understanding: Policymakers should evaluate natural and human resources' sufficiency, efficacy, and inclusion. Understanding the issue helps establish and implement successful policies.
- Political leaders must promote central-peripheral communication. Understanding local needs, wants, and concerns requires transparent and accessible communication, enabling more democratic and effective policymaking.
- Political parties are crucial for central government-local communication. Political parties present leaders and improve communication, making them crucial for political participation.
- Value of Technology and Ideology Flexibility. Understand how ideology and technology effect social and material growth. Being relevant in a changing world needs adaptability.
- In development, ideology is crucial for equilibrium. Ideology is vital to systemic orientation. However, it is crucial to establish if a single ideology is needed or if a holistic approach could fulfill many societal goals.
- Improving Legislative Oversight: Governments should increase legislative oversight capabilities. This includes giving parliamentarians enough resources and training to review policy proposals and keep the executive branch responsible.
- Promoting Executive Accountability: Executive authorities should improve policy development and execution openness and accountability. Civil society organizations, public involvement, and independent oversight may be needed.
- To ensure the judiciary's role in maintaining the rule of law and constitutional rights, governments should safeguard its independence. Merit and honesty should determine judicial selections, not politics.
- Encourage civil society engagement: Interest groups and advocacy organizations should be encouraged to participate in policymaking. Governments should facilitate civil society-decision-maker dialogue.
- Fostering International Cooperation: Global concerns are becoming more intertwined, making international cooperation crucial for policy success. Countries should work with international organizations and other nations to handle transnational concerns including climate change, migration, and economic development.
- Technological Innovation: Policymakers should use technology to improve governance and service delivery. Data analytics, digital platforms, and e-governance technologies may improve policy results and public service delivery.
- Promote Policy Flexibility: Policy frameworks should adapt to changing social and technological needs. Flexible and adaptable policy measures can help governments address new challenges and opportunities.

Governments can improve public policy governance's efficacy, transparency, and inclusivity by following these principles, improving society's outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Dulaimi, W. A. M., & Al-Taai, S. H. H. (2021). Pollution and its Impact on Sustainable Development. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 790, No. 1, p. 012025). IOP Publishing.

2. Allern, E. H. (2010). *Political parties and interest groups in Norway*. ECPR press.

3. Almond, G. A. (1990). A discipline divided: Schools and sects in political science (Vol. 175). Sage.

4. Almond, G. A., & Coleman, J. S. (Eds.). (2015). The politics of the developing areas. Princeton University Press.

5. Anderson, C. B. (2013). The trouble with unifying narratives: African Americans and the Civil Rights Movement in US history content standards. The Journal of Social Studies Research, 37(2), 111-120.

6. Anderson, C. J. (2009). The private consequences of public policies: active labor market policies and social ties in Europe. European Political Science Review, 1(3), 341-373.

7. Anderson, J. E. (2010). Public Policymaking (7th ed.). Cengage Learning. ISBN: 0618974725, 9780618974726

8. Bache, I. (2007). The politics of redistribution. Handbook of European Union Politics, 395-412.

9. Basrur, R. (2017). Modi's foreign policy fundamentals: a trajectory unchanged. International Affairs, 93(1), 7-26.

10. Bawn, K., Cohen, M., Karol, D., Masket, S., Noel, H., & Zaller, J. (2012). A theory of political parties: Groups, policy demands and nominations in American politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, *10*(3), 571-597.

11. Becker, G. S. (1983). A theory of competition among pressure groups for political influence. The quarterly journal of economics, 98(3), 371-400.

12. Benkler, Y. (2022). Power and productivity: institutions, ideology, and technology in political economy. Danielle Allen, Yochai Benkler, Leah Downey, Rebecca Henderson, & Josh Simon, A Political Economy of Justice, (University of Chicago Press 2022).

13. Bengston, D. N., Fletcher, J. O., & Nelson, K. C. (2004). Public policies for managing urban growth and protecting open space: policy instruments and lessons learned in the United States. Landscape and urban planning, 69(2-3), 271-286.

14. Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Hansen, D. (2012). The impact of policies on government social media usage: Issues, challenges, and recommendations. Government information quarterly, 29(1), 30-40.

15. Blair, H. (2000). Participation and accountability at the periphery: Democratic local governance in six countries. World development, 28(1), 21-39.

16. Box, R. C. (2014). Running government like a business: Implications for public administration theory and practice. In Public Administration and Society (pp. 251-269). Routledge.

17. Burstein, P., & Linton, A. (2002). The impact of political parties, interest groups, and social movement organizations on public policy: Some recent evidence and theoretical concerns. Social forces, 81(2), 380-408.

18. Carlsson, U. (2019). Understanding Media and Information Literacy (MIL) in the Digital Age: A Question of Democracy. University of Gothenburg.

19. Carmona, M. (2017). The formal and informal tools of design governance. Journal of Urban Design, 22(1), 1-36.

20. Cerna, L. (2013). The Nature of Policy Change and Implementation: A Review of Different Theoretical Approaches. Analyst, OECD.

21. Chambers, S. (2000). A culture of publicity. Deliberation, democracy, and the media, 193-208.

22. Commuri, S., & Ekici, A. (2008). An enlargement of the notion of consumer vulnerability. Journal of Micromarketing, 28(2), 183-186.

23. DFID, U. (2011). The Politics of Poverty: Elites Citizens and States.

24. Deschouwer, K. (2006). Political parties as multi-level organizations. Handbook of party politics, 291-300.

25. Du, W. (2010). Policy analysis of disaster health management in china (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).

26. Dunn, W. N. (2015). Public policy analysis. Routledge.

27. El Amrani, I. (2010). Cultural politics and cultural policy in the Arab world. *Cultural Policies in Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Syria and Tunisia an Introduction*, 13.

28. Fischer, F., & Miller, G. J. (Eds.). (2017). Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics, and methods. Routledge.

29. Fraussen, B., Halpin, D. R., & Nownes, A. J. (2021). Why do interest groups prioritise some policy issues over others? Explaining variation in the drivers of policy agendas. Journal of Public Policy, 41(3), 553-572.

30. Furtado, B. A., Sakowski, P. A. M. E., & Tóvolli, M. H. E. (2015). Modeling complex systems for public policies.

31. Gerring, J., & Thacker, S. C. (2008). A centripetal theory of democratic governance. Cambridge University Press.

32. Gerston, L. N. (2014). Public policy making: Process and principles. Routledge.

33. Glynn, C. J., & Ostman, R. E. (1988). Public opinion about public opinion. Journalism Quarterly, 65(2), 299-306.

34. Golden, S. D., & Moreland-Russell, S. (2016). Public policy explained. Prevention, policy, and public health, 17-39.

35. Grant, W. (2021). Pressure groups. In Politics UK (pp. 266-288). Routledge.

36. Hacker, J. S. (1998). The historical logic of national health insurance: Structure and sequence in the development of British, Canadian, and US medical policy. Studies in American Political Development, 12(1), 57-130.

37. Hawkesworth, M. E. (1988). *Theoretical issues in policy analysis*. State University of New York Press.

38. Head, B. W. (2010). Reconsidering evidence-based policy: Key issues and challenges. Policy and Society, 29(2), 77-94.

39. Head, B. W., & Alford, J. (2013). Wicked Problems. Administration & Society, 47(6), 711–739. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713481601

40. ILO, I. (2010). The reader 2010: Social and solidarity economy: Building a common understanding.

41. John, P. (2013). Analyzing public policy. Routledge.

42. Koford, K. (1983). Science and Ideology in the Public Policy Sciences.

43. Kolawole, A. S., & Iyiola, A. O. (2023). Environmental Pollution: Threats, Impact on Biodiversity, and Protection Strategies. In Sustainable Utilization and Conservation of Africa's Biological Resources and Environment (pp. 377-409). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

44. Korol, L., Fietzer, A. W., Bevelander, P., & Pasichnyk, I. (2023). Are immigrants scapegoats? The reciprocal relationships between subjective well-being, political distrust, and anti-immigrant attitudes in young adulthood. Psychological Reports, 126(3), 1392-1415.

45. Kozlowski, S. W., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological science in the public interest*, 7(3), 77-124.

46. Krause, G. A., & Meier, K. J. (Eds.). (2009). Politics, policy, and organizations: Frontiers in the scientific study of bureaucracy. University of Michigan Press.

47. Lascoumes, P., & Le Galès, P. (2007). Introduction: Understanding public policy through its instruments—From the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation. Governance, 20(1), 1-21.

48. Lasswell, H. D. (2017). Power and society: A framework for political inquiry. Routledge.

49. Lee, J., Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2023). Mutual efforts for mutual trust: Impacts of citizens' knowledge and governmental communication channels on trust in participatory budgeting. Journal of Public Affairs, e2879.

50. Lipsky, M. (1968). Protest as a political resource. American political science review, 62(4), 1144-1158.

51. Litman, T. (2015). Evaluating public transit benefits and costs. Victoria, BC, Canada: Victoria transport policy institute.

52. Litwak, R. (2000). Rogue states and US foreign policy: containment after the Cold War. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

53. Majone, G. (1997). From the positive to the regulatory state: Causes and consequences of changes in the mode of governance. Journal of public policy, 17(2), 139-167.

54. Michelman, F. I. (1979). Welfare rights in a constitutional democracy. Wash. ULQ, 659.

55. Murphy, G. (2009). Interest groups in the policy-making process. In Politics in the Republic of Ireland (pp. 349-380). Routledge.

56. Norris, P. (2011). Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited. Cambridge University Press.

57. Parsons, T. (1963). On the concept of political power. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 107(3), 232-262.

58. Peters, B. G. (2020). The problem of policy problems. In Theory and Methods in Comparative Policy Analysis Studies (pp. 59-80). Routledge.

59. Plant, J. (Ed.). (2007). Handbook of Transportation Policy and Administration. CRC Press.

60. Pomper, G. M. (1992). Concepts of political parties. Journal of Theoretical Politics, 4(2), 143-159.

61. Popoola, O. O. (2016). Actors in decision making and policy process. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 47-51.

62. Pratt, H. J. (1993). Gray agendas: Interest groups and public pensions in Canada, Britain, and the United States. University of Michigan Press.

63. Rockman, B. A. (1984). Legislative-executive relations and legislative oversight. Legislative Studies Quarterly, 387-440.

64. Room, G. (2011). Complexity, institutions and public policy: Agile decision-making in a turbulent world. Edward Elgar Publishing.

65. Rose, N., & Miller, P. (2010). Political power beyond the State: problematics of government. The British Journal of Sociology, 61, 271-303.

66. Rotmans, J., Kemp, R., & Van Asselt, M. (2001). More evolution than revolution: transition management in public policy. foresight, 3(1), 15-31.

67. Roy, B. (2013). Governing Body GB. 317/PV-Minutes of the 317th Session of the Governing Body of the.

68. Sadowski, Y. M. (2010). Scuds or butter? the political economy of arms control in the Middle East. Brookings Institution Press.

69. Sharma, R. K. (1998). Causal pathways to infant mortality: linking social variables to infant mortality through intermediate variables. Journal of Health & Social Policy, 9(3), 15-28.

70. Simon, C. A., Steel, B. S., & Lovrich, N. P. (2019). State and Local Bureaucracy and Administration. State and Local Government and Politics.

71. Smith, D. G. (1964). Pragmatism and the group theory of politics. American political science review, 58(3), 600-610.

72. Soule, S. A., & King, B. G. (2006). The stages of the policy process and the equal rights amendment, 1972–1982. American Journal of Sociology, 111(6), 1871-1909.

73. Swinkels, M. (2020). How ideas matter in public policy: a review of concepts, mechanisms, and methods. International Review of Public Policy, 2(2: 3), 281-316.

74. Tannenwald, R. (1997). State regulatory policy and economic development. *New England Economic Review*, 83-98.

75. Thacher, D., & Rein, M. (2004). Managing value conflict in public policy. Governance, 17(4), 457-486.

www.iprjb.org

76. Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework.