

CHAPTER 3

PUBLIC POLICY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to evaluate the Poverty Relief Programme (PRP) in the Limpopo Province within the context of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) from a social work perspective. The researcher intends to discuss the RDP as a social policy and the PRP as a social programme which has been translated from the former. It will however be necessary for this study to distinguish between the concepts social policy and public policy which most scholars and practitioners confuse with each other.

In order to evaluate the formulation, implementation and outcomes of the PRP in the context of the RDP, it is necessary to give attention to the following dimensions of public policy as discussed and described in this chapter:

- Definitions, conceptualization and characteristics of public policy and social policy.
- The factors which influence public policy making, namely internal and external factors.
- The theoretical models regarding public policy making, namely: the descriptive and the prescriptive models.
- The public policy process which consists of five stages namely: policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation.

In order to understand the whole issue of public policy, it is of utmost importance to define and conceptualize the concept public policy in detail. Public policy is mostly confused with social policy and in order to distinguish between them, this study will as well define and conceptualize social policy.

3.2. DISTINCTION BETWEEN PUBLIC POLICY AND SOCIAL POLICY

In this section, the researcher defines and conceptualizes social policy and public policy in order to distinguish between them. This is especially aimed at addressing the confusion regarding the utilization of these concepts.

This study makes use of Table 3.1 below to summarize the distinctions between public policy, social policy and social programme.

Table 3.1: The Distinction between public policy, social policy and social programme

Types of Public Policy	Social policy	Economic policy	Environmental policy	Security policy
Examples of Public Policies according to their types	Reconstruction and Development Programme Act, (Act No. 7 of 1994) Rental Housing Act (Act No. 50 of 1999)	Public Finance Management Act (Act No. 1 of 1999) Preferential Procurement Policy framework Act (Act No. 5 of 2000)	Genetically Modified Organisms Act (Act No. 55 of 1998) Nuclear Energy Act (Act No. 46 of 1999)	State of Emergency Act (Act No. 64 of 1997) Defense Special Tribunal Act (Act No. 81 of 1998)
Examples of programmes developed for the types of Public	CBPWP PRP	GEAR BIG		

Policies				
Government departments responsible for the type of Public policies	Public Works Social Development	Finance		South African National Defense Force National Intelligence

Table 3.1 reflects public policy as a general and inclusive entity which is legislated by legislatures at their different levels of government. In this way they can acquire the status of being draft policies, White Papers and Acts as indicated in the table above. Public policies are developed for the purpose of addressing specific problems in the society and can be classified into a number of types such as for example, the social policy, economic policy, environmental policy and security policy. Social policy is therefore another type of the public policy. Public policy is explained through the general theoretical perspectives regarding public policy making. It is systematic in nature because its making follows a specific process which is made up of a number of phases, namely: policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation. Public policy should be translated into different programmes which are specific, measurable and easy to conduct.

On the other hand, when social policy is closely observed on a level of being an entity without relating it to public policy, it is identified that it becomes a general and inclusive entity. Social policies are enacted by policy-makers and obtain statuses of draft policy, White Paper and Acts. Social policies are developed for the purpose of addressing social problems and therefore, they are intended for the improvement of the general welfare of individuals and communities. They are explained through the general theoretical perspectives regarding public policy making. Social policies are systematic in nature, in that they are made through a process which is made up of a number of phases, such as the policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation. Social policies are developed for the purpose of addressing specific social problems, and as such they are meant for the improvement of the general welfare of individuals and communities. Social policies are difficult to implement on their holistic value and therefore, they should be translated into a number of objectives which are

social programmes. Social programmes are more specific, measurable and easy to conduct than the two entities discussed above. Social policies are explained through the general theoretical perspectives regarding public policy making. They are systematic in nature, in that they are made through a process which is made up of a number of phases, such as the policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation.

Both entities share the feature of being legislated into policy documents such as policy proposal, draft policy, Green Papers, White Papers and Acts. Because public policies or the social policies are general and inclusive, they are therefore difficult to implement and evaluate in their holistic context unless they are translated into different programmes which are conducted by different governmental and nongovernmental institutions. In this explanation, the researcher views the RDP as an example of the social policy which could be realized through a number of different social programmes such as the Poverty Relief Programme (PRP) and the Community Based Public Works Programme (CBPWP), for example, which were developed by differing institutions, namely the Department of Social Development and the Department of Public Works, respectively. It would not be wrong therefore to say that public policy is either a social, economic, environmental, security or foreign policy.

The researcher will closely discuss public policy and social policy and their characteristics in the succeeding part.

3.2.1. PUBLIC POLICY

According to Cloete (1998:126) public policy is defined as “a declaration of intent to do something or to have it done by specified institution or functionaries as prescribed.” Policy is more than a decision because to implement it, decisions are made. Public policy is different from individual, group or organizational policies in that it is aimed at providing goods and services and reconciling differences among groups and/or organizations in the society.

Public policies are contained in Acts of Parliament, provincial ordinances, regulations, proclamations, administrative rulings and other governmental documents (compare

Cloete, 1998:24; Pilay, 1999:240.) Public policies are intentions proclaimed by the government institutions to influence behavioral interactions within communities and to meet some needs that people deserve at a particular place in time.

This function of the public policy was cited by Hanekom (1987:25) when he mentioned “the promotion of the general welfare of society depends on the policies made by the policy-makers (legislatures), the resources available, whether the policy-maker have a clear understanding of societal problems and needs, and the nature of public policy.”

A definition which contains most of the public policy’s characteristics states that “policy consists of courses or patterns of action by governmental officials rather than their separate discrete decisions; not only the enactment and the feedback, form part of the policy” (Fox, Schwella & Wissink, 1991:27). It is a result of many decision makings, it is future-oriented and promotes the general welfare of people rather than of individuals.

Anderson (1994:4-5) whom the researcher regards as a prominent expert on public policy-making defined public policy as “whatever governments choose to do or not to do.” Peters (1996:4) says that “public policy is the sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as those actions have an influence on the lives of citizens.”

Public policies are formulated and implemented by government departments and non-governmental organizations which are specifically developed for particular problems, for example, the Department of Correctional Services or the Department of Health and Welfare. Government writes its intention on a piece of legislation and these policies are transformed into programmes as Peters (1996:5) states “policies, in terms of their effects on the public, emerge from a large number of programs, legislative intentions, and organizational interactions to affect the daily lives of citizens.”

Anderson (1994:5) continues to cite that public policy is “a proposed course of action of a person, group, or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach a goal or realize an objective or a purpose.” Botes, Brynard, Fourie and Roux

(1992:306) state as follows: “ whereas aims describe the desired idea which is worth attaining, policies are the systematic actions which should be taken to achieve them.” These definitions indicate that policies include in them the directions the executors need to follow in order to reach their intended goals. Public policy are structurally planned on a paper and their implementers are only required to translate the plan into action.

Important elements which were cited above could be listed as: public policy is a purposive or goal-oriented action; it consists of courses or patterns of action; public policy emerge due to public demand; public policies unlike any policy are contained in enactment which were formulated by authorities such as legislatures, government officials, judges, etc; policy is concerned only with what government does or does not do; public policy may either be negative or positive; it was created to protect and promote the general welfare of people and environment that public policies are translated into different programmes and are systematic in nature.

Public policy is an action with aims as was echoed by Dye (1998:5-6) who stated that there are three reasons why we study public policy. These reasons are as follows:

- **Scientific understanding:** We want to know the causes of a particular social problem together with the outcomes of a programme which is designed to redress it.
- **Professional advises:** We want to utilize the scientific understanding of the public policies in order to devise some hypothesis about the problems in the communities. Policy makers expect researchers to come up with directions and unless enough information regarding the problems has been gathered, researchers will advice them very little and as such policy makers will formulate ineffective policies.
- **Policy recommendations:** the aim being ensuring “that the nation adopts the “right” policies to achieve the “right” goals” (Dye, 1998:6). Ineffective policies are usually violated by the public and are hard to implement and as such should be discouraged in the public policy making.

Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:63) stated the features of public policy as (i) authoritative, i.e. the authorized or legitimate policy-maker is the cabinet which is made up of

ministers who are political heads of the government departments (ii) public policy is a comprehensive frame, in that it follows a certain format from the formulation to evaluation process; and (iii) it is a purposeful activity which is put into operation to realize postulated objectives or goals.

Anderson (1994:10-11) maintains that public policies are classified into substantive policies and procedural policies. Substantive public policies are concerned with what government is going to do and the procedural ones indicate how something is going to be done.

Public policy is a plan which has been drawn in order to address certain social problems within the community. The most effective method of formulating and implementing public policy in order to address social problems such as poverty for example, is through the development of social policies which are specifically aimed at dealing with the social issues. In this regard, public policy should be viewed as a whole which has different types such as for example, social policy, economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy which are intended to address different problems in the society.

In the succeeding part of the section, the study will define social policy in order to deliberate its relationship with public policy.

3.2.2. SOCIAL POLICY

Sewpaul, Lombard, Louw and Noyoo (1999:6) noted that "social policy is a concept that is extremely difficult to define and is perhaps, in some ways, a bit of misnomer."

Manyire and Asingwire (1998:76) contend that " social policies are perceived as the outcomes of national and local decisions in response to human development. They consist of formal and informal rules which are embedded in the organized effort of society to meet identified personal needs as well as within the wider context. The ultimate aim of such organized efforts is to enhance the well-being of societal members in their respective environments."

“Social policies constitute the formal and informal rules and guidelines underlying the organized efforts of society to meet the needs of its members and ameliorate the problems confronting them as individuals, groups and communities” (Nthomang, 2002:99).

Another definition of social policy was derived from Sewpaul, Lombard, Louw and Noyoo (1999:7) who write that “the purpose of social policy is to make appropriate and relevant responses to social problems, with emphasis on plans of action that direct allocation of resources, development, allocation of status and distribution of rights.”

Social policy is more specific and effective in dealing with social problems such as poverty, for example. A social policy is a well-tailored design suitable for improving the conditions of a given social problem. Social policy is therefore about the identification of social problems, strategic planning of action to be taken to address them, and the implementation of the plan of action or the delivery of social services to those in need.

Social policy together with economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy are the types of the public policy and as such it is of utmost importance to discuss them in relation to it.

3.2.3. CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC POLICY AND SOCIAL POLICY

In this part of the section, the study will name and discuss the characteristics of both public policy and social policy. It has been mentioned above that public policy is a generic entity which includes types such as the social policy, economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy, and therefore that they cannot be discussed in isolation from it. Both public policy and social policy will have similar general characteristics and different specific characteristics due to their different levels of study. Characteristics of the public policy are general and inclusive whilst those of the social policy are more specific and measurable.

3.2.3.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC POLICY

From the definitions of the concept public policy, the study identified its characteristics which need to be discussed in detail in this part.

According to Botes et al. (1992:312), public policy has the following specific characteristics: authoritative, enforceable, flexible and adaptable, feasible and clear.

- **Public Policy is Authoritative**

Considine (1998:62) views authority somehow differently when he states “authority is power multiplied by legitimacy,” which implicates that we identify a concept of coercion in which individuals, groups and or organizations are subjected to conformity or else they face punishment. Deviants could experience exclusion from other members.

For Colebatch (1998:7), authority legitimates policy and it flows from the top downwards. Authority has something to do with expertise in that the policy-makers are the only people who have the necessary skills in the policy making process. Not everybody is authorized to make public policy, but only those with the necessary skills, knowledge, and are authorized by legislation. "This implies that policy requires knowledge, both of the problem area, and of the things that might be done about it" (Colebatch, 1998:7).

In order for the implementers to demand compliance, they must mobilize and enter into contract with those who have different opinions towards the policy they intend to implement (Weimer & Vining, 1992: 329).

- **Public Policy is Enforceable**

Public policy should specify what would be done to those individuals, groups, corporations, governments, etc. who do not conform to the regulations. Enforcement is a concept which is similar to implementation; it is a measurement which tells one what steps should be taken if one has transgressed the expected behaviors.

This calls for order because once policies are in place, every individual, group and or organization is expected to behave in a certain way. In this way, "policy sets limits on the behaviour of officials, at the same time, it frees them from the need to make choices" (Colebatch, 1998:7).

Enforceable is stipulated for instance in the *Child Care Amendment Act* (Act No. 96 of 1999 Section 50A (3)) as follows: "any person who is convicted of an offence in terms of this section, shall be liable to a fine, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or to both such fine and such imprisonment."

- **Public Policy is Flexible and Adaptable**

Public policies should be flexible and adaptable. But in the real life, any policy will be advantageous towards another group and at the same time disadvantageous to another. The majority will gain in the expense of the minority. In this regard, the weak sector is forced to conform to the expectations of the strong sectors of the society.

Some policies are welcomed by the nation. Gumede and Haffajee (2000:39) note for instance after President Thabo Mbeki's state-of-the nation address of the 4th February 2000 that "for black business, the promise of a package of measures to jumpstart small business has been like manna, and the prospect of new procurement legislation is tantalizing." When public policies are highly criticized by a majority of people, policy makers should be flexible to develop some alternatives to make their policies popular to the people.

- **Public Policy is Feasible**

Public policy makers should conduct adequate feasibility studies before formulating policies. Feasibility is a concept closely related to the research process without which, policy makers will postulate policies that are not relevant to the problems at hand.

According to Gumede and Haffajee (2000:39), the South African President, Thabo Mbeki for instance is increasingly informed by surveys and focus groups when drafting speeches. In this regard, he is able to address the nation with the controversial issues

which concern the society as a whole. Public policy like the presidential speeches therefore, should address the exact social problems which are experienced by the society.

- **Public policy is Clear**

Public policies should have an important characteristic of clarity. It means that when they are not clearly specified, the implementers in field find it difficult to translate them into actions. Since a policy is a plan on paper, it should specifically state who, when, how, and to which direction one has to conduct it.

This exposition was explained in a statement by Colebatch (1998:13) who maintains that policy is a clearly stated statement which is generally understood as an intent of government or nongovernmental organization to reach certain goals. Public policy has known goals and its objectives are specifically stated so that its implementation becomes easy to follow and execute.

"In this perspective, policy must be understood not simply in terms of officially proclaimed goals, but in terms of the way activity is patterned among a wide range of participants, so that people know what is going to happen" (Colebatch, 1998:9). This implies that policy-makers show the nation what their decisions are all about by clearly stating without ambiguity what the policies intend to achieve and how they are going to be implemented.

From the above exposition, the researcher discussed the characteristics of public policy, namely; authoritative, enforceable, flexible and adaptable, feasible and clear.

The researcher has stated the relationship between public policy and social policy, in that public policy is a general and inclusive entity whilst social policy is one of its types which is specifically designed to address specific social problems such as poverty, for example. The characteristics of public policy will be similar to the general characteristics of the social policy, economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy, whilst at the same time those of each of them will differ from its characteristics due to their levels of study. The characteristics of the social policy therefore will be more detailed than those of the public policy.

The characteristics of social policy will be discussed in the succeeding part of the section.

3.2.3.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOCIAL POLICY

It is interesting to learn that both the social policy, economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy share similar characteristics when they are addressed at the level of public policy. When these entities are studied at their own levels, their characteristics become more specific and differ diversely from those of the other levels. The social policy in this regard, will have its own characteristics which are different from those of other mentioned types of public policies.

Characteristics of social policy identified in this study are as follows: social and economic policies complement each other; social policy is a field and practice of study; it is usually confused with welfare policy; its process occurs even when there is an economic growth; it is the state's obligation; it is concerned with the life course of people's developmental stages; it is closely related to the concept of globalization; inclusiveness is an important concept; and that it is formulated around social problems (compare MacPherson, 1992; Masiye, Tembo, Chisanga & Mwanza, 1998; Osei-Hwedie, 1998; Sjoberg, 1999; Wint & Ngcobo, 2000; Priestley, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Lodge & Stirton, 2001; Sewpaul, 2001.)

- **Social and Economic Policies Complement each other**

According to Masiye, et al. (1998:35), social and economic policies complement each other. These authors indicate that the social policies place a burden upon the economic policies because they cannot be resolved without the involvement of the economic policies. They mention for instance that developing countries should obtain financial support from the international financial bodies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in order to fund their social policies or programmes. Social policies cannot be implemented if there are no sufficient funds available; and therefore funds from the donor institutions will be needed by the developing countries.

Social policies do not exist independently from the economic policies, because " social policy is not only concerned with the sectors usually defined as social such as health,

education, social welfare, and social security; but also includes sectors more commonly identified as "economic" such as employment, infrastructure and housing" (Masiye, et al. 1998:38).

According to Masiye, et al. (1998:38), the relationship between the economic and social policies can be recorded in the following statement: "while economic policy promotes economic development objectives for the development of the economy, social policy promotes social development objectives such as the development of an equitable society."

Osei-Hwedie (1998:14) mentions that "while economic policy deals with the efficient allocation of resources for increasing productivity, social policy focuses on the manner in which the structure of society and its institutions determine the nature of participation of different social groups, and how resources are distributed in the development process."

The relationship between the two concepts is further illustrated by Nthomang (2002:99) who conveys that "social policy therefore seeks to improve the social, economic, political and cultural conditions of people."

The above authors are all Africans. They were specifically selected in this study to share the relationship between social and economic policies in the African context. It is clear that social policies are enabled by economic policies and that the two indeed complement each other.

- **Social Policy is a Field and Practice Study**

Social policy is a field and practice study (Lewis, 2000:132)

Social policy is a discipline within the social work profession as it is concerned with the identification of social problems and strategies which are effective in addressing them. Twigg (2000:133) mentions that "social policy is a multidisciplinary subject which is basically concerned with the planning of the most effective strategies and the identification of social and economic resources for addressing the problems."

Chambers (2000:23) agrees by stating that "when political scientists, students of governments, or sociologists study a social policy or program, their interest is centered on explaining it as a fact of social life; that is, how the policy or program came to be, what broad social function it serves, why it appeared in one form and not another." The multi-disciplinarity of social policy is a show-case because this field of study is intended to solve the diverse social problems within our complex society.

Sewpaul, Lombard, Louw & Noyoo (1999:10) and Sewpaul (2001:309) mention that social policy remains a largely neglected area both in social work training and in social work practice in South Africa today. This trend will however change in the near future because some universities within South Africa, such as the University of Pretoria for example, have included social policy in the curriculum of their social workers in training as a basic requirement. This step will access both the students and their mentors to the social policy making process.

- **Social Policy is usually confused with Welfare Policy**

Social policy is a concept which is difficult to explain, maybe because it is usually confused with welfare policy.

The concept social policy is said to contain a certain ambiguity, as it refers to "a cluster of government policies designed to promote social ends or objectives. It means policies which are designed to improve the well-being or the welfare of citizens, and in this context it is always confused with the welfare state" (Lewis, 2000:4).

Welfare means "the provision of income maintenance benefits and services to individuals and families" (Lewis, 2000:7). Welfare could also mean the transfer of other commodities than cash such as clothing, food and housing.

Social welfare is a component of social policy, and it appears to the picture when resources and other amenities are distributed to the rightful recipient. Welfare comes into picture when those defined as the legitimate persons or groups of people affected by a particular problem start receiving intervention in the form of alms, cash, housing and

others. Sjoberg (1999:290) is of the opinion that eligibility for benefits must be based on the means test, and that this should specify the citizenship and whether the applicant or recipient has contributed towards the social insurance.

Governments should specify through the social policies, their obligation to provide assistance to the individuals and communities who do not have other means of existence. Sjoberg (1999:276) has to support this by saying that "the state can provide help for those who lose their income, or are unable to earn an income in the first place, in a number of different ways." This then puts more burden on the social policies to be formulated and implemented by governments as this will mean an increased expenditure on the welfare component. To counteract this problem, Sjoberg (1999:278-9) suggests that cost could be minimized through the reduction of the proportion of high-risk individuals or groups covered by the schemes, e.g. the exclusion of individuals who could be defined as unwilling to work to provide for their basic daily requirements, behaviors and lifestyles which will lead to dependency on such welfare schemes.

The confusion of associating welfare with social policy should be resolved by considering social policy as the umbrella concept and welfare as a component of social policy, which is only reached when resources start to be distributed to the recipients.

- **Social Policy occurs even when there is an Economic Growth**

The social policy process occurs even when there is an economic growth. In a study by MacPherson (1992), he contends that even when economic growth is experienced for instance in Asia Pacific Region, social problems such as child labour, prostitution, environmental pollution, crime, drug abuse and other levels of stress continue to occur. This connotation means that economic improvement does not in itself assure the alleviation of social problems. He goes on by stating that "despite being the world's most dynamic economic region, social progress is lagging in the Asia Pacific. They point to the widespread poverty, the high rates of population growth, the uncontrolled environmental degradation and the inadequate social infrastructure" (MacPherson, 1992:60).

The social policy process is thus not only about the distribution of resources such as food, clothing and shelter to the poor, it is also about the distribution of abstract basic needs of communities, the development of programmes to address social ills such as drug abuse, crime, rape, murder and other developmental problems which are present even within the developed communities.

- **Social Policy is the State's obligation**

Social policy is according to Lodge and Stirton (2001:104) a *daseinsvorsorge* which is "the state's obligation to provide an infrastructure for the economic activity of its citizens." As already mentioned, social policies are always directed towards specific social problems through government social programmes intended for target groups.

Social policy is therefore about social development programmes, for instance, the PRP which was developed by the Department of Social Development in order to reduce the incidence of poverty within the poor communities in South Africa. In this regard, the state has an obligation to formulate social policies in order to reduce poverty.

- **Social Policies are concerned with the Life Course of People's Developmental Stages**

Social policies target those sectors of society which are vulnerable to social problems. These groups in the Southern African context, include children, woman, youth, the disabled and the aged to name but a few, who should be recognized (*Social Assistance Act*, Act No. 59 of 1992).

According to Priestley (2000), social policies could be explained through the life course development of an individual as follows:

- ***Before birth:*** there are social policies which allow the "pre-natal screening for significant impairments" of the unborn babies, these policies provide pregnant women with the choice to terminate their pregnancies (compare Priestly 2000: 429; *Sterilization Act*, Act No. 44 of 1998).

- **After birth:** children with impairments have everlasting childhood and should be subjected to community care. *Social Assistance Act* (Act No. 59 of 1992) and *Child Care Amendment Act* (Act No. 96 of 1996) are examples of social policies which were developed to protect the children .
- **Adult age:** adults who are physically disabled require amenities such as housing, education, health, welfare and employment and as such there are social policies which are specifically developed to address their needs (*White Paper on Public Works*, 1997).
- **Old age:** Priestley (2000:431) notes that “the majority of people with impairments are over retirement age and a majority of those over the age of 75 are disabled in some way.” *Social Assistance Act* (Act No. 59 of 1992) makes provision for the care of children, adults and aged who were mentioned in this part. Other acts which could be listed in this category are the *Aged Persons Amendment Act*, Act No. 45 of 1994, *Housing Amendment Act*, Act No. 6 of 1996, *Child Care Amendment Act*, Act No. 96 of 1996 and *White Paper for Social Welfare*, October 1996. These are examples of the social policies which are aimed at addressing problems encountered by persons at certain stages of their life development.

It is important to note that social policies are intended for all sectors within communities, namely for example, the young and the old, the living and the dead, the rich and the poor, the physically fit and the disabled, the employed and the unemployed, and people from all walks of life being women, people of colour and people with different religious, socio-economical and political backgrounds. Every sector of the society which is found to be affected by social problems is afforded an opportunity to access social development programmes through the social policies.

- **Social Policy is closely related to the concept of globalization**

According to Clarke (2000:201), social policy is closely related to the concept of globalization because it tends to be studied in relation to national welfare states or welfare systems of the entire international world.

Globalization is the "transformation of the relations between states, institutions, groups and individuals, the universalization of certain practices, identities, and structures and ... the expression of the global restructuring that has occurred in recent decades in the structure of modern capitalist relations" (Sewpaul, 2001:309).

Social policies are similar to the process of globalization because they address similar problems which are addressed by globalization, namely; to name a few, issues regarding the rights of categories of people, fair labour, non-discrimination, land reforms, disability, old age, youth, substance abuse, crime and women.

Clarke (2000:202) defines globalization as "a fairly homogeneous process in which the increasing mobility of capital, investment, trade and information dissolves outmoded barriers, boundaries and ways of life in the construction of a new world order." This author contends that the intersection between globalization and social policy helps social policy practitioners to identify the needs and solutions of social problems.

Through globalization, governments are expected to formulate social policies which are similar to those of other national states, such as for example, the reduction of government expenditure, shifting resources from consumption to investment, the adoption of macroeconomic policies which favour the international trade and the raising of productivity levels by relying greatly on the market mechanisms, and enhanced citizenry participation in policy making, implementation and evaluation. Globalization is about the sameness of cultures and nations, the similarity in solving social problems and the homogeneity of different conceptions through diversification.

Sewpaul (2001:311) has noted the limitations of globalization, when indicating that it pushes countries towards dependency and continued debts, and that "it would appear that, having achieved independence from colonial domination, developing countries have become entrapped into a new form of colonialism with the IMF, the World Bank and the donor community as masters." This is reiterated by Nonyake (2000:17) when she stated that during the annual meetings of the Boards of Governors of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, "the message they sought to convey was that the IMF and World Bank were to blame for the economic predicament, spurred by growing scale and depth of the debt crisis in developing countries."

Social policy is closely related to globalization because a concept such as the Structural Assistance Programme for example, is embedded within the international bodies such as the IMF and the World Bank who are intended to distribute socio-economic and political resources to developing countries in order to eradicate the social problems.

Sewpaul (2001:310) continues to link social policies with the characteristics of inclusiveness.

- **Inclusiveness of Social Policy**

“Transformation in the South African discourse refers to a process of transition from exclusion to inclusion in all spheres of daily life” (Wint & Ngcobo, 2000:93).

Inclusiveness means that a person is geographically resident to a society and that he or she participates in the normal activities of citizens in that society” (Selwyn, 2002:3). When individuals are included in the social mainstream, they take part in the consumption, saving, production, political and social activities of the society. Selwyn (2002:4) also includes the concept of technological disparity to explain that the underdeveloped countries lack information because they are excluded and as a result they suffer problems of unemployment, poor skills, poor housing, poor health and others.

Social policies need to be developed in order to address the disparities of exclusivity.

- **Social Policies focus on social problems**

"Social policies were developed in response to the concern of the party regarding increasing social differentiation, inequality, and disparities in national development" (Mchomvu, Ngahla, Nchahaga, Tangaraza, & Maghimbi, 1998:47).

Social policies are specifically developed by governments to address social problems within communities, such as poverty, unemployment, ageism, child poverty, disability, and HIV/AIDS.

Social policies should include the financial implications of their programmes. Social policies are translated into social programmes which are effective in dealing with social problem within communities. This is supported by Manyire and Asingwire (1998:80) who state that "once social policies are developed/formulated, they may be translated into programmes."

Social policies should specify the institutional arrangement designed to implement them in order to address the social programme. It is true that social policies which are formulated by any governmental department should adhere to this requirement as reiterated by Manyire and Asingwire (1998:77) who state that "social policy is perceived in terms of the institutions involved in the making and delivery of social services."

It means that there would be no social policies if there were no social problems.

In order for the state to develop effective social policies, policy makers should access social work practitioners to the process of public policy making. If the social work practitioners are not afforded the opportunity to participate in the public policy making process, they need to press the demand on policy makers. Social work practitioners need to fulfil their ethical obligation by advocating on behalf of the poor and the excluded, and they "need to challenge Government where policies do not cohere with professed reconstruction and development principles adopted by the Government" (Sewpaul et al., 1999:9).

Conclusion

From the discussion about public policy and social policy above, the researcher drew a conclusion that both entities are similar because they are general and inclusive, they are enacted by the policy makers, they are developed to deal with specific problems within communities and that they cannot be conducted in their holistic nature and therefore need to be translated into a number of programmes which are specific, measurable and easy to implement. It is only when public policy and social policy are distinguished from each other that their differences surface. In this regard, public policy cannot be a type of social policy whilst the latter together with the economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy are its type, and this suggests that public policy holds a

more seniority position than a social policy. Social policies are translated into a number of social problems whilst public policies are translated into programmes in general.

And lastly, at the dimension of public policy making as a study and practice, both public policy and social policy share similar attributes with regard to the internal and external factors which influence policy making, the theoretical models regarding policy making and the policy making process.

It has been mentioned that the aim of this study is to evaluate a social programme, namely the PRP, within the context of the RDP which is a social policy document. It would therefore be a limitation to discuss a social policy without relating it to broad framework, namely public policy. By concentrating a discussion on public policy making, this study will also be attempting an inclusion of other public policy types which were mentioned before.

Concepts of the public policy which are also available in other types of policies are factors influencing public policy making, the theoretical models regarding public policy making and the public policy making process. These concepts will be discussed in the succeeding sections.

3.3. FACTORS INFLUENCING PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

From the definitions of public policy, one identifies that policy-making is a consequence of some public needs. These needs in turn are factors which influence the public policy-making. This is contained in a statement which says “a variety of internal and external factors influence the process of policy making on a daily basis” (Botes, Brynard, Fourie & Roux, 1992:306). The internal and external factors influencing public policy making will be discussed in more detail.

3.3.1. INTERNAL FACTORS

Botes et al. (1992:306) defined the internal factors influencing public policy making as “those factors present within the government institution which can exercise an active influence on policy making.” An example of internal factors in the South African

context are affirmative action and employment equity which are to address the inequalities of the past. These are factors from within an institution or society, and unless they are successfully addressed, exclusion problem will remain unchallenged..

The most important internal factors according to Botes et al. (1992) are the following:

- conditions of establishment
- political assignment
- legality according to the state and administrative law
- financial means
- ability of the personnel
- physical facilities
- managerial style of the head of a department.

3.3.1.1. Conditions of Establishment

Conditions of establishment means that any governmental department is specifically established to attain a specific aim or aims; that is we expect from particular government departments to make policies especially intended for its mission. The Department of Public Works in this regard, for example, will make public policies which are concerned with the public works rather than inducting on those which fall within the domain of the Department of Health and Welfare.

Conditions of establishment for the different government departments are contained in the *South African Constitution* (Act 108 of 1996 Section 205 (1)) which states, for instance that "the national police service must be structured to function in the national, provincial and, where appropriate, local spheres of government." [Government institutions and departments develop public policies which are assigned to them by the Constitution of a country.](#)

3.3.1.2. Political Assignment

A Minister, Member of the Executive Council and/or the Councilor for a particular department have a responsibility to see to it that his/her political statement or assignment is achieved through his/her department.

Schedule 10 (1) of the *South African Constitution* (Act 108 of 1996) states that "everyone who was a member or office-bearer of the province's legislature when the new Constitution took effect, become a member or office-bearer of the legislature for that province under the new Constitution." By being a member or office-bearer of the legislature, the individuals are automatically tasked to perform an effective role in public policy making.

As contained in the Constitution and was also reported above, the political heads of particular government departments are responsible for making public policies which are relevant to their areas of operation.

3.3.1.3. Legality according to the State and administrative Law

The government departments have the responsibility to see to it that people's rights and freedoms are not violated by their actions.

Botes et al. (1992:307) state that "all government actions require that the rights and freedom of people be dealt with in a responsible way and it is to be expected that where everyone is subject to the same destiny, no legal claim can be made against the state."

Public policies are regulations which after their approval, are referred to government institutions to check if they are enforceable. If these policies violate the freedom of people, then the state is in a position to suffer the consequence of being sued by the excluded individuals, communities and organizations. It is therefore important that this factor be taken with seriousness when formulators and implementers draft public policies.

3.3.1.4. Financial Means

It has been reported that policies are translated into programmes. In this context therefore, every programme is achievable through the availability of funds. Every programme which is introduced by the governmental institution is possible if funds are made available to it, because for it to run, the following resources are necessary: staff, equipment, expertise, knowledge, skills, etc. All these resources involve the financial requirement in the policy making process.

The *Sector Education and Training Authority* (Act No. 97 of 1998 Section 14 (1), for example, will only jumpstart if it received funds from the skills development levies, money from the National Skills Fund, grants, donations and bequests, surplus moneys, income earned on services and money received from other sources.

Financial resources are necessary to back up every public policy document. The amount of money available will therefore influence the formulation and implementation of public policies.

3.3.1.5. Abilities of the Personnel

Public policy making is not possible without personnel as supported by Botes et al. (1992:307) who state that "when a policy is determined for the attachment of aims, it is necessary to take into account the number of staff members available as well as their standard of training."

Current public policy making requires experienced individuals who Hecló (1995:50) term the *technopols* to denote the craft professionals and the gifted amateur in the policy making arena.

The knowledge level, skills and abilities of personnel involved in policy making will influence the standard and context of public policies.

3.3.1.6. Physical Facilities

This factor regards the availability of office space, grounds, equipment, etc. There are physical buildings where institutions responsible for the public policy making are housed, these being state-owned or leased buildings.

To enable the *Adult Basic Education and Training Act* to take form, for example, Section (4) made provision for facilities which could be utilized as public centres for that purpose and if such facilities are not available, other public or private facilities could be made available (*Adult Basic Education and Training Act*, 2000 Section (4) (1)).

Some public policies would not have developed if there was a lack of infrastructure such as buildings, roads, electricity and telecommunication. As an example cited in the ABET Act above, it is important to mention that the availability of the public centres are internal factors which influenced the development of that public policy.

3.3.1.7. The Managerial Style of the Head of a department

This factor explains that public policy making is influenced by the beliefs, views and preferences which heads of government departments develop at their workplace. Some head of departments, for instance, do not believe that there is a relationship between HIV and AIDS. They become reluctant in developing programmes intended to distribute the antiretroviral drugs to those affected by the disease. This misfortune was reported by Lekota (2003:4) who contends that “the war of words between the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) and the government around the call for provision of antiretroviral drugs to all people living with HIV-Aids raged on yesterday with the TAC accusing the government of using delaying tactics while people continue to die.” In this regard, the managerial style of head of department as an influence towards public policy making is unethical, and as a result, policies developed through it usually meet criticism from the majority of people, organizations and communities.

3.3.2. EXTERNAL FACTORS

Botes et al. (1992:308), define the external factors of public policy-making as the “factors that exist outside public institutions.” These could be in the form of demands made by the public on the government institutions.

The most important external factors according to Botes et al. (1992) are as follows:

- changing environmental circumstances
- policy direction of political parties
- political experience
- pressure groups, interest groups and mass demonstrations
- research and investigations by commissions and committees
- personal views of public servants and political office bearers
- international expectations, considerations and influence

3.3.2.1. Changing environmental circumstances

Environmental circumstances are continually changing and as such, government should adhere to their requirements in order to meet the public demand. An example is when there is an adverse incident of drought in a country, government legislate policies to relieve communities who are affected by it. During incidences of catastrophes, eg. floods, government is influenced to make policies that are directed at assisting those who are victimized. Catastrophe “is specifically designed to forecast trends where small changes in one variable (for example, time) produce sudden large changes in another variable” (Dunn, 1994:220).

For instance, immediately after the plane crash attacks attributed by terrorists in the United States of America on the 11th of September 2001, the Ugandan government responded by publishing its new Suppression of Terrorism Bill in order to suppress terrorism through the imposition of a death penalty on terrorists and their supporters (Wakabi, 2001).

3.3.2.2. Political Directions of Political Parties

Political parties which took over the running of the State have their own missions, which are contained in public policies.

The ANC, for example, is a political party which has taken over the running of the South African Government immediately after the 1994 elections. Its mouthpiece, President Nelson Mandela said "my government's commitment to create a people-centred society of liberty binds us to the pursuit of the goals of freedom from want, freedom from hunger, freedom from deprivation, freedom from ignorance, freedom from suppression and freedom from fear. These freedoms are fundamental to the guarantee of human dignity" (*RDP White Paper: Discussion Document*, 1994:1).

The directions of the ANC are therefore aimed primarily at addressing equality among the racial groups and the redistribution of the socio-economic and political resources to those who were previously disadvantaged by the apartheid regime. The ANC's mission influences therefore the content of public policy making.

3.3.2.3. Political Experience

In some instances, political experience is a strong determinant of policy making as indicated in the following examples: "the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning had to ensure that projects were visible on the ground by September 30th 1974, which was twenty-one days before the general elections in Botswana" (Mwansa, Lucas & Osei-Hwedie, 1998:64). The ANC in South Africa released its Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) election manifesto immediately before the 1994 general elections. Public policies may be released in order to convince the people that the government of the day is in a direction of assisting them. From these examples, it is clear that the political experience of politicians will influence policy making.

3.3.2.4. Pressure Groups, Interest Groups and Mass Demonstrations

According to Botes et al. (1992:309), people form pressure groups or participate in mass demonstrations, when they have strong convictions on a matter and would like to make this known to the government of the day. This process therefore influences public policy making. Most public policy making is a consequence of the demand made by communities to the government.

Gould (2001) contributes an example on how pressure groups can exert an influence in the process of public policy making. According to him, prostitution in Sweden has been increasing, was changing in character and form and has damaging effects on the prostitutes, clients, families, communities, and society as a whole. The Swedish government wanted to criminalize prostitution and appointed a commission to investigate the problem before they finalized the policy. The commission recommended that prostitution should be criminalized and that both the sellers and buyers of sex be arrested and charged of the offence. Pressure groups with different perspectives on the issue of criminalization of prostitution emerged, these included the high courts and magistrate courts, national police service, national administrative boards for health and social affairs, young people, state institutional care, the national associations for sex education, the national federation for lesbian and gay rights, members of the commission which was tasked with the investigation, sex workers and prostitutes' organizations, and newspaper editors (Gould, 2001). In this situation, the pressure groups managed to influence government's proposal of becoming the first country to criminalize those who buy sex instead of those who sell it.

The influence of the role players in the public policy making will be discussed in detail during the policy formulation phase of the public policy making process.

3.3.2.5. Research and investigations by commissions and committees

Legislature is not always skilful in policy making and as a result policy making can be influenced by experts such as researchers and or commissions and committees. Public

policy making can be influenced by the explanation, prediction and findings which were made in research projects and investigations by commissions.

For John (1998:29), "the research task is to identify the obstacles, such as inadequate resources and unclear policy formulation, that limit perfect administration." It is true that before the actual public policy is formulated, there should be enough information regarding the possible anticipated failures and successes of its implementation.

Investigations by commissions on the other hand, are invited by politicians when they want to know why certain incidents have occurred in their areas of operation. As an example, in South Africa, we have the following commission reports which influence public policy making:

- Final Report: Commission of Inquiry into Cricket Match Fixing and related Matters (29 June 2001).
- Submission by Kwazulu- Natal MEC for Transport to the Commission of Inquiry into Taxi Violence (12 September 2000).
- Strauss Commission Report- Commission of Inquiry into the Provision of Rural Financial Services (19 February 1997).
- Hoexter Commission of Inquiry into the Rationalisation of the Provincial and Local Divisions of the Supreme Court (under construction)
<http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/commissions/index.html> (2002:1)

3.3.2.6. Personal views of public servants and political office bearers

Public servants and their respective political heads of the departments exert much influence on the public policy making.

Fischer (1993:22-24) expresses that in the public institutions, there is an emergence of a new class of individuals referred to as technical *intelligentsia*, who are the public servants who are professionals in the policymaking process. The skills of these

professionals influence public policy making. The theoretical model regarding public policy making, namely the rational model maintains that public servants and political office bearers have their own personal views which influence public policy making towards a direction which they regard as best. These individuals have also the capacity and opportunity to influence politicians into selecting public policies which they feel should be prioritized over others.

3.3.2.7. International expectations, considerations and influence

The international community through the United Nations Organization (UNO) play an important role in influencing the governments into adopting public policies. This influence was identified during the discussion of globalization process.

A good example is the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (Unicef, 1990, Article 4) which states that policies should stipulate the implementation requirement in them, such as, "state parties shall undertake all appropriate legislative, administrative, and other measures for the implementation of the rights recognized in the present convention." This expectation is realized by our South African *Child Care Act* (Act No. 74 of 1983 Section 28A) which states "the Minister may, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, out of monies appropriated by Parliament for that purpose, establish and maintain secure care facilities for the reception and secure care of children awaiting trial or sentence." Sections which are contained in the Convention on the Rights of the Child are also contained in our *Child Care Act Amendment Act* (Act No. 96 of 1996). This is reiterated by a statement which says international societies, through their non-governmental organizations "are putting pressure on the government to provide services and opportunities for the marginalised and the disadvantaged" (Mwansa, Lucas & Osei-Hwedie, 1998:64).

International expectations through the process of globalization compel countries to conform to certain international public policies in order to avert a sanction of being excluded from participating in the international bodies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. A good example is a recent requirement for Iraqi to disarm its weapons of mass destruction as stipulated in the Resolution 1441 of the United Nations Security Council (*The Economist*, 2003:21). To avert sanctions, Iraqi

government should formulate, implement and evaluate public policies which are aimed at disarming itself of the weapons of mass destruction.

Conclusion

The internal factors influencing public policy making were identified as those forces which are within the social system which require public policies intended to address the disequilibrium within the society. When people discriminate one another because of their racial, gender, social, ethnic and religious background, conflict results in that society. Public policies should therefore be put in place to address the exclusion of people from the socio-economic and political resources of society.

The external factors influencing public policy making on the other hand, are forces which are outside the control of policy makers such as, for example, pollution, diseases, famine, drought, veld fires and the spread of HIV/AIDS epidemic. Public policies are developed specifically to address such forces which affect the society.

Public policy making is not only influenced by the factors which were mentioned above. It is also influenced by the theories. Theories are guidelines which explain how policies are made and how they ought to be in order to achieve their outcomes or impacts. It is of utmost importance that this study includes the theoretical models regarding public policy. Theoretical models regarding public policy are of major importance in the study of public policy because they explain the reasons why policies were made in the first place and prescribe what public policies ought to achieve.

In this way therefore, the descriptive and prescriptive models regarding public policy making will be discussed in the succeeding section.

3.4. THEORETICAL MODELS REGARDING PUBLIC POLICY

3.4.1. INTRODUCTION

To pervade and understand public policy making, it is necessary to utilize its theoretical

background for explanation. Theoretical backgrounds regarding public policy making differ widely and they are grouped into theoretical models.

A model is defined as “a simplified representation of some aspect of the real world. It may be an actual physical representation” (Dye, 1998:14).

According to Papalia and Olds (1992:21), theories are guidelines which help us to organize our explanation, interpretation and prediction about a phenomenon under study. In this context, the theoretical models regarding public policy are formats utilized to explain and categorize policies according to their features of orientation. Theoretical models are therefore the necessary element in public policy making because they help the researcher to explain, interpret and predict the characteristics of public policies, to group policies according to their orientations and to explain the similarities and differences among policies.

Different authors identified different theoretical models regarding public policy. Some contributions are summarized in Table 3.2 below and then discussed afterwards.

Table 3.2: Different Authors and their Theoretical Models Regarding Public Policy

Authors	Pillay (1990)	Cloete (1998)	Hanekom & Thornhill (1994)	Dye (1998)
Models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pluralist model -Elist model 	<p>IDEAL TYPE MODEL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Descriptive -Prescriptive 	<p>DESCRIPTIVE MODELS (Process)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Functional process model -Elite/Mass model -Group model -Systems model -Institutional model <p>PRESCRIPTIVE MODELS (Outcome/Impact)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Incremental model -Rational model -Mixed-scanning model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Elite model -Group model -Systems model -Institutional process model -Incremental model -Rational model -Game theory model -Public choice model

3.4.1.1. PILLAY’S PLURALIST AND ELITIST MODEL

Pillay (1990:241) identified the pluralist and the elitist views to discuss theoretical models regarding public policy. According to this view, the masses are apathetic and not well informed about public policy matters, and as such the elite is a group which is concerned with the policy making processes. In this regard therefore “public policy really turns out to be the preference of elite” (Dye, 1987:29).

Pillay's model explains that whilst it is the entire community which experience social problems such as poverty for example, the community is unable to do anything to improve its conditions and as a consequence its representatives, namely the elite group, are the people who will develop public policies to assist the community. In this instance, public policies intended to affect the masses to ameliorate social problems are developed by the few. Public policies which are developed in this way are ineffective in addressing the social problems because they were not articulated by the majority who experience the problem.

3.4.1.2. CLOETE'S IDEAL TYPE MODEL

Cloete (1998) registered yet his public policy-making models which he calls the ideal type model which includes the descriptive and prescriptive policy-making models. The descriptive model specifies the process of policy making, and the prescriptive specifies what ought to be done in the public policy making process.

In this way, the descriptive model of public policy making details a step-by-step process of how policy is formulated, implemented and evaluated. On the other hand, the prescriptive model explains what need to be done in order to reduce certain conditions within communities. Public policy making is indeed categorized into the descriptive model and prescriptive model.

3.4.1.3. HANEKOM AND THORNHILL'S DESCRIPTIVE AND PRESCRIPTIVE MODELS

Hanekom and Thornhill's descriptive model and prescriptive model are more detailed than Cloete's ideal type model. Apart from categorizing models into descriptive and prescriptive, these authors have a number of models listed under each category.

In the descriptive category, we have five models, namely; the functional process model, elite-mass model, group model, systems model and the institutional model. In the prescriptive category on the other hand, we have the incremental model, rational model and the mixed-scanning model. The aims of the descriptive and prescriptive models are

to analyze the process of policy making and the policy outputs and impacts, respectively (Hanekom & Thornhill, 1994:68).

It has already been explained under Cloete's ideal type model that descriptive models are concerned with the public policy making process, that is the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policy. The prescriptive models on the other hand, are concerned with the outcomes/results or impacts. The prescriptive models are a result of the evaluation process, that is, they inform the audience whether a public policy had an impact in improving the lives of those it was intended for.

3.4.1.4. DYE'S EIGHT MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

An American author, Dye (1998:14), bestowed eight models of public policy, namely; institutional process model, group model, elite model, rational model, incremental model, game theory model, public choice model and the systems model. Although Dye's model does not classify public policy models into the descriptive model and the prescriptive model as the South Africans Cloete, and Hanekom and Thornhill do, his list of models are similar to those cited by Hanekom and Thornhill. From his list, only two new models were identified, namely; the game theory model and the public choice model which the researcher incorporated in the discussion.

The researcher will conclude in this regard that theoretical models regarding public policy should firstly be categorized into descriptive model which is basically concerned with the public policy making process and the prescriptive model which informs public policy makers that their policies or programmes had an impact in improving the lives of those they were intended for; and secondly, that under each of the two categories, there should be a list of submodels.

In a way, the researcher chose to integrate all the models regarding public policy making which were contributed by the authors above.

3.4.2. THE DESCRIPTIVE AND PRESCRIPTIVE MODELS REGARDING PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

In this section, the descriptive and prescriptive models regarding public policy will be discussed. These models are reflected in Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Descriptive and Prescriptive Models Regarding Public Policy making

DESCRIPTIVE MODELS (Process)	PRESCRIPTIVE MODELS (Outcome/ Impact)
-Functional Process model	-Rational model
-Elite-Mass model	-Game Theory model
-Group model	-Public Choice model
-Systems model	-Incremental model
-Institutional model	-Mixed-scanning model

As indicated in Table 3.3 above, the theoretical models regarding public policy are categorized into the descriptive models and prescriptive models.

The descriptive models are concerned with the process of public policy making, namely, formulation, implementation and evaluation. The descriptive models are further made up of different models, namely: the functional process model, elite/mass model, group model, systems model and the institutional model.

The prescriptive models on the other hand, are concerned with the outcomes/results or impacts of public policies. This means that an evaluation process needs firstly to take place in order to assess whether the interventions have indeed improved the lives of

those the public policies or programmes were intended for. The prescriptive model has further models such as the rational model, game theory model, public choice model, incremental model and the mixed-scanning model.

3.4.2.1. DESCRIPTIVE MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

Hanekom (1987:30) defines the descriptive models by stating that they “deal with the actual process of policy-making, the individuals and/or groups involved and also the institutions concerned with policy-making.” Cloete (1998:142) adds to this by stating that the descriptive models were developed with the aim of explaining the real life of the policy-making process. “A descriptive model is a very natural human activity, since we need to see some sort of shape or pattern in the world about us” (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984:49).

Descriptive models are process oriented and inform us how policy-making is conducted, by whom and in which direction.

Under the descriptive category, the researcher will discuss the following models: functional process model, elite/mass model, groups model, systems model and institutional model.

• FUNCTIONAL PROCESS MODEL

The functional process model regarding public policy making suggests that policy-makers should seriously consider other policy alternatives when formulating policies. The proponents of this paradigm suggest that effective generation of alternatives will be achieved through grassroots participation towards the policymaking process. During the policy-making process, policy analysis is encouraged so that the successes or failures of the process could be identified. Lastly this model suggests that administrators should implement effective methods in making sure that policies are successful in improving the lives of communities.

In a manner corresponding to Dye (1998:17), the functional process model explains that policy is a political activity which has stages, namely: identification of problems, setting

the agenda, policy formulation, legitimating policy, implementation and evaluation. The process in policy making is basically inherently embedded in the functional process model of public policy. The functional process model is highly concerned with the patterns of activities or processes in the policy making (Dye, 1998:7). These activities include, for instance, how social problems are identified, who identify the social problems, why do some social problems achieve the agenda status when others cannot, and other public policy making phases such as policy formulation, implementation and evaluation.

- **ELITE/MASS MODEL.**

Cloete (1998:142) conveys this model by stating that “a policy is usually the product of the contributions of a number of institutions, political office-bearers, officials and interest groups who become engaged in deliberation, negotiation, bargaining and compromise.” To Hanekom (1987:31), this model postulates that the elite groups made of the minority group is responsible for policy-making and that the majority irrationally and passively follows suit. Anderson (1994: 29) terms the model the *elite theory* which explains that government policies are seen as representing the interest of those in the influential positions. This model categorically states that a small group of the elite is responsible for the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policy. The minority decides for the majority.

Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:69) explain the disadvantage of the model by stating that “the policy flows downward from the elite to the masses and is applied to the masses by a selected group of government institutions and public officials.” The existence of the model relies heavily on the consensus that is reached within the elite group.

“Defined in this way, the political elite is composed of bureaucratic, military, aristocratic and business elites, while the political class is composed of the political elite together with elites from other areas of social life” (Hill, 1997: 44).

Mills (1995:73) explains the elite group as those individuals who “rule the big corporations. They run the machinery of the state and claim its prerogatives. They direct the military establishment. They occupy the strategic command posts of the social

structure, in which are how centered the effective means of the power and the wealth and the celebrity which they enjoy.”

Policy making in this regard is therefore not a demand by the majority but represent the interests of the elite groups. Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993:120) considered this limitation when they stated that “in addition to generally degrading, the quality of policy making one particular consequence of impaired probing is that economic and political elites have an easier time preserving their advantages in the expense of the disadvantages of the majority poor.” The elite is formed by congressional committees and subcommittees, executive branch agencies, relevant interest groups etc. but unfortunately it does not represent the majority in the wider population.

Dye (1998:21) stated that public policy “may also be viewed as the preferences and values of a governing elite.” The masses are usually passive and ill-informed and are to be manipulated by the elite. Inactive participation in the policy making process by masses was also noted by Mwansa, Lucas and Osei-Hwedie (1998:67) when they disclosed "thus the public often witnesses little in the form of a policy debate unless a ministry decides to engage in some form of consultation. In this manner the elite group completes all the processes of public policy making and, during the implementation phase, they now go out to communities out there and explain the contents of the policies. This always leads to failure of the policy."

Colebatch (1998:1) noted that the masses generally support the electorates without considering their initial promises when he states that "there is a great deal of interest in what politicians say that they are going to do, but much less interest in whether they do it." This model has disadvantages in that, it exposes the masses to be exploited by the minority, in this circumstance, the elite group.

- **GROUP MODEL**

An interaction between the interest/pressure groups and the policy-makers in policy-making is the theme of this model. There are some groups, which are more powerful than others which exert more influence on the policy-makers.

Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:69) describe this state of power relation when they mention that “the influence and power of the group is determined by its membership, leadership, cohesion, access to policy makers, and money.” This model promotes a harsh condition wherein other groups have greater political influence than others, and that it “is possible that policy is adopted in the direction of the group with increasing prestige, with a movement away from the group that has forfeited it” (Hanekom & Thornhill, 1994:70).

This view is supported by Hanekom (1987:31) who propagates that policy-making should be made through the interaction between pressure groups. According to this perspective, the legislature still maintains an influential position of the arbiter during the policy-making process. There will be instances where we find that the problem exists but it is not defined as such by the majority and therefore it cannot draw the politician's attention.

The group theory model could be explained by the exposition which says “that interaction among groups is the central fact of politics. Individuals with common interest bond together formally or informally to press their demands on government” (Dye, 1998:19). A group plays an important role of bridging the gap between the individual and the government. The model explains that groups tend to reach an equilibrium state through their struggle for power.

Equilibrium is reached when there is consensus among the differing poles. When a group receives more support than the other, it means it would tend to have more public policy influence towards the government than other groups.

Another important facet of the group theory model is the management of group conflict contributed by Dye (1998:20) who contends it is achieved through “(1) establishing rules of the game in the group struggle, (2) arranging compromises and balancing interests, (3) enacting compromises in the form of public policy, and (4) enforcing these compromises.”

Policymakers are not stable, they take directions of influences of groups which have more membership, wealth, structural strength, are close to the legislators, and have a

strong cohesion.

Rushefsky (1996:23) coined the group model with the word “pluralism” to mean that there are many interests represented by pressure groups who govern the rest of the society. There is therefore a need for groups to wield more influential power on the legislative decisions and if they feel they do not have enough influence they may exercise compromise or make coalitions with other groups which will help articulate their interest. When societies develop in complexity, they in turn develop more and more interest groups, which also experience their own internal conflicts. The interest groups are valued by Rushefsky (1996:25) who says they “may advocate governmental action, propose policies, impede policies, have an impact on implementation, conduct evaluations, and so on.”

Anderson (1994:27) believes that public policymaking is a product of the struggle which existed between different pressure groups. Pressure groups compete for an access to influence the policy-makers. The more a group becomes nearer to the policy-maker, the more it becomes pursuant to him/her towards a certain direction. Persuasion is an important public policy-making concept which is defined as “the best sense of the word, meaning the use of information and thought to move people closer to reassured and voluntary agreement” (Lindblom & Woodhouse, 1993:129).

Persuasion is the ability to give reason or to pose an argument which will influence others to take action towards the suggested direction.

- **SYSTEMS MODEL**

According to the systems model, “inputs from the external environment such as community needs and problems serve as the basis for action by the policy-maker” (Hanekom, 1987:32). “Another way to conceive of public policy is to think of it as a response of a political system to forces brought to bear on it from the environment” (Dye, 1998:35).

Anderson (1994:26) terms the systems model the political systems theory and agree that "public policy may be viewed as a political systems response to demands arising from its environment."

Du Toit and van der Waldt (1999:93) explain that government receives money from the public, which has put it (government) to power, and it is therefore the responsibility of government to see to it that this money is effectively utilized to meet the needs of the people. They announce that "we must remember that for any government to be able to govern, the greatest possible number of society's needs must be met, in other words, public administration must take place" (Du Toit & van der Waldt, 1999:93).

Systems model is about government's responsibility and accountability towards meeting demands that are articulated by the people.

South Africa has a bad history of human rights violation, racial domination, social injustice, political oppression, economic exploitation, gender discrimination and judicial repression, and all these required the present government to respond through the legislating of the *Constitution* which protects the rights of the citizens, (*The National Action Plan for the Promotion & Protection of Human Rights*, 1998; *Constitution*, Act No. 108 of 1996).

Needs that lead to policy making could be felt by a group of countries. For example, the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (1990) is a product of different countries who on 29 – 30 September 1990 gathered at the United Nations, Geneva, in order to draw a Convention to protect the rights of the children all over the world. Article 2 Section 1 of the Convention reads as follows for example: "States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth on the Convention to each child within the jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status."

Demands or needs could be in the form of circumstances. Catastrophies, recessions, and other socio-political problems occur in communities which compel the government to enact its intention to intervene and save the communities. The systems model can therefore be a government's response to natural disasters.

- **INSTITUTIONAL MODEL**

Hanekom (1987:32) explains the institutional model by expressing that it “is supposed to describe the roles of public institutions involved in policy-making and to analyse the public policies as products of institutions either as policies formulated by or implemented by public institutions, or both.” This means that only the ministers, members of executive committee (MEC’s), councillors, etc. are legitimately responsible for public policy-making of their respective jurisdictions. Hanekom, Rowland and Bain (1987:32) added that “these policies have no significance unless legitimised by the legislator.”

Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:71) explain the institutional model by mentioning that it “was intended to give a description of the roles of the various government institutions involved in policy making.” It is this model which will stipulates that it is the responsibility of only the department of Health and Welfare, for example, to formulate, implement and evaluate particular policies which are related to health and welfare matters.

Anderson (1994:31) terms the model ”institutionalism” which he defines with “since simple political life generally revolves around governmental institutions such as legislatures, executives, courts, and political parties. Public policy, moreover, is authoritatively determined and implemented initially by these institutions.” This model contributes the structures in government institutions which are legitimately responsible for policy-making. The model approves that public policy making should be executed, by what Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993:45) call “elected functionaries,” because the mass public cannot make policies.

Public policies are different from other policies because they are formulated by government through its respective departments. Dye (1998:15) informs us by stating that “a policy does not become a public policy until it is adopted, implemented and enforced by some government institution.” Public policies involve every sector of the society, are legal and are coerced by government institutions.

This part of the section has explained in detail the descriptive model regarding public policy making which is concerned with the process public policy making, that is there should firstly be problems in order for public policy making process to take place.

3.4.2.2. PRESCRIPTIVE MODELS OF PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

Prescriptive models is a second category of theoretical models regarding public policy making which according to Cloete (1998:143), are “models that would bring reason and expertise to prevail in policy-making and rationalize the inputs or political processes.” Hanekom (1997:32) states that the prescriptive models are concerned with normative theory, which states how policy makers have to act. Prescriptive models are involved with the analysis of the outputs and impacts of the policy.

The prescriptive models are according to Hanekom, Rowland and Bain (1987), made of the rational, incremental and the mixed-scanning models. This is supported by a statement which says “the best known prescriptive policy analysis models are the rational, the incremental, and the mixed-scanning models” (Hanekom & Thornhill, 1994:71).

The researcher wants to add to this category also the game theory model and the public choice model which were contributed by Dye (1998). The sequence in the discussion will be rational model, game theory model, public choice model, incremental model and the mixed scanning model.

- **RATIONAL MODEL**

Cloete (1987:142) explains the rational model by stating that “there will always be a tendency for policy-makers to claim that they are rational in their performance of policy-making functions.” Anderson (1994:32) contributes a list of terms by which the rational model is known namely; rational choice model, social choice model, public choice model and formal theory model.

The rational model is utilized by those in power to further expand their power so that they can remain there. In this regard, Anderson (1994:33) contends that “politicians are

guided by their self interest rather than an altruistic commitment to such goals as statesmanship or the national interest.”

For Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:71), the rational model has the following qualities: detailed research about the community and its needs; well researched solutions and their possible consequences; the checks and balances regarding the financing; and the total benefit of the community at large. The model emphasizes the norm of effective public policy formulation.

Dye (1998:24) contends that “a rational policy is one that achieves maximum social gain; that is, government should choose policies resulting in gains to society that exceeds costs by the greatest amount, and government should refrain from policies if costs are not exceeded by gains.” In other words, if it is anticipated that policies which are formulated will have costs which will exceed their benefits, such policies should be discouraged. This model requires an involvement of the administrators who should draw a cost-benefit analysis of the policy programmes way ahead before such programmes are actually implemented.

Before one takes a decision, he/she should have gathered enough information which should assist him/her into taking that decision. Wilhelm (2000:38-39) gives an example of a decision that was taken based on distorted information, when the former South African President De Clerk "hoped for a return to normality with his party still in charge-believing, even, that it might win a democratic election, when he unbanned all the opposition parties.” This decision was very fatal to both himself and the National Party which confided on him.

Rationalistic models are widely held conceptions about how decisions are and ought to be taken. An actor becomes aware of a problem, posits a goal, carefully weighs alternative means, and chooses among them according to his estimate of their respective merit, with reference to the state of affair he prefers (compare Smith & May, 1997:164; Schneider & Ingram, 1997: 32.)

Even when many scholars agree that the rational models are effective in public policy making, Smith and May (1997:167) identified its limitations as follows; (i) the models are

narrow in that their practitioner proved to be effective in environments which were constraints-free, (ii) are utopian in that practitioners posit their dreams as reality whilst in the real world, it is not thus so, (iii) it is value biased in that it is accused of favouring management and senior professions to the detriment of low-ranking staff, clients and patients, whose perspectives are in practice neglected. The model intends to inform the public out there that management is good, efficient and effective in addressing its problems whilst in reality it is not so, (iv) the model is rigid in that it does not delineate the relationship between the ends and means and or their distinctions, and lastly, (v) the rational model is impractical.

- **GAME THEORY MODEL**

The game theory model is another form of the rational model regarding public policy making. It is a model which is defined as “the study of rational decisions in situations in which two or more participants have choices to make and the outcome depends on the choices made by each” (Dye, 1998:29). This model is usually implemented when policies regarding the choice of either war or peace, nuclear weapons or not, etc. are to be made. This concern what Dye (1998) call the pay-offs, which are values which each participant accumulates on numerical quantities so that comparison could be easily be made between the two of them. Payoff in the game theory model is according to the points that each player scores as a result of his or her choices against those of the opponent (Dye, 1998:33).

In this approach, two players compete by developing strategies to win the game. It is a zero-sum game in that “the sum of losses for one player must be equal the sum of gains for the other player” (Render & Stair, 2000:22). The two players mentioned in the game theory could be for example, the defendant versus the complainant in the criminal case.

- **PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY MODEL**

The public choice theory model views policy as a collective decision making by self-interested individuals and is defined as “the economical study of nonmarket decision making, especially the application of economic analyses to public policy making” (Dye 1998:32). This model explains that public policy is a resultant of individuals, groups or

organizations who want to maximize their personal benefits within the entire political system politics. This is true because it is the concentration of all the individual benefits, which at the end are reflected at public policy. Public choice entails that the human beings are self-interested who will influence policy making towards their own liking through whichever means available to them such as votes, intimidation, and the like (Schneider & Ingram, 1997: 38).

According to the public choice model, whoever it is, be it a politician, administrator or the interest group, their aim is to maximize their own personal gain through public policy. Politicians care about winning elections and being re-elected but have nothing to do with the production and achievements entailed in the public policies. This is called **organizational sclerosis**, which is "a political economy so encrusted with subsidies, benefits, regulations, protections and special treatments for organized interest groups that work, productivity, and investment are discouraged" (Dye, 1998:34).

In our modern society, there are greedy individuals, groups and organizations whose goal is the maximization of own benefit rather than those of the entire society.

INCREMENTAL MODEL

Hanekom (1987:33) describes the incremental model with a statement which says it has as "point of departure that existing policies are legitimate and satisfactory and probably only marginally ineffective, and should thus be adapted incrementally to eliminate those aspects which are no longer effective." This model gives opportunities to the stakeholders or the interest groups to make inputs and effect amendments to the existing policy. According to Hanekom and Thornhill (1994:71), "the incremental model for policy making regards public policy as the continuation of exiting government activities with only incremental adaptation to provide for changing circumstances." Thus according to this model, the policy maker intend to maintain the *status quo* whilst adapting only the marginalized items to the current policy.

To describe incrementalism, Dye (1998:27) writes, " incrementalism views public policy as a continuation of past government activities with only incremental modification." Instead, policy makers utilizing this model concentrate on decreasing, increasing or

modifying some of the items in programmes, this being because they are faced with inadequacy of resources such as time, money, skills, information, and others. This model exposes a situation that policy makers refrain from encountering the radical changes in their programmes and will opt for a *status quo*. According to Dye (1998:29), the policy makers reduce conflict, maintain stability and preserve the political system when "they seldom search for the "one best way" but instead end their search when they find "a way that will work."

Smith and May (1997:166-167) accused the incremental model of a number of limitations, namely; (i) it is conservative in that it does not allow for new innovations. Its anti-innovation feature is a serious limitation to policy making; (ii) it is unjust because it does not give room for other differing opinions in that it favours the interests of the most powerful and systematically to under-represent the interests of the underprivileged and politically unorganized. This embodies that the incremental model is narrowly constructed and has more limitations than the rational model it sought to replace in the first place; and (iii) it is extremely costly, in that, if it conducted the processes of other models of going through the comparison of cost-benefit cycle, it would be a worse-off model. This is captured in a statement which says "although the costs of rational decision making are high, the costs of failing to explore radical alternatives to existing policies may be even higher."

- **MIXED SCANNING MODEL**

Hanekom (1987:33) elucidate the mixed scanning model as follows: "owing to the inherent inadequacies of both the rational and incremental policy-making models, it was suggested that the best qualities of both models be integrated into a new model, the so-called mixed-scanning model." This model was suggested as an alternative to the rational comprehensive and incremental decision-making models. It strives to combine the qualities from both the mentioned models.

According to Smith and May (1997:167), the mixed scanning model is a product which was developed by Etzioni and Dror who "have attempted to avoid the weakness of rationalist and incrementalist models by combining the strongest features of the two."

Further exposition states that each of the two elements in mixed-scanning helps to reduce the effects of the particular shortcomings of the other model.

Anderson (1994:125) writes that mixed scanning is "an approach to decision-making that takes into account both fundamental and incremental decisions and provides for higher -order fundamental policy-making processes which are basic directions." This model was developed with a full view of selecting only the effective features of the mentioned two models, and as a consequence it has more advantages than disadvantages in the policy making process.

From the discussion above, it was identified that the incremental model of public policy is a conservative model which favours the *status quo*. Policy makers utilizing this model like things to remain as they are with minor adjustments here and there on their policies. A disadvantage of the incremental model of policy making was recognized by John (1998:68) who said "incrementalism does not recognize the inequality of power in the policy-making process and justifies a conservative approach to politics." This stand is discouraged in the South African public policy making context which is liberal and innovative in nature. Incremental model is favoured by the politicians who dislike challenge and innovation and has a serious limitation of failing to provide public policies with new intervention methods to address diverse problems (Dye, 1987:36-38).

The rational model of public policy making on the other hand, is concerned about the rules and procedural orientation. These models stick to the rules and procedures which are to be followed when public policies are made. The rational model is the most criticized method of social science inquiry because its applications are "often more descriptive and heuristic than explanatory, have difficulties in explaining change and are difficult to test conclusively" (John, 1998:138).

Limitations of both the incremental and the rational models could be minimized by the introductory of the mixed scanning model in the public policy making which is both innovative and liberal in nature. The mixed scanning is a composition of the qualities which were selected from both the incremental and the rational models of public policy. The mixed scanning model is effective and efficient and as such it is favoured over other models.

It has been mentioned that the descriptive models regarding public policy making are effective in providing policy makers with the public policy making process. This process has elements such as formulation, implementation and evaluation which will be discussed in detail in the succeeding section.

3.5. PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS

The public policy process is an important topic within this study because it guides policy makers to follow certain phases and activities in the public policy making. The process also informs us about the types and nature of legislation such as for example, the so-called 'green papers,' 'white papers' and acts.

There is no blueprint public policy process available, and most authors suggest different stages in the public policy making process. This is supported by Anderson (1994:37) who admits that "there is, however, not a single process by which policies are made." This absence however does not mean that there is totally no process in public policy making. Fox, Schwella and Wissink (1991:29) state for instance that public policy is amoeboid in nature, meaning that it does have a specific sequence of phases in its process. This is due to the reason that policy making is a continuous process adapting to the changing nature of the problems within communities. This postulates a condition that policy making process moves backward and forward and *vice versa*.

It is important to indicate how different authors compose their public policy making process models before a choice can be made.

Models suggested by Hanekom (1987), Pillay (1999), Rushefsky (1996) and Peters (1996) are discussed in this regard.

It is noted from the above four models that the international authors, namely, Rushefsky (1996) and Peters (1996) suggest that the budgeting phase should be included in the public policy making process. The researcher admits that indeed the budgeting phase is part of the public policy process, but chooses not to discuss it in this study. This is

because within the South African context, public policy making does not include it as a phase in the process.

The researcher included all these four models in this study with the reason of indicating that the South African and international authors term them differently, that the models have different numbers of phases and lastly that policy makers in South Africa need to utilize their own models without the reliance on the international models which are not relevant to their circumstances.

In the **first model regarding the public policy process**, Hanekom (1987) suggests that the public policy process should include the following five phases:

- The identification of a goal
- Authorisation to act by the policy-maker
- A public statement of what the policy-maker intends doing
- Execution of the policy
- Evaluation of the policy in conjunction with feedback regarding policy results.

This process together with its phases is exactly the one cited in Anderson (1994), but only differs in terminology.

The **second model regarding the public policy process** has been contributed by Pillay (1999) who contend that it contains at least six phases as follows:

- issue search and agenda setting
- issue definition
- setting objectives and priorities
- analysis of the policy options and selection of the best option
- policy implementation, monitoring, evaluation
- Policy review.

The **third model regarding the public policy process** was offered by Rushefsky (1996:3) who suggests it should contain eight phases, namely:

- Problem identification
- Agenda building
- Policy formulation
- Policy adoption
- Budgeting
- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Policy succession

The **fourth model regarding the public policy process** was contributed by Peters (1996). His model has the following five phases:

- Agenda setting and Public Policy
- Legitimizing Policy Choices
- Organization and Implementation
- Budgeting: allocation and Public Policy
- Evaluation and Policy Change

In this study, Hanekom's model will be utilized. This is because the researcher prefers to utilize models which are relevant to the South African context. The researcher has identified that the terminology of phases in Hanekom's model (1987) will confuse the international readers, and to counter this problem, he has chosen to utilize terms used by Anderson (1994) which will be known internationally.

The public policy process which has been derived from Anderson (1994:37) has the following phases:

- Phase 1: Policy agenda
- Phase 2: Policy formulation
- Phase 3: Policy adoption
- Phase 4: Policy implementation
- Phase 5: Policy evaluation

Blakemore (2003:124) has suggested that public policy making process and the legislative process take place concurrently and that they could be presented in a table. In this regard, the researcher has designed Table 3.4 which contain the South African public policy making process and the legislative process.

Table 3.4: South African public policy making process and the legislative process

Phases	Features	Role players	Types of policy documents
Policy Agenda	The larger the number of the people affected by a problem, its severity and visibility, the more probable it is to be on the agenda	Demonstrations, media, perceptions	Policy proposal (Draft Bill)
Policy Formulation	How best can a problem be resolved with the available resources	Elite groups, government officials, presidential organizations, legislatures, interest groups	Draft Bill (Green Paper)
Policy Adoption	Choice of an effective policy or programme to deal more effectively with the problem Final policy draft is assented	Cabinet President	Draft bill (White Paper)
Policy Implementation	Post-legislative phase during which plans and programmes are put into action, delivery takes place through laws, services, money, taxes, economic instruments and suasion	Government and NGOs	Programme frameworks
Policy Evaluation	Estimation, assessment and or appraisal of policy, policy is improved Assertion of final policy choice	Elite groups, government officials, presidential organizations, legislatures, interest groups	Draft Bill (Policy Proposal) Amendment Act

In the following section, the five phases, namely; policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation will be discussed separately and in-depth.

3.5.1. PHASE 1: POLICY AGENDA

The first phase of the public policy process is called policy agenda.

The content of the policy agenda phase can be explained by the following paragraph:

By issue definition, then, we mean the processes by which an issue (problem, opportunity, or trend), having been recognized as such and placed on the public policy agenda, is perceived by various interested parties; further explored, articulated and possibly quantified; and in some, but not all cases, given an authoritative or at least provisionally acceptable definition in terms of its likely causes, components, and consequences (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984: 222).

During this phase, the problem is identified. According to Rushefsky (1996:3), this stage begins with a demand for government action to resolve a problem or take advantage of an opportunity. It is an attempt to get government to see that a problem or opportunity exists.

Dye (1998:321) has much to say about this phase when he writes that “defining the problems of society and suggesting alternative solutions – agenda setting- is the most important stage of the policymaking process.” In this context, agenda setting becomes a process of sifting through a number of conditions and selecting those which are of utmost importance.

To begin the discussion, the researcher recognized that “agenda setting is in many respects an ideological process, translating an issue into a policy proposal” (Hill, 1997: 115).

In order for an issue to be regarded as a social problem, both the status and power of individuals defining it and pressing for its urgent solution and the number of people affected by it are regarded as the most important determining factors. Social problems should affect many people. "Social problems are those concern about the quality of life for large groups of people where the concern is held as a consensus populationwide, and/or the concern is voiced by the socially powerful or the economically privileged" (Chambers, 2000:8).

Another dimension of the policy agenda is that it is concerned with the distribution of power among people who influence the public policy making.

According to Dye (1998:322), agenda setting is a concept which in itself indicates who has the most influential power towards policy making, how much support he/she has, his/her knowledge and his/her economic and political standing.

When the most powerful group refuses to consider an issue as a social problem, then that issue would not achieve an agenda status. This is termed *non decision making*.

Dye (1995:301) conveys that nondecisions are "conditions in societies that are not defined as a problem and for which alternatives are never proposed, never become policy issues." Nondecision is "a means by which demands for change in the existing allocation of benefits and privileges in the community can be suffocated before they are even voiced; or kept covert; or killed before they gain access to the relevant decision-making arena" (Anderson, 1994:95). Such issues will never qualify to be put on agenda and as such they will remain the same until such time they receive more demand for inclusion in the agenda. Nondecision making occurs when an issue is feared to provoke public attention; if the issue will be disfavoured by the elite or if its resolution may obstruct the resolution of others.

Rushefsky (1996:5) views agenda setting somehow differently by stating that "the agenda is a list of items to be discussed at a meeting. In a similar vein, a policy agenda consists of those items that policy makers are discussing and seriously considering." This phase of policy making process is about the technicalities of defining a problem so that it can

receive an agenda setting status and it explains why are some problems considered when some are ignored.

Public policies are put on agenda on a win-loose basis, that is, one group gains on the disadvantage of the other. The proponents of an issue should mobilize support from their constituencies in order for their issue to be put on an agenda. Mobilization does not only mean bringing a large membership together, it also means an effort to drive the membership or constituents towards action to redress their socio-economic and political standing (Mamburu, 2000:20-21).

It has been mentioned that different problems compete to achieve the status of being placed under agenda. Dror (1986:153) contends that being included on a policy agenda is a necessary, though not sufficient condition for active and explicit policymaking. According to the author, agenda setting is a process of allocating attention and inducement of policymakers to consider problems and their respective solutions. Agenda setting is about disequilibrium which manifests when certain groups of people demand some form of intervention from government.

There are a variety of ways in which problems can reach a policy agenda, namely:

- when politicians are motivated by their constituencies to deliver something to them
- through the presidential agenda setting
- through the electoral manifesto agenda setting
- government departments often having agendas they have to periodically set
- protests after some incidents, eg. when a teenager has shot dead other school mates and some teachers
- groups of concerned minorities, eg. gays and lesbians demanding recognition by government
- issues that are displayed by media
- statistical indicators
- political changes in the country
- problems as a consequence of crisis, natural disasters, etc. (Anderson, 1994:95).

According to Rushefsky (1996:4) there are two concepts which are related to the identification of a problem for policy agenda setting, namely: perception and definition.

- **Perception** is a generic term which involves different senses in the human being, namely: hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and seeing. In the public policy making process, there should be individuals, groups and organizations in the society who are able to point out that certain attributes must be regarded as problems. It is therefore important to know who is perceiving and how that perception is defined (Rushefsky, 1996:4).
- Problems can also be identified through **definition**. Definition is the description of a condition in the words that can stimulate some understanding to the next person. Definitions differ according to the perspectives from which they are drawn. The most important concept for this study is, for example, poverty which is defined through a variety of perspectives, namely: the individualistic perspective, the reformist perspective and the structuralistic perspective which were discussed in chapter 2. To identify a problem for agenda setting, there should be adequate information available regarding the decline or increase of something; the problem should affect a number of people and the causes with possible solutions must be known.

According to Rushefsky (1996:5) a definition process is conducted in three categories, namely (i) narrative:- which is the explanation of stories regarding the problem and its effects, (ii) numbers and statistics:- to define a problem through figures in order to show the extent to which it affects a number of people, and (iii) causes of the problem:- which maintains that it is important to understand the underlying causes of the problem in order to solve it. Problems could indeed be effectively defined if enough information about them, the number of people they affect and their respective causes exist.

Government receives thousands of demands from the public regarding diverse social problems, but only a few are prioritized in order to receive consideration and these constitute the policy agenda (Anderson, 1994:89). A problem qualifying to achieve the agenda status is prioritized over others.

Social work practitioners should select different theoretical approaches in order to define the social problems in the manner that they can influence policy makers to put them on agenda. This study will discuss some of the theoretical approaches to policy agenda in the succeeding part.

3.5.1.1. THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO POLICY AGENDA

According to Peters (1996) there are three theoretical approaches to policy agenda, namely: the pluralist approach, elitist approach and state-centric approach which will be discussed separately in this part.

- **Pluralist Approach**

The pluralist approach is the dominant and most influential approach to policy agenda. The larger the group size, the bigger its influence will be on policy. Powerful interest groups will pressure government to regard their interest as more important to receive the agenda status than are weaker groups. Powerful groups influence the agenda through their votes whilst government maintains the role of an umpire between the competing groups “to enforce the victories through law” (Peters, 1996:51). “The appropriate role of Government in society, according to pluralist theories, is to produce public policies that represent the interest of the electorate, resolve conflicts, reflect reasonable compromises among competing perspectives, and ensure the continued stability of the collectivity along with its preferred economic and cultural characteristics” (Schneider & Ingram, 1997: 13). This view rests in conception of democracy that states government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

“In pluralist democracy, citizen preferences are articulated and aggregated by intermediate groups such as interest groups, professional associations and political parties. Through their activities, citizens are more likely to have their preferences reflected in public policy” (Schneider & Ingram, 1997: 15).

It seems therefore that policy agenda is based on the pluralist approach because it is influenced by the majority preferences.

- **Elitist Approach**

The second theoretical approach to policy agenda namely, the elitist perspective assumes the existence of a power elite who dominate public decision making and whose interests are served in the policy making process (Peters, 1996:50). The elite are usually big guns who are financially sound, hold high socio-economic and political positions in the society and are usually from the middle and upper classes, and in most countries are whites. The elite are highly educated and have the necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes towards the development of the communities.

This view suggests that the elite group is in minority, it is more powerful than the majority and it governs most societies.

The disadvantage of the elite's influence in public policy is that they usually remove issues from policy agenda which they feel are a threat to their positions (Minogue, 1997).

- **State-centric Approach**

The third theoretical approach to policy agenda is the state-centric approach.

The state-centric approach “would place the bureaucratic agency or the congressional committee, not the pressure group, in the centre of the process” (Peters, 1996:51). This approach explains the institutional type of agenda in that elected officials who manage the government departments are responsible for selecting agendas that they warrant are most important to be addressed by their departments at a certain point in time.

Apart from the different theoretical approaches to policy agenda, agenda setting has a number of different types which will be discussed in the succeeding part.

3.5.1.2. TYPES OF POLICY AGENDA

There are two types of policy agenda, namely: the systematic agenda and the institutional agenda (Anderson, 1994:90)

- **Systematic agenda**

Systematic agenda is usually only a general topic under discussion. It is said to include “all issues that are commonly perceived by members of the political community as meriting public attention, which government should intervene in order to solve” (Peters, 1996:49). Systematic agenda is concerned with influential forces to the policy making, that is, the demands and government's response towards them.

- **Institutional agenda**

Institutional agenda consists of the problems to which legislators or public officials feel obliged to give serious and active attention. It is usually found in the calendar of the authoritative decision making of the government department and through it, “decision-makers presume that older problems warrant more attention because of their longevity and the greater familiarity officials have with them” (Cobb & Elder, 1995:101). Institutional agendas are in other words called government departmental visions. They are automatically there in the public policy making process.

An institutional agenda is defined as “that set of items explicitly up for active and serious consideration of authoritative decision-makers” (Peters, 1996:48). This is the type which is exemplified by the names attached, for example, to the South African Department of Public Works that deals with all matters of infrastructure construction and maintenance whilst the Department of Health and Welfare deals with all issues regarding the health and welfare of citizens. Thus these institutions are specifically made to attend to the issues attached to them.

The different types of policy agenda are important in the agenda setting and should always be considered in the process of agenda setting. This is also the case with the factors which influence agenda setting because without them the agenda setting process would not take place. It is therefore important to discuss the factors which influence agenda setting in the succeeding part.

3.5.1.3. FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE AGENDA SETTING

Apart from being supported by whoever to maintain the agenda status, public policy should be constructed in such a manner that it will become worthwhile. That is, in order for a public policy to achieve the agenda status, it should have satisfied a number of factors which shall be discussed in this part. Factors influencing agenda setting are of utmost importance because they prepare a base for the public policy making process. Peters (1996), discusses different factors which influence agenda setting, namely: the effect of the problem, analogous and spillover agenda setting, relationship to symbols, the absence of private means and the availability of technology.

- **The Effects of the Problem**

Government legislators would like to know who the problem affects and its extent in that, “the more extreme the effect of a problem, the more likely it is to be placed on an agenda” (Peters, 1996:53).

The problem can influence its placement on an agenda only if it satisfies the following requirements: if it affects most of the people staying in one area, it affects people severely and it is visible.

- **Spillover Agenda Setting**

In order to explain the influence of spillover on agenda setting, Anderson (1994:241) maintains that public policy may affect different individuals, groups and organizations than the ones initially targeted, for example, testing nuclear explosives is a benefit for the warfare of the country but has an adverse effect on the environment and the future generations.

And Schneider and Ingram (1997: 32) note that “government policies usually impact not just one narrowly defined problem, but may spill over and have effects far beyond the specific problem they were addressing.” This is a double effect notion in which one intervention usually leads to the other and is available in all areas of public policy making

such as policies regarding environment, redistribution of resources, crime prevention and others.

- **Relationship to Symbols**

This means that “the more closely a particular problem can be linked to certain important national symbols, the greater is its probability of being placed on the agenda” (Peters, 1996:56). In South Africa today, for example, problems which are closely related to children and women abuse, genderism and HIV/AIDS have the highest probability of achieving the agenda status.

Developed countries need to develop policies which discourage the exclusion of people from programmes due to socio-economical, political and cultural background. The relationship to symbols therefore could be viewed as “symbolizing protection of widely shared interest” (Edelman, 1995:27).

In the newly democratic countries, the concept of the relationship to symbols is accorded to the consideration of those who were previously disadvantaged by the colonial regimes and or apartheid systems.

The factor of relationship to symbols which influences agenda setting is of paramount importance in the public policy making process and it is not static because it changes over a period of time.

- **The Absence of Private Means**

The absence of private means factor influencing agenda setting is known as nondecision which Anderson (1994:95) defines as “a means by which demands for change in the existing allocation of benefits and privileges in the community can be suffocated before they are even voiced; or kept covert, or killed before they gain access to the relevant decision-making arena.”

According to the nondecision process, governments choose to do nothing in the absence of necessary resources or private means. In Zimbabwe for example, there has been a

serious deterioration of the economy when President Robert Mugabe took over government during the 1980's. This forced his government to review its public policies and stopped providing people earning less than Z\$150 per month free primary education and free health services (Kaseke, Gumbo, Dhemba & Kasere, 1998:24).

Problems will gain the agenda status if there are socio-economic resources necessary to eliminate them.

- **The Availability of Technology**

If an issue has got a possible solution, it has a high probability that it can be put on an agenda because problems may be excluded from the agenda, simply because they lack of effective interventions to address them (Peters, 1996:58). In this regard, there should be an indication that the problem is solvable before it is placed on an agenda.

There are crucial problems within the communities that are not receiving government attention simply because legislators are not convinced that they are solvable. Peters (1996:47) maintains that “the most basic cause for placing an issue on the agenda is a perception that something is wrong and that the problem can be ameliorated by public action.” When there is an outbreak of a problem, say, HIV/AIDS within the society, citizens, organizations and even government departments become concerned and put pressure for its immediate remedy or removal in order to protect the citizens. Watt, Higgins and Kendrick (2000:173) advise that politicians should consult communities in order to develop good policy agendas which are representative of the problems in the communities.

It is identified that policy agenda is an important phase of the public policy making in that it is the foundation from which public policy making can build. This researcher has so far defined the agenda setting phase of the public policy process as the phase in which a problem or condition competes with others in order to be selected as a priority. The most powerful groups among the policy makers are the ones which will be influential towards the selection of an issues. These groups are not only necessarily formed by the majority of the policymakers, they could also be formed by an elite group which is more socio-economically and politically powerful than the rest of the groups in the society. The process of selection is

explained through three theoretical approaches to policy agenda setting, namely: the pluralist approach, the elitist approach and the state-centric approach. The study further discussed the two types of agenda setting, namely: systematic and institutional agendas. The last part of the section explains the factors which influence agenda setting. The agenda setting phase of public policy process involves the analysis of the effect of a problem on a large number of people, its severity and visibility which will in turn influence the public policy makers in selecting it as a priority. It has also been mentioned that the policy document during the policy agenda phase of public policy making process is called a policy proposal.

After prioritizing and selecting agenda topics, the next step in the public policy making process is the policy formulation phase, which will be discussed in the succeeding section.

3.5.2. PHASE 2: POLICY FORMULATION

Policy formulation was identified as the second phase of the public policy process and it involves the development of pertinent and acceptable proposed courses of action which are called alternatives, proposals, or options for dealing with public problems (Anderson, 1994:102).

After the problem has been put on the agenda, the next step would be what should be done to solve it. In other words "the development of the mechanisms for solving the public problem" (Peters, 1996:59). It includes the analyses of the cost-benefits. Cost-benefit is according to Dunn (1994:294), "an approach to policy recommendation that permits analysts to compare and advocate policies by qualifying their total monetary costs and total monetary benefits."

The following individuals, groups and/or organizations should decide what to do to effectively solve the problems:

- elite group
- government/public officials
- presidential organizations

- legislatures
- interest groups

All the above are referred to as role players in the public policy making process and will be discussed in detail in this part.

3.5.2.1. ROLE PLAYERS IN PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

The role players who are responsible for the public policy making process are individuals, groups and/or organizations. They are the representatives of the entire communities.

There are many role players who participate in the public policy making process who were drawn from the local, provincial, national and international communities. In this study, the researcher selected to discuss only the elite group, the government or public officials, the presidential organizations, legislatures and the interest groups because they play a major role and are easily identifiable within the South African communities.

• ELITE GROUPS

The elite group are referred to as the “think tanks” and the “technocrats” which are defined as the organizations which “bring together the leadership of corporate and financial institutions, the foundations, the mass media, the leading intellectuals and influential figures in the government” (Dye, 1998:326).

Hill (1997:68) calls them the political elite, which he argues, are the decision-makers who are drawn from a narrow spectrum within society. As explained above, this group is in minority but is socio-economically and politically more sound than the entire populace. The political elite are regarded as the think tanks or the heavy weight pressure group because they exert more influence on the government decision-making process than any other group.

Elite are professionals in their fields of study, but Considine (1998:193) realizes that they have limitations because their courses are usually in contradiction with those of the entire

community. "When sociologists and commentators talk of technocracy they mean rule by a class of experts who are trained in the skills of investigation, diagnosis and manipulation, and who offer this expertise impartially to the state and the corporation" (Considine, 1998:194). During policy formulation, elites are highly necessary as their skills, knowledge and attitudes will direct the legislatures to a desired goal.

- **GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

Public officials are the second group of role players in public policy making process to be discussed in this part of the section.

Public officials are the most effective role-players in the policy making process because they are the ones who identify community problems and turn them into policy statements. In an orderly process "politicians instruct administrators to frame policies compatible with their mandates and commitments" (Hill, 1997:71). Public officials are skillful in the sense that the legislatures borrow their technical expertise in order to make the public policy making process a reality.

For Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993:60), "many legislative acts and executive orders actually are designed to require administrators to formulate policy specifics instead of legislatures." Anderson (1994) adds that public officials occupy the administration and the judiciary positions in the government.

The above explanations put the public officials in the centre of the public policy making process. They are the individuals who occupy government institutions and render the day-to-day processes of the departments. In other words, because government departments are concerned with the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies, then the public officials who directly render these tasks are the most important role players in the public policy making process.

The researcher prefers to term these officials both the policy "formulators" and the "implementers" of public policies whilst Minogue (1997:17), offered yet another term, namely; managerialism, to denote that it "offers both a method and a philosophy for achieving efficient and effective administration." The managers have the capacity to

translate policy plans into action. The managers provide desirable rational management as against the politicians who provide sometimes more irrational and ineffective management. Minogue (1997:21) continues to mention that public officials are more skillful than their respective politicians whom he claims produce unreal, unworkable or unacceptable decisions.

Community involvement in public policy making is limited as this process is highly centralized at the government level to the public officials. Osei-Hwedie (1998:8) mentions that "it is, in fact, top civil servants who dominate the policymaking process." Public officials have the limitation of undermining the inputs of the grassroots in the public policy making process and as a consequence public policies are not representative to the majority, they are unpopular and they are difficult to implement at the community level.

Fox, Schwella and Wissink (1991:38) mention that public officials render two types of policy-making, namely: internal policies which are concerned with the internal running of their departments and the external policies which concern problems of the communities outside the departments.

Public officials have a responsibility for interpreting a public policy to the public. This task is usually carried by the judges, magistrates, police and traffic officers. Public managers are specialists in their fields of operation and the politicians are reliant on their expert advice. They are people who are responsible for preparing all policies and speeches made publicly by the politicians. Fox, Schwella and Wissink (1991:39) maintain that most of the public statutes that we see were in fact prepared by the public managers rather than by the politicians because administration is above politics in the day to day running of every government.

Although the legislatures are authorized by the South African Constitution to formulate, implement and evaluate public policies, this important obligation is downsized by the public officials who are more professional and have the required expertise in the public policy making field. It has also been mentioned that the legislatures are dependent on the expert advice they regularly get from the public officials. The researcher therefore

concludes that it seems as if the public officials are more important role players in the public policy making process than the legislatures.

- **PRESIDENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Presidential organizations such as the advisory commissions, interagency committees, presidential commissions, task forces, etc. are purposely employed for the development of public policy proposals. Anderson (1994:103) writes that “temporary organizations, sometimes called “adhocracies” may be established by the president to study particular policy areas and to develop policy proposals.” Commissions are necessary for thorough investigations into issues and they provide expert advice to the legislatures.

- **LEGISLATURES**

Legislatures are those individuals who are the top political executives of the government, who are ministers and the political heads of different government departments.

The legislatures are also called the elected functionaries and they are the elite groups who are not representative of the grassroots problems. Most of them have bureaucratic institutions which they utilize to control the government. Anderson (1994:55) maintain that the legislatures perform an important task of engaging “in the central political tasks of law-making and policy formation in a political system. Only the legislatures have the legal authority of making public policy.”

Legislatures were elected by their constituencies and as such are the mouthpiece of their constituencies. Mthomboti (2000:39) warns them with the following statement: "people are unlikely to bite or bark at the hand that feeds them...you're unlikely to cross someone who holds your fate in his hands... They must do as they are told- cheer their own side, jeer the other side regardless of what is being said, and serve as voting fodder when required to."

In this way, the legislatures should consult with those they serve.

In the United States of America, the legislatures are congressmen who are the source of policy formulation and are “generally interested in reform, for if they were primarily interested only in incremental change, there might be little need for their involvement” (Peters, 1996:63).

The above expositions reiterated that the most important responsibility of the legislatures is public policy making. This is supported by De Waal, Currie and Erasmus (2001:42) who state that legislature “refers to Parliament, the provincial legislatures, and the municipal councils. These legislatures’ primary responsibility is the making of legislation.”

The legislatures spend most of their time and resources drafting the policy proposals, discussing, criticizing and approving legislation. When policy programmes fail to achieve their goals, it is only the legislatures who the blame of having failed to formulate, implement and evaluate the policy programmes accordingly.

- **INTEREST GROUPS**

The fifth group of role players in public policy making is called the interest groups.

Pillay (1999:240) compares that unlike previously, South African government currently encourages community participation in matters of public policy-making.

Interest groups are also called the grassroots. They have been mobilised to form organizations which empower them as explained by Cloete (1998:147) who says that “because individuals are politically so powerless and insignificant when they act individually, they started years ago to create voluntary associations to enable them to act collectively.” Giddens (2001:439) supports this by saying "social movements often rise with the aim of bringing about change on a public issue, such as expanding civil rights for a segment of the population."

Through their representation, organizations are able to articulate the real community problems.

There are many interest/ pressure groups within the societies such as labour unions, agricultural unions, public institutions and professional and occupational groups. According to Watt, Higgins and Kendrick (2000:168), pressure groups in South Africa may include "community-based organizations (CBOs or "civics"), trade unions, social movements, mass-based groups, and those non-profit organizations that supported oppositional efforts through funding, technical assistance, or advocacy research."

According to Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993:75), "interest group activities are interactions through which individuals and private groups, not holding government authority, seek to influence policy."

An important feature of the interest groups is that they are nongovernmental organizations meaning that they are not part of government institutions. These groups are therefore more powerful in articulating the social problems because they are able to effectively urge government into providing the necessary resources to reduce problems in the communities.

Pressure groups are for instance most influential in the British public policy-making. They are strong and most of the public policies are formulated through their influence as noted by Hill (1997:67) when he mentions "most powerful British pressure groups tend to have an established relationship with one or other political party." Even funds which strong political parties utilize have in one way or another been donated by these pressure groups. Interest groups need to be large, strong and highly organized in order to wield more power and influence towards the legislature. Groups are the blood of all political systems, they are not only important and essential, but are the centre of the social activity (Blondel, 1995:97).

Anderson (1994:68) asserts that research organisations must also to be included in the interest groups list. He regards this group as the thinking tanks in the public policy making process because their "studies and reports provide basic information and data on policy issues, develop alternatives and proposals for handling problems, and evaluate the effectiveness and consequences of public policies." In South Africa, institutions such as the Public Service Commission, the Central Statistical Service, National Economic, Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC), the Council for Scientific and Industrial

Research, and the Human Sciences Research Council are just a few such bodies which do research on policy and advice the legislature on the effectiveness of policies (Cloete, 1998:154).

Some interest groups were also drawn from the business community. McLennan (1997:54) identified business as a minority group which has a strong influence on public policy-making when he contends that the government is seen as "holding a role of an umpire. The oligarchical nature of government surfaces when business and the elite groups dictate the direction where public policies should take." Blowers (1997:192-193) saw the influence of business or what he terms "corporate" on the public policy-making when he writes "business is able to penetrate all levels of political decision making and, by strategies of manipulation, information control and sanctions, is able to define the political agenda and resist controls or financial penalties that threaten its continued prosperity."

Interest groups articulate demands on public policy makers, they represent the grassroots, they are nongovernmental, some of them were drawn from the business community, they conduct independent research and they have become more influential to public policy making. Currently most political parties, public officials and government departments have either joined interest groups or they are financially dependent upon them.

Policy formulation tells us what those in the legislative authority are to do to address a problem at hand. When a problem is well defined, especially during the agenda setting stage, then public policy makers should select the most effective solution to its elimination.

Policy formulation is therefore a public policy process phase which is concerned with the engagement of debates regarding the most effective and efficient means of solving social problems. The identification of strategies to effectively and efficiently eliminate the problem rests upon a number of individuals, groups and organizations which have different perspectives and interests on particular social problems. When the elite group, government officials, presidential organizations, legislators and interest groups finally agree on specific solutions to the social problems, they publish that strategy in the

government gazette as a draft bill so that the entire society can be able to comment on it. The draft bill is during the formulation phase known as a green paper which is defined as “a consultative document aimed at stimulating discussion with and feedback from the public and other interested parties. Its purpose is also to pose questions and find answers in order to formulate policy” (Du Toit & van der Waldt, 1999:274). A green paper sets out policy options for comments by public (Bekink, 2002:236).

Examples of South African Green Papers are the Green Paper on National Youth Service- October 1998; Draft Green Paper on Development and Planning- 22 April 1999; Public Works in South Africa Green Paper- October 1996, and others.

Policy agenda and policy formulation phases of the public policy making process exist before a decision about the policy is actually made and as such, they constitute a pre-decision segment of the public policy making process.

The process of policy making proceeds to the moment when decisions are made. This is during the next phase, namely, policy adoption which will be discussed in the succeeding part.

3.5.3. PHASE 3: POLICY ADOPTION

It has been mentioned above that the policy adoption phase constitutes a decision segment of the public policy making process. Peters (1996:77) writes that “once it has been decided that a certain program is required, or is feasible, as a response to a policy problem, that choice must be made a legitimate choice.” This is because the choice of one policy usually benefits one sector of the community to the disadvantage of the other.

Adoption or legitimacy is “a belief on the part of citizens that the current government represents a proper form of government and a willingness on the part of those citizens to accept the decrees of the government as legal and authoritative” (Peters, 1996:77). Public policy adoption is constitutionalization in the sense that the contents of the draft bill are measured in accord with the requirements of the Constitution.

Adoption of public policy is a centralized process, in that it only takes place at the national, provincial and the municipal government levels. In South Africa, policy adoption is executed by the highest electorates of the country.

In the context of this study regarding the RDP, the South African position is indicated by a statement which says "the National Government will set the broad objectives of the RDP and together with the provincial and local government will provide a policy and regulatory framework" (*RDP White Paper: Discussion Document*, 1994:12).

Rushefsky (1996:9) mentions "that the proposal must be accepted by some person or group that has the power and authority to make decisions." Adoption is a process of assessing the two sides of a debate, in this regard a judge, or the umpire decides which side wins based on the inputs put forward by him/her. Adoption can be pushed into the open debate and can involve a judicial action wherein courts hear matters arriving from groups.

During the policy adoption phase in the law making process, the Bill is known as a White Paper. "Proposal for legislative changes are sometimes set out in government "White Papers" which may be debated in Parliament before a Bill is introduced" (Britannia, 2001).

In South Africa, we have the following examples of White Papers; Reconstruction and Development Programme White Paper- September 1994; Towards the 21st Century Public Works White Paper - November 1997; White Paper on Disaster Management- December 1998; White Paper on Safety and Security- 13 October 1998; and others.

When everything is found to be correct in the draft bill, it is then enlisted in the Announcements, Tabling and Committee Reports, in the case of the South African context.

The draft bill will then be referred to another stage of finalization of the legislation

The final draft is signed and assented by the President as being an Act which could be implemented.

Bekink (2002:253) states that "most states require a bill to be approved by the head of state after its adoption by parliament. This assent can be a mere formality, for example in the Westminster system (according to the convention in the Westminster system the head of state must assent to bills adopted by parliament) or the head of state might have a substantial veto right."

Anderson (1994:144) accepts that "the president can be viewed as a policy adopter in his own right. In foreign affairs, much policy is a product of presidential actions and decision." For example, decisions that are taken by the president are the executive agreements to form agreements or disagreements with other nations, international – trade policies. This does not mean that the president alone takes those decisions, he/she is assisted by other legislatures.

Peters (1996:81) maintains that law-making is equated with the congress/legislators because it is the principal legislative body in the country. It is the legislator which has the responsibility of legislating policies. The legislators follow certain procedures so as to prevent poorly formulated legislation from becoming law or programmes. Policy should receive good support in order to be legitimated.

The support legislator need to gain in order to adopt policies is in the form of a procedure known as *logrolling* in which they exchange their votes with others (opposition) who will be selling their own different policies at the time. For Anderson (1994:139), logrolling is "a way of gaining support from those who are indifferent to or have little interest in the matter, usually encompasses a straightforward mutual exchange of support on two different topics."

Another procedure of gaining support is called a *pork-barrel* legislation in which legislators promise benefits to their constituents. Pork-barrel legislation was noted as examples when the Accelerated Rural Development Programme (ARDP), the Arable Land Grazing Programme (ALDEP) and the Old Age Pension Scheme were introduced immediately before the 1974, 1979 and 1999 general elections in Botswana, respectively. In this way, the Botswana Democratic Party was able to convince the majority of electorates that they will deliver as expected (Osei- Hwedie, 1998:9-10).

Acts are the final product of the legislation process as stated that “government and semi-government institutions are established in terms of Acts and enabled by Acts which embody policies” (Du Toit, van der Waldt, Bayat & Cheminias, 1998:74).

As an example, in South Africa we have the following Acts which were passed by Parliament:, the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, Act No. 108 of 1996; the *Public Finance Management Act*, No. 1 of 2000; *Higher Education Act*, No. 101 of 1997; and others.

If summarized, it is clear that the policy adoption phase of the public policy making process falls within the decision making sector and involves the decision regarding the selection of the most effective means of solving a particular social problem. The resources necessary for that problem will be listed. At some stage, the draft bill is known as the White Paper. The White Paper is referred to the Announcement, Tabling and Committee Reports where it will be thoroughly checked for its conformity to the requirements of the Constitution of the country. When the White Paper is found to be perfect, it is assented by the State President who is identified as the most important person responsible for policy adoption. The legislation is known as an Act.

The public policy making process then proceeds to the forth phase, namely, policy implementation which is the action taken in addressing the problem.

3.5.4. PHASE 4: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The adoption and the implementation phases of the public policy making process are regarded as the post-legislative stages of decision-making (John, 1998:27). Because policy adoption has been discussed in detail during the previous part, the researcher will discuss only the policy implementation in this part.

Implementation of public policy is when “action is made and ends successfully when the goals sought by the policy are achieved and the costs are within reasonable expectations” (Theodoulou, 1995:89). According to this author, poor implementation on the other hand occurs when the original policy is distorted when its goals are forgotten, when its characteristics are not well-known by the implementers and when there is little

demarcation between the social, economic and technological conditions regarding that policy.

Dye (1998:330) has to illustrate that "implementation involves all of the activities designed to carry out the policies enacted by the legislative branch. These activities include the creation of new organizations – departments, agencies, bureaus, and so on or the assignment of new responsibilities to existing organizations. These organizations must translate laws into operational rules and regulations." Policy implementation is about putting plan into action. Every solution identified during the previous stages should be executed during the implementation phase. Public policy implementation is about the execution of tasks which were designed to solve particular problems and also means the development of different government departments and their respective policy programmes.

The public policy making and implementation stages are fused together in such a manner that "it is hard to identify a dividing line at which making can be said to be completed and implementation to start" (Hill, 1997:48). Implementation has commenced even during the formulation and the adoption phases. This indicates that the processes which were conducted towards policy making during those phases should be referred to as a form of implementation. "The policy-making process is like the design of a building for a specific occupant by an architect; the implementation process affects policy design quite early on, and will still continue to influence some details of it even after implementation has begun, just as modifications are made to buildings after occupancy" (Hill, 1997:86).

It is true that policy implementation phase has started earlier on during the formulation phase but for the sake of this study, the researcher contends that it is a phase which comes immediately after the legislation has been passed, that is after policy adoption.

Cochran, Mayer, Carr and Cayer (1993:4) say that policy implementation means that "steps must be taken to put the policy statement into practice in order to achieve the policymaker's goals. Policy implementation means money spent, laws enforced, employees hired, and plans of action formulated." Public policy implementation is concerned with two concepts, namely; (i) **policy outputs** meaning what is it which is observable and measurable that a policy achieve and (ii) **policy impact**, which is

concerned with the effects a policy has on the communities. Policy implementation is therefore a comparison of the costs to the respective benefits of a programme.

During implementation, the functionaries in the government departments transform the planned intentions contained in the public policy into actions. Peters (1996) regard policy implementation as realization through instruments. The following instruments are important to implement policy:

3.5.4.1. INSTRUMENTS OF PUBLIC POLICY

Public policy instruments are the tools, equipment and or measures utilized by the policy implementers to enforce and ensure coherence of policy compliance. Public policy instruments cannot be left out of this discussion because without them, policy implementers and evaluators will be without tools to measure if the policies are complied with.

Based on the fact that public policy instruments flow from policy implementation, it is important that Peters' (1996:7) public policy instruments, namely: law, services, money, taxes, economic instruments and suasion be discussed in this part.

- **Law**

Law is a resource of any government through which it enforces compliance on the part of its citizens, agencies and other groups. Law as an instrument utilized by government is "to prohibit or restrict the behaviours of certain groups within the policy system" (Considine, 1998:41). In laws, restriction, bans and prohibitions are specifically stated and individuals, groups and organizations are expected to conform according to their requirements. It is law that govern our daily living, without which, individuals, groups and corporations will do as they wish and exterminate other members of the society and the environment.

- **Services**

Governmental services are diverse in nature and can be in the form of garbage removal, hospital services, home affairs registration of births, death, adoptions, health and welfare, grants, for example. It is therefore suggested that these services be rendered adequately to communities.

Any government is made possible by money available to it through contributions of taxes. The government is in turn expected to redistribute money back to the communities, in this instance, in the form of services.

- **Money**

Peters (1996:8) maintain that “governments also provide citizens, organizations, and other governments with money.” Money that is collected through taxes, property taxes, sales of government property, fines, etc. is called revenue. Revenue is returned back to the citizens, organizations and/or other governments to enable them to function on a daily basis. This is called expenditure and it is the money which is channeled from the public funds to policies or programmes. There are many forms of government’s involvement into giving money to individuals, groups and/or organizations with the main reason of conditioning their behaviour. Other forms could be food stamps, grants, drought relief, etc.

- **Taxes**

Tax is a government's major revenue collection practice. The state imposes taxes to individuals, groups and corporations. Taxes are utilized to pay government officials their monthly salaries, equipment, machinery, buildings, transport and tools which the running of a government requires on a daily basis. The state uses taxes to encourage and or to discourage certain behavior. Governments condition behaviours through taxes so that those who fail to refrain from particular behaviours are expected to pay heavily. “Where it may be impossible to prohibit a good, government can make it less accessible by lifting the tax applied to it” (Considine, 1998:44). In the South African context today

for example, heavy taxes are imposed on commodities which government wishes to lower their consumption, namely: alcohol and tobacco.

- **Economic Instruments**

Economic instruments are amenities such as credit, seeds, land and loans which government may supply to individuals, groups and /or corporations in order to enable them to meet certain requirements. Haddad and Zeller (1997:127) calls the economic instruments, the policy and programme instruments which they listed as comprising of general food subsidies, targeted income transfers, public works, school feeding, social funds, small scale credit and emergency feeding programmes.

- **Suasion**

To explain suasion, Peters (1996:10) writes that “when all other instruments of policy fail governments can use moral suasion to attempt to influence society.” Politicians who publicly address masses of people and claim they represent the interests of masses and that those who oppose them are unpatriotic and selfish exemplify suasion. Suasion is effective as long as people regard the government of the day as legitimate.

In the democratic world, suasion is regarded as a negative instrument because it stifles the opinions contributed by the minority groups. In the public policy making process, diverse interest groups should be afforded an opportunity to submit their inputs without being publicly intimidated and criticized by the those in power.

Viewing the public policy implementation instruments closely, the researcher has identified that they could be grouped into two categories, namely: the positive instruments and the negative instruments. The positive instruments are intended to assist with community development programmes which are basically intended to deliver services, money and economic instruments to the communities. The negative instruments on the other hand which are utilized by government to suppress certain behaviour from occurring and to punish other with different perspectives and are in the form of laws, taxes and suasion.

There are moments when public policies achieve what they were intended for, but there are also moments when public policies fail to achieve what they were intended for.

Even though public policy instruments ensure the effectiveness of policy implementation through programmes and practices, the process is featured by a number of problems which emanated from the initial stages of the policy making process. These problems are according to the researcher, strategies which should be utilized to evaluate and improve the policy implementation process. In the succeeding part, the researcher will discuss the public policy implementation problems.

3.5.4.2. PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS

It has been mentioned that public policy making is not a smooth running process because it can be featured with implementation problems which emanate from its initial stages of development. These problems are necessary in public policy making because they could be utilized as strategies to evaluate and improve the policy implementation process.

In this part, the researcher will discuss the policy implementation problems which were contributed by Peters (1996) namely: organizational disunity, standard operational procedures, organizational communication, time and resources, horse-shoe nail and public planning, interorganizational politics, vertical implementation structures, horizontal implementation structures, top-down perspective, bottom-up perspective and circumstances external to the implementing agency.

- **Organizational Disunity**

Organizations need to be unitary entities in order to be effective, but unfortunately sometimes there is an adverse disunity between them. This is recorded when the officials at central government level expects the field workers to do some assignments within communities which the field workers find too impractical to implement. The field workers at the community level of implementation “cannot follow all the directives coming to them from the center of the organization” (Peters, 1996:113).

For Hill (1997:87) this situation is reached when there is a “split between Central Government as a policy initiator and Local Government in the role of implementer. It produces a situation in which Central intentions affect to be thwarted by local scarcities.”

The organizational disunity problem of the public policy implementation could be minimized through a close coordination between the central and local governments.

- **Standard Operating Procedures**

There is a need for organizations or governmental departments to develop standard operating procedures which can be utilized as measuring instruments for policy programmes. The standard operating procedures are essential in public policy implementation although they sometimes tend “to produce inappropriate or delayed responses to crises” (Peters, 1996:115).

Implementation becomes a problem when there is no sound theory of causes and effects, if the policy is unclear, if there are multiple policy goals and if the implementers are not committed and have less expertise (Colebatch, 1998:57).

Problems regarding standard operating procedures for the public policy implementation could be effectively addressed if during the formulation phase, public policies were designed to contain clear and specific guidelines regarding the implementation process.

Standard operating procedures are effective measuring devices which, if well formulated and implemented, can reduce confusion.

- **Organizational Communication**

Improper communication within the governmental departments cause problems on the implementation of public policies. Usually members of the same department do not share the same information regarding policy programmes and they have different technical or professional backgrounds.

Sometimes there is also a case of secrecy which, according to Peters (1996:117), is a serious problem towards both the communication and the implementation of public policies. Secrecy denies information to other sectors of the organization while at the same time it produces inefficiency.

A single line of authority is necessary to ensure the existence of horizontal and vertical communication and coordination within a department. This approach is effective in reducing communication breakdown.

- **Problems regarding Time and Resources**

When there is disunity within departments, usually there is a time delay in the response towards problems.

When time is limited and there are not enough resources towards the public policy implementation, policy will become a non-existent. Resources necessary for the implementation of policies are in the form of infrastructure, staff, transport, stationery, and finance. These resources should be available throughout the programme lifespan because if one or more of these is delayed then the project as a whole is set back by several months (Hogwood & Gunn, 1997:218).

This constraint on implementation was also identified by Hill (1997:87) who mentions "that the scarcity and control of public finance frequently sets limits to policy development." Without sufficient funding, programmes will not kick-start. Hill (1997:88) provided the term "*political ambivalence*" to denote a situation where policy-makers achieve policies but fail to provide the means in the form of funds and staff for policy implementation process.

- **Horse-Shoe-Nail Problem and Public Planning**

This is a situation where government departments completely fail to plan the implementation of their public policies. Peters (1996:119) gives an example wherein the department passes a law that insists that there is a need to have inspection on the coal mines, but fails to indicate that there is a need to hire inspectors.

Well formulated public policies have limited planning problems and as such they tend to be highly encouraged.

- **Interorganizational Politics**

As is the case with our South African governmental departments which are assigned with the responsibility for conducting the RDP programmes in their domains, there will rise a problem of communication and coordination amongst them. Poor coordination is highly identified as causing conflicts, duplicating of tasks and waste of state resources.

This could be eliminated through recognition of “the importance of collaboration between organisations in many areas of policy implementation. Governments have been prone to argue the case for greater co-operation and to try to set up devices to facilitate joint planning” (Hill, 1997: 166).

- **Vertical Implementation Structures**

This concept is concerned with the communication between the bottom and top hierarchical levels of the government departments. Usually what the top most echelon in the department intends to achieve is far different from what those on the bottom level regard as high priority. According to Peters (1996:122), the top will see implementation as necessary and possible whilst the bottom level regards it as impossible due to the lack of resources such as funds, time, manpower, technical expertise, etc.

Fast (1998:308) also noted this lack of capacity on the local level when mentioning "very few have the capacity to deliver services, and a significant number are unable even to draw up business plans and manage financial resources."

- **Horizontal Implementation Structures**

This concept again calls for the coordination between departments, and it impedes implementation when “the objectives of one organization conflicts with those of one or more other organizations” (Peters, 1996:123). Thus, other departments would not

support programmes of other departments if they feel they are threatened by their existence. The lack of co-ordination was recorded by Peters (1996:124) who writes about duplication when communities have “horror stories about the same streets being dug up and repaired in successive weeks by different city departments and by private utilities.”

This could be solved through what Hogwood and Gunn (1997:220) term "***perfect implementation***" in which a single implementing agency need not depend on other agencies for success. Public programmes should therefore have specific departments solely responsible for the implementation whilst others are regarded merely as stakeholders.

- **Top-Down Perspective**

This concept explains that “bureaucracies should march to a single drummer, and that drummer should be the congress or the president” (Peters, 1996:124).

Top-down perspective involves the centrality of power, in this regard to the central government. Dror (1986:5) maintains that the “central mind of government” is the only body which shall instruct other elements and their respective sub-elements to implement public policy. Unfortunately a limitation identified is that the bottom sometimes does not understand the language used by the top management.

- **Bottom-Up Perspective**

This is an alternative to the top-down problem discussed above. According to this view, government departments should take instructions from the citizens instead of *vice versa*.

The bottom-up perspective progresses from the grassroots to local, then regional, then provincial and finally the national hierarchies until it reaches the top-most level of governance (Sabatier, 1997:281).

The bottom-up perspective is said to be effective because it relies much on the inputs and involvement of those whom policies are intended for and who are more

knowledgeable than those in the central government with regard to the problem that needs to be addressed and their respective solutions.

The researcher's statement is supported by Osei-Hwedie (1998:13) who saw the bottom-up perspective "as contributing greatly to capacity building and sustainable social development" and that it is more relevant to the African context.

- **Circumstances External to the Implementing Agency**

There are circumstance which are external to the implementing agency which may make policy implementation a non-reality. Some obstacles to implementation are outside the control of administrators because they are external to the policy and the implementation agency such as drought, famine, diseases or policy that is unacceptable by pressure groups (Hogwood & Gunn, 1997:217).

The problems regarding circumstances external to the implementing agency of public policy is difficult to address as it is mostly natural in nature. In order to reduce the adverse effects of this problem, policy implementers should develop contingency plans for the policy programmes.

The implementation phase of the public policy process is the actual putting of action to reproduce what the policy programme has been specified to achieve. Public policies are formulated by the top most echelon in the government departments but are implemented by those at the lowest level, namely the local government. Policy programmes are implemented through the instruments of public policy. The researcher has categorized these instruments into two categories, namely: the positive instruments which are intended to assist the communities such as services, money and economic instruments; and the negative instruments which are utilized by government to suppress certain behaviour from occurring and to punish other with different perspective through laws, taxes and suasion.

When the instruments of public policy ensure smooth policy implementation, conformity and delivery of services, public policy implementation still is featured by a number of problems which have emanated from the initial stages of public policy making, namely

the formulation and the adoption phases. The researcher suggests that it is now time in the South African context that problems regarding the public policy implementation be reduced through the introduction of a bottom-up perspective. This perspective contends that the grassroots are the ones to be afforded an opportunity to make most inputs regarding the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies. This approach has an advantage of empowering the masses which are experiencing the problems the policy programmes intend to solve rather than the case when policies were formulated, implemented and evaluated by the elite who are the minority and know little about the problems felt by the masses. The problems of public policy implementation are necessary for the evaluation and improvement of the programme implementation. That is, the effectiveness or non-effectiveness of public policy implementation is revealed by policy evaluation which will be discussed in the succeeding section.

3.5.5. PHASE 5: POLICY EVALUATION

In this part of the section, the study discusses the policy evaluation phase of the public policy process as the fifth and final stage of the public policy process.

Anderson (1994:238) states that “generally speaking, policy evaluation is concerned with the estimation, assessment, or appraisal of policy, including its content, implementation and effects.” According to Rushefsky (1996:16), at some point during or after program implementation, judgements are made about how well a program has worked.

Evaluation in the policy-making process is important because it informs policy-makers about the extent at which their policies are achieving their objectives, and in necessary to act accordingly. Usually the public policy initiator at the central government department will instruct bodies in the provincial or regional levels to do the actual evaluation. That is, their monthly reports will inform the central government department whether policy implementation is achieving its objectives or not.

Evaluation phase is meant for the improvement of policy programmes. According to Peters (1996:171), evaluation is meant to produce some change in the current policies of government and it is meant for both the ongoing and finished programmes (Vedung, 1997:8).

In order to implement effective evaluation, goals of the programmes should be clearly specified. Goals of the governmental policies should not be in conflict with each other. An example of this conflict is when the American government introduced a policy to subsidize tobacco production farmers and at the same time introduced policies to discourage smoking (Peters, 1996:172).

Public policy is a governmental obligation which when evaluated, the President, legislature, Parliament and whoever is interested in it seeks "to learn whether or not policies are achieving their stated goals; at what costs; and with what effects intended and unintended, on society" (Dye 1998:333).

Dye (1995:321) extends that evaluation means a lot. He states that this "bean counting" tells us little about poverty, crime, health, or educational achievement. "We cannot be satisfied with meaning how many times the bird flaps its wings; we must know how far the bird has flown" in that in the impact of public policy, we should be able to find change that are associated with an intervention. During and after implementation of the programmes, different interest groups like to access information regarding the success or failure of the intervention.

Evaluation is aimed at finding out about the outputs and impacts of public policy implementation. By outputs, evaluators need to assess the observable and measurable results of government intervention, whilst on the other hand, impacts are concerned with consequences of the policy intervention (Cochran, Mayer, Carr & Cayer, 1993:5).

Evaluation is more than impact assessment. For Vedung (1997:9), when defining impact analysis, scholars only mention of the effectiveness of the programs without specifying the efficiency. Efficiency has to do with the cost-benefit analysis and addresses how much all the intervention cost to reach a certain goal and how much benefits are achieved from that goal.

According to Murtagh (2001), there are two types of policy evaluation, namely: the instrumental and the interpretive evaluation.

Instrumental/ technocratic evaluation "is concerned with clarifying objective and quantification in measurement" (Murtagh, 2001:224). **Interpretive evaluation** on the other hand, " were premised on the idea that evaluations are never neutral and that they embody fundamental questions about power relationships and who gets what and why out of the policy process" (Murtagh, 2001:224).

The policy evaluation phase reveals the following information to the policy makers: either the problems and or conditions which are stressing the communities were resolved or could not be resolved. If the problems and or conditions failed to be resolved, the policy making process returns to the first phase, namely, agenda setting and or amendments of the policy alternatives.

After policy evaluation, policies are either accepted or rejected. Acts are not static, they change from time to time and when they are amended during this process, "the same procedures are followed as when new Acts are made" (Du Toit & van der Walddt, 1999:278).

In South Africa, we have for example the following amendment acts which were passed by Parliament: *Pharmacy Amendment Act*, No. 88 of 1997; *Tourism Amendment Act*, No. 8 of 2000; *Welfare Laws Amendment Act*, No. 106 of 1996/1997, etc.

Evaluation of public policy is a process of making an assessment based on the comparison between the costs and the benefits of a policy programme with an aim of informing the policy makers of the worthwhile of the programme. Evaluation is conducted at provincial and local levels of government and its reports are referred to the highest echelon of government. This study will utilize the summative evaluation research to conduct an evaluation project on the PRP within the context of the RDP from a social work perspective. In this regard, programme evaluation research will be discussed in detail in chapter 5.

3.6. SUMMARY

In this chapter, the researcher distinguished between public policy and social policy. The researcher drew a conclusion that both public policy and social policy are similar

depending at the level of their discussion,, that is they are general and inclusive, they are enacted by the policy makers and would obtain the statuses of being draft policy documents, Green Paper, White Paper and Acts during the development stages, they are developed to deal with specific problems within communities and that they cannot be conducted in their holistic nature and therefore need to be translated into a number of programmes which are specific, measurable and easy to implement. It is only when public policy and social policy are distinguished from each other that their differences surface. In this regard, public policy cannot be a type of social policy whilst social policy together with economic policy, environmental policy, security policy and foreign policy are its types, and this suggests that public policy holds a more seniority position than a social policy. Social policies are translated into a number of social problems whilst public policies are translated into programmes in general.

At the dimension of public policy making as a study and practice, both public policy and social policy share similar attributes with regard to the internal and external factors which influence policy making, the theoretical models regarding policy making and the policy making process. In this context therefore, this study proceeded on to discuss public policy through:

- factors influencing public policy making, namely; the internal and external. The internal factors are within the control of an institution whilst on the other hand the external factors influencing public policy making are outside government institutions.
- the theoretical models regarding public policy were categorized into descriptive models which are concerned with the policy making process, and the prescriptive models which are obtained after an evaluation process and will inform policy makers if policies are achieving their goals as set.
- the public policy process which is made up of five phases; policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation. During policy agenda setting, social problems compete each other in order to acquire the agenda status. The stage of law making is known as a policy proposal. Active participants in the public policy making process are the elite group, the public officials, the presidential, legislatures and the interest groups. This study has

identified that both the legislatures, the public officials and the interest groups are the most important role players in the public policy making. The legislatures are authorized by the legislation to make policies and therefore no other person or organization has got the power to do so. The public officials are experts in the public policy making process and their expert advice is utilized by the legislatures when they make policies. Finally, the interest groups have become so powerful that they maintain more influence on the public policy because the legislatures, the public officials and government department have recently become their members. In this context, the interest groups will soon take over the entire public policy making process. During the formulation phase, all the participants mentioned during the previous phase decide on what should be done in order to effectively solve a problem. At this stage the draft bill is called a green paper. The third phase in the public policy making process is the policy adoption. The only person who is important during the phase is the State President who assents a White Paper into an Act. The implementation phase is concerned with putting action on the plan. This means that programmes, services, funds and penalties are brought to the communities, depending on the type of the law. Public policy implementation has a number of problems and the researcher suggests that it is time that the bottom-up perspective be introduced so that the masses at the grassroots are afforded an opportunity to actively participate in the public policy making process. This will also empower them. During the evaluation phase, an assessment is done in order to see if the policy programmes are achieving their intended goals.

Social policy and social programme were defined and conceptualized. They both have different levels of formulation, implementation and evaluation. That is, social policies are in the form of legislation such as for example, Acts, White Papers and Amendment Acts which are formulated by Parliament. Social programmes on the other hand, are formulated by the national government departments and are implemented and evaluated by the provincial and local governments. Social programmes are expressed in the form of frameworks. The researcher will detail a discussion for the purpose of exemplifying the distinction between the RDP (which is a social policy) and the PRP (which is a social programme) in the succeeding chapter.