

RATIONALITY, DISJOINTED INCREMENTALISM AND MIX SCANNING THEORIES FOR DECISION- MAKING ON GLOBALISATION

E.O.C. Ijeoma
School of Public Management and Administration
University of Pretoria

ABSTRACT

Since the early 90's, *globalisation* has become a universal slogan in almost all aspects of human endeavours ranging from politics, commerce, economy and public governance. Globalisation has given countries and regions of the world opportunities to play a role on the world stage. This has placed a major demand on the local, national and regional public policy decision-making processes. In response to these demands, there is a need to establish linkages between some major public policy decision-making theories in managing the globalisation process. As different management paradigms are applied in every decision made in the public and private sector institutions, the public policy decision-making theories being considered in this article range from comprehensive rationality, disjointed incrementalism to mixed scanning. Each of these theories represents an explanation of *what is* or *what ought* to be the best method of policy decision-making in managing globalisation. As public policy decision-making at all levels of government do not operate in a vacuum, the article encourages policy-makers and scholars alike to always look at the *bigger picture* in their efforts towards determining appropriate delivery strategies that could have a positive impact on policy decision-making in the present globalisation era.

INTRODUCTION

Public policy decision-making in the context of globalisation may entail a comprehensive outlook, considering the entire globe as a single system. It is important to note that when public decision-makers in the contemporary world begin to recognise the

need for empirical application of the existing theories within the global context, the public policy decision-making process would be greatly simplified. As globalisation brings with it diverse cultural, political and religious beliefs as well as the economic and developmental inequalities, proactive public decision-making becomes inevitable. The responsibilities of the public decision-makers seem to dictate the degree to which various theories would apply. In many circumstances some combination of two or more theories may become necessary, since the solution to align policy decision-making theories towards managing the globalisation process does not lie in adopting one approach and rejecting the other. Rather, the solution may result from a combination of two or more theories in an effective manner with a view to achieving stated global policy objectives.

Many public administrators still employ old management techniques to assist them in making most modern decisions. This is indeed unfortunate, especially since the world is in an era that treats issues such as famine, natural disasters, wars, terrorism and space exploration (to mention but a few) as issues of common global concern; such issues cannot be separated from the experiential impacts of globalisation. Public decision makers, like their counterparts in business, must have the required knowledge to interpret and apply appropriate theories on which to base their decisions. The complex nature of modern day affairs and the rapid expansion of all facets of public policy with respect to the fast-growing globalisation initiatives make it more difficult to determine clearly what decisions must be taken. However, decisions made today are more far-reaching and more irrevocable in their consequences than ever within the nation-state in particular and the world in general.

The strategic elements that constitute effective decisions do not by themselves make decisions. Indeed, every decision is risk-taking judgment. Unless decision-making theories are taken as stepping-stones in the public decision process, right and effective decisions will not necessarily be made in any given circumstance. Therefore, before examining the decision-making theories with respect to globalisation initiatives, it is important to note that in every given scenario, there is a sequence of steps in the decision-making process, as identified below by Peter Drucker, (1985:249) whose principles were derived from the global environment in which competitiveness has become the rule of the game:

- The classification of the problem; is it generic? Is it exceptional? or is it the first manifestation of a new genius for which a rule has yet to be developed?
- The definition of problem; what are being dealt with?
- Specifications that the answer to the problem should satisfy: what are the *boundary conditions*?
- The decision as to what is *right* rather than what is acceptable, in order to meet the boundary conditions: what will fully satisfy the specification before attention is given to the compromises, adaptations, and concessions needed to make the decision acceptable?
- The building into the decision of the action to carry it out: what does the action commitment have to be and who has to know about it?
- The feedback, which tests the validity and effectiveness of the decision against the actual course of events: how is the decision being carried out and are the assumptions on which it is based appropriate or obsolete?

Considering the above guiding steps in the public decision-making process, right and effective public decisions may be arrived at. The article will present some brief explanations on a number of public decision-making theories such as the comprehensive rationality, disjointed instrumentalism and mixed scanning theories. These theories will provide the philosophical foundation and the main focus of the argument. Similarly, attempts will be made towards recommending appropriate decision-making strategies and linking the underlying principles in seeking better public decision-making models. The conclusion will be based on the resulting information drawn from the above-mentioned techniques with emphasis on the possible policy alternatives that would give impetus to an effective public policy decision in the present globalisation era.

UNDERSTANDING VIEWS ON GLOBALISATION

A general understanding of not only the conceptual nature but also of the potential dangers of globalisation, is essential for guiding the inter-governmental relationships between nations on the one hand, and the geo-political and socio-economic development among the international communities, on the other. This will also help to understand in a meaningful way, the type of developmental process that may emerge from the global inter-governmental relationships for appropriate decisions.

Westernization

According to the first school within the orthodox view, globalization has been pioneered by the major international trend of the past several centuries. It was the economic and military incorporation of the world by Europe that created the precondition for an integrated global system. It was Europe that first brought about the economic and technological unification of the globe (Bull and Watson, 1984:2). The authors added that it was the European-dominated international society of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that first expressed its political unification (Bull and Watson, 1984:2). In terms of these perspectives, globalization could only develop once the territorial integration of the world had been brought about by European power. Once that occurred it could be subjected to Western technology and rationality. Some professionals, researchers and writers agree that this global economic and social integration is no more than *pervasive Westernization*. From this viewpoint, the world revolution of Westernization brought together an inescapably intimate and virtually instant interaction among all the people of the world.

Modernity

For various authors, globalization is simply the spread of the characteristic features of modernity (Robertson, 1992:141-142). Probably that was why Giddens (1985:263, 291) views globalisation as the spread of the nation-state system, the world capitalist economy, the world military order, and the generalised international division of labour. Thus

Robertson conceives the globalization concept as a package and views globalisation as an enlargement of modernity, from society to the world.

Idealists' views

In the view of the idealists, globalisation is not only irresistible, but should also be heartily welcomed (Hurrell and Woods, 1995:44). This view does not only consider globalisation as an irresistible force towards reform within the global context, but also contends that there is nothing any government or people could do *not* to accept the principle of globalisation. This view is absolutist and leaves the international community with no options or choices.

Liberal views

The theorists and contributors to the liberal view of globalisation believe in the progressive impact of globalisation within the context of the economic, political and social behaviour of states (Gill, 1995:406). This view, however, may sound impressive, but may also have some constraints since the view is based on a *positive* economic assumption, that is, markets without any distinctive ideology. It provides no restrictions or conditions for participation in any global economic activities and therefore, there could be widespread abuse in liberal practice.

The functionalists' views

The functionalists' view can be viewed as a deviation from other views on the grounds that this approach focuses on technical co-operation in the management of specific material problems (Jones, 1993:3). This would not only provide for technical interdependence among states but it would encourage material development and favourable technical competitiveness.

Historical views

The globalisation concept has drawn two opposing responses namely, *the orthodox* views, that is, the proponents and the supporters of globalisation and *the critics'* views, that is, the critics and opposing views against the concept of globalisation.

The historians' views popularly known as *in between* views represent scholars, writers and researchers who are neutral about globalisation. These groups hold one common view, that globalisation is not a new concept but is rather a linear extension of the old global way of managing the phenomena (Waters, 1995:4). It neither supports nor opposes the globalisation program. Based on the historical views; two key questions may be asked, namely, what is globalisation and what are its central dynamics?

Despite one bold claim that the historical views show that the history of the last two hundred years is one of broadening, deepening and accelerating globalisation, there is fundamental disagreement about what it is and, indeed, about whether it is actually

taking place at all. At the very least, there is recognition that part of the problem in any systematic treatment of globalisation is the fact that it is inescapably a multi-faceted process. In view of the foregoing, globalisation can be considered as a composite of four elements (Bretherton and Ponton, 1996:3, 12):

- technological change;
- the creation of a global economy;
- political globalisation; and
- globalisation of ideas

The above four elements are helpful as they constitute a reasonable historical assessment of the nature and possible divergent views on how globalisation can be defined within professional disciplines and management approaches towards a better political and corporate governance. The historical view considers globalisation as an exogenous process with its own inexorable logic (driven by technology, economic organisation and related social and cultural change) and enjoying the independence of international relations or whether it is itself a creation of international relations and the behaviour of states.

Global balance of power

The global balance of power usually categorised as orthodox emphasises the global balance of power but pursues a more general direction. A once-off historical process did not trigger globalisation (e.g. Westernization), but is rather fostered or impeded by general fluctuations in the distribution of international power. This is a clear assertion of the essentially dependent rather than the autonomous nature of globalisation (Hirst, 1995:2-3). Any prevailing system of international economic relations in the new millennium would have taken a long time to develop. Such systems are transformed by major changes in the political-economic balance of power. The conjunctures that affect these shifts have been large-scale conflicts among the major powers. In this view, the worldwide international economy has been determined by its structures and the distribution of power by the major nation-states (Hirst, 1995:2). It would follow that the economic independence of all nation-states should be encouraged, rather than a single global economy.

Hegemonic balance of power

The hegemonic balance of power emphasizes not the balance of power in general, but a specific hegemonic balance. Dominant states, if their interests are served by open international orders, create, by their own national power, the essential preconditions and support for the activities that are recognised as constituting globalisation (Jones, 1993:16). This scenario gives a detailed account of the necessity of prior political determination before interdependence and globalisation can occur. It also gives pride of place to the central role of political purposes and processes in the generation of contemporary international interdependence and globalisation. Similarly, in discussing the historical

hegemonies of Britain and the United States, Jones (1993:171-72) notes that frequently dominant political and economic actors create a sympathetic political environment. This view calls attention to the need for common global policy objectives in all aspects of hegemonic power balance, or else globalisation dividends will still be dominated by the powerful nations.

Sovereignty of states

Sovereignty of states focuses on national economies and is less concerned with the distribution of power internationally. It is more concerned with the residual and powerful resources of states in general. Dickens (1992:149), an exponent of globalisation that can be classified as orthodox, remains convinced that states, while constrained by globalised economic activities, are far from powerless in confronting them. On the contrary, globalisation is itself directed by the varying fortunes of national economies and state policies, which underpin them. Such a general perspective is given specific illustration by account of integration in post-war Europe. Rather than requiring a zero-sum relationship between state power and integration, it is firmly of the view that the latter is a product of the former and that the two are mutually reinforcing processes. Integration was not the supercession of the nation state by another form of government as the nation state became incapable, but was the creation by the European nation states themselves for their own purposes, an act of national will (Smith, 1969:18). In this view, economic integration reflects states choices and not simply a particular international configuration of power, that is, it is not an autonomous process over which the states have no control.

Preservation of Global Economic and Military Might

Some autonomy of international politics in shaping globalisation is preserved under the preservation of global economic and military might, even if in reduced and modified form (Cox, 1993:149-150). This provides a good example of the approach. While devoting most of his arguments to transition in the underlying basis of economic organisation, Cox highlights the contradiction that the globalising interdependence principle is strengthened as the territorial national principle is weakened. Following the above view, it is important to state the significance of the fact that ultimately, the security of globalisation depends upon military force with a territorial basis. Even as globalisation is fostered through the instrumentality of the economic system it has to be sustained by powerful states willing to take military action to preserve it.

PERCEIVED ACCEPTANCE OF GLOBALISATION: A CRITIQUE

Following the events in global history over the years, most commentators contend to present globalisation as a long-term process, however much of it may have intensified in the last few decades. Typically, it is asserted that the linear extension of globalisation that is currently being experienced began in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This view

restricts globalisation to history and therefore, does not allow room for a better interpretation of the concepts therein. The belief does not give any options or choices for states to decide on issues of globalisation as it affect them. However, public decision-making at the global level is expected to be democratic enough to leave the states and governments with several alternatives. This is seriously lacking in the historical view.

The liberal interpretation makes a number of judgments about the beneficial consequences of globalisation namely that it fosters economic efficiency and encourages problem solving. Moreover, for those who view democratic capitalism as the end of history, globalisation is to be welcomed for the effect it has in promoting social convergence built around common recognition of the benefits of markets and liberal democracy (Hurrell and Woods, 1995:449). In this sense, globalisation may be considered a welcome development. This could also be seen merely as an economic assumption that may prove to be negative when observed for a reasonable period of time. It is this set of beneficent assumptions that have sought to question this view by emphasizing the association between globalisation and the perpetuation of inequalities among developed and developing countries, and inequalities among the rich and the poor even within the individual states.

In the fall of 1994, just prior to the vote by the United States Congress on the Uruguay Round of GATT, the vote that would establish the World Trade Organization (WTO), the United States government offered a \$10,000.00 United States dollars donation to the charity of choice of any congressman who could sign an affidavit stating that he or she had read the 500 pages of the agreement; and successfully answer ten simple questions about its contents. Not one single member accepted that offer.

That was the beginning of a corrosive effect on the supremacy of domestic procedures including the rights of the federal, state and local governments to establish US laws (Nader and Wallace, 1996:92-93). Similarly, Nader and Wallace (1996:93) also reported that on the 1st December 1994, the US Congress approved the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in the House by 300 to 235 votes and in the Senate by 68 to 32 votes without knowing what was in it. Before the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which is a US-Canadian alliance, was fully operational, apparently they were sidelined. It became obvious that the governments of the United States of America and Canada could not protect the interest of the majority of their citizens and the international community. As the US and Canadian citizens were put in a difficult situation by these agreements, the global financial and commercial systems became more empowered to be run by the multi-national corporations under the same agreement. This North American concept of globalisation set a bad precedence on the contemporary global decision-making approach. The approach has created a huge gap in the global decision-making process.

APPLICATION OF COMPREHENSIVE RATIONALITY, DISJOINTED INCREMENTALISM AND MIX SCANNING THEORIES

According to Dunn (1994:14), policy decisions may be described in terms of particular forms namely *rule policy* and *goal policy*. When rule policies specify actions to be performed, goal policies set goals to be achieved by any of a number

of available actions. Therefore, public policy may be considered as a complex pattern of interdependent collective choices, including decisions not to act, made by governmental bodies and officials. The above definitions were given within the broad term *Policy*, and two features stand out: *Firstly*, policy is a social practice, not a singular or isolated event. For example, when a country's president is assassinated, it is a political event and not, an issue requiring a policy-decision. If it occurs, then policies may be put in place to ward off future re-occurrence. *Secondly*, the definitions portray policy as occasioned by the need to reconcile conflicting claims or to establish incentives for collective action among those who share goals but find it irrational to co-operate with one another. It is a summation of people's demands, or an expression of goal, in ways that can be settled neither spontaneously nor through some co-incidental operation of natural laws.

Finally, the policy-making process needs to seek a successful way of co-operating to obtain set goals. Policy should be considered as an outcome of an effective decision backed with action. The growth of regional and continental blocks such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the African Union or the European Union (EU), to mention but a few, had brought about regional, continental and global policy directions and common global public policy-decisions.

Comprehensive rationality

The best-known and most widely accepted theory is the comprehensive rationality approach to policy decision-making. The main characteristics of this theory are that, it involves reasoned choices about the desirability of adopting different courses of action to resolve public problems. Yet, any form of rational comprehensive theory is difficult to realise fully in most policy-making settings. In the late sixties, Lindblom (1968:80) pointed out that , for choices to be rational and comprehensive at the same time, they would have to meet the following conditions, which are described as the rational-comprehensive theory of decision-making:

- an individual or collective decision-maker must identify a policy problem on which there is consensus among all relevant stakeholders;
- an individual or collective decision-maker must define and consistently rank all goals and objectives whose attainment would represent a resolution of the problem;
- an individual or collective decision-maker must identify policy alternatives that may contribute to the attainment of each goal and objective;
- an individual or collective decision-maker must forecast all consequences that will result from the selection of each alternative;
- an individual or collective decision-maker must compare each alternative in terms of its consequences for the attainment of each goal and objective and
- an individual or collective decision-maker must choose that alternative which maximizes the attainment of objectives.

Firstly, in considering the globalisation process, for these and similar reasons it may appear that the process of making policy recommendations is not and cannot be **rational**. Tempting

as this conclusion might be, the inability of the individual or collective decision-maker to satisfy the conditions of the simple model of choices available in the globalisation agenda does not mean that the process or the recommendation is rational. *Secondly*, if *rationality* is meant to be a self-conscious process of using reasoned arguments to make and defend advocative claims, it will indicate not only that many choices are rational; but will also prove that most are *multi-rational*. This means that there are multiple rational bases underlying most policy choices. According to Dunn (1994:274), the rational comprehensive theory may be characterized in several ways based on the reasons for which a specific or several choices are made and the goals they are likely to achieve in the decision-making process:

- technical rationality is the characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their capacity to promote effective solutions for public problems;
- economic rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their capacity to promote efficient solutions for public problems;
- legal rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their legal conformity to established rules and precedents;
- social rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their capacity to maintain or improve valued social institutions, that is, to promote institutionalisation;
- substantive rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involves the comparison of multiple forms of rationality-technical; economic, legal and social as described above in order to make the most appropriate choice under given circumstances.
- The above breakdown of the rationality decision-making theory for the purpose of policy-making, has two common characteristics namely, *choices* and *comparison* in any given set of alternatives. In the context of globalisation, the above decision-making approaches could take several dimensions.

Firstly, technical rationality can include choices that will involve a country's participation in highly specialised technical issues at the global level such as choices between solar and nuclear energy technologies. However, owing to several grassroots problems and given the current rate of unemployment and poverty, it may not be a wise choice for poor countries to be involved in such a venture as there are more urgent needs at the local and national levels.

Secondly, in considering economic rationality, an example could be a comparison of alternatives such as medical care programmes in terms of their total cost and benefits. Countries may need to harmonize its medical costs and benefits. Expensive medical care may not necessarily produce a high benefit. In considering this policy-decision, it may be necessary to bring other needs of the people on board before such a policy-decision is finally made.

Thirdly, an example of the legal aspects of comprehensive rationality is that choices have to be made regarding awarding of public contracts according to whether institutions

comply with laws against racial and sexual discrimination. Apart from countries with a peculiar historical past, such as South Africa, racial and sexual discrimination are not emphasized in the constitutions of most countries. But as the globalisation process recognises these issues, there is a need for countries to draft a holistic policy that will address issues of this nature constitutionally.

Fourthly, one of the best examples of social rationality involves the extension of rights to democratic participation at work. The new multi-party democracy derived its strength from the Bill of Rights. Therefore, democratic approaches in public decision-making are already in place in most public and private institutions. Governments need to see this as contributions by civil society and non-governmental organisations to public decision-making and, not as a force competing with it.

Finally, in substantive rationality, one can draw an example from the fact that many issues of a government information policy involve questions about the usefulness of the costs and benefits of the above approaches to decision-making with a view to policy-formulation; respect for the global society; and their legal implications in terms of rights to privacy. Following the above considerations, it may be easy to infer that the comprehensive rationality theory of public decision-making may be difficult to achieve when applied within the globalisation policy-process with the examples given by Frohock (1980:29) as follows:

- Frequently, the decision maker has neither the time, nor the capacity, nor the information necessary to make the in-depth study that this method requires.
- Identifying global values required by the comprehensive rationality approach, can be difficult or impossible to attain.
- All available values have a very high rate of not being considered. Some must be sacrificed in order to achieve others.
- Some disagreement exists among the values in the decision-making process when using this approach.
- Finally, this approach rests on the ambiguous relationship between *means* and *ends*.

Given the above challenges inherent in the comprehensive rationality approach to decision-making, the ultimate valued decision can be achieved. However, the usual situation is that one person's goal may be another person's means to achieve an entirely a different goal. The democratically elected government representatives world-wide and their counterparts in civil society institutions may be the only legitimate bodies that can take public policy decisions pertaining to issues of globalisation. Representatives of stakeholders that make up the political power centres may have minimum negative impacts on the people, now and in the future or else they will be caught up by the above-identified constraints in the comprehensive rationality approach.

Disjointed incrementalism

Prior to his work in 1968, Lindblom and Braybrooke (1963:18) suggested that there are several important criticisms of the rational-comprehensive theory of decision-making. The

first of these, known as the disjointed-incremental theory of decision-making, holds that policy choices seldom conform to the requirements of the rational-comprehensive theory. According to Dunn (1994:275-276), when allying the incremental theory, individual or collective decision makers may:

- consider only those objectives that differ incrementally, that is, by small amounts from the *status quo*;
- limit the number of consequences forecast for each alternative;
- make mutual adjustments in goals and objectives, on the one hand, and alternatives on the other;
- continuously reformulate problems, hence goals, objectives, and alternatives in the course of acquiring new information;
- analyse and evaluate alternatives in a sequence of steps, such that choices are continuously amended over time, rather than made at a single point prior to action;
- continuously remedying existing social problems, rather than solve problems completely at one point in time; and
- finally, share responsibility for analysis and evaluation with many groups in society, so that the process of making policy choices is fragmented or disjointed.

The disjointed incrementalism approach gives the impression that the administrator specifically considers only a limited set of policy alternatives that are incremental additions or modifications of a broader set of policies that are considered *given*. Similarly instrumentalism is disjointed when it lacks concentration on only a small number of relevant values. The general features of instrumentalism, as described above, seem to be opposed to those of comprehensive rationality in the sense that instrumentalism lacks the following attributes (Frohock, 1980:49): no hierarchical arrangement of goals or means; imperfect and limited information and the elevation of cost as an important consideration.

In defence of instrumentalism, it could be argued, that it reduces the value problems, and diminishes the general complexity of the entire process. Problems are handled by marginal comparisons. The official makes policies and choices only at the margins, rather than having to consider each programme or alternative in its entirety. Both empirical analysis and value judgments are considered at the same time. The measure of a good decision is the degree to which the decision-makers are in agreement, while a poor decision excludes or ignores participants capable of influencing the projected course of action. Therefore, if one wants to think of decision-making models as calling attention to globalisation initiatives, this approach is more convenient than the comprehensive rationality approach. This is because, these approaches are appropriate in the case of believing that a policy decision covering a large number of issues and people, where the issues and people affected change quickly and are quite diverse, will be more complex than a policy decision involving only a few issues and a limited number of people. This approach seems appropriate for globalization decision-making as the issues and participants form a homogenous family of units within the globe.

Mixed scanning

A final perspective on the issue of decision-making theories being considered here relates to policy formulation provided by a sociologist (Etzioni, 1967:385-92). Etzioni proposed a strategy of mixed scanning as an alternative to better the comprehensive rationality and rival viewpoints, including disjointed incrementalism. While accepting the criticisms of the comprehensive rationality theory of decision-making, Etzioni points to limitations of disjointed instrumentalism. Mixed scanning may seem to distinguish between the requirements of strategic choices that set out basic policy directions and operational choices and contribute to the groundwork for strategic decisions and their implementation. In effect, mixed scanning seeks to adapt strategies of choices to the nature of the problems confronted by policy-makers. Because, what is rational in one context may not be so in another and mixed scanning selectively combines elements of comprehensive rationality and disjointed incrementalism (Dunn, 1994:280-81).

For a proper explanation of the three decision-making theories under consideration, it may be necessary to use the illustration given by the mixed scanning theorist himself. Assume one about to set up a worldwide weather observation system using weather satellites. The rationalistic approach (that is, the comprehensive-rationality theory) would seek an exhaustive survey of weather conditions by using cameras capable of detailed observations and by scheduling reviews of the entire sky as often as possible. This would yield an avalanche of details, costly to analyse and likely to overwhelm action capabilities, (for example, seeding cloud formations that could develop into hurricanes or bring rain to arid areas) (Etzioni, 1967:389).

Disjointed instrumentalists would focus on those areas in which similar patterns developed in the recent past and, perhaps, in a few nearby regions. It would thus ignore all formations which might deserve attention if they arose in unexpected areas. Etzioni (1967:389) explains that it is often fundamental decisions that set the context for numerous incremental ones, although, fundamental decisions are frequently prepared by incremental ones. In order for the final decisions to be made a less abrupt change is proposed. These decisions may still be considered relatively fundamental. The incremental steps which follow cannot be understood without them, and the preceding steps are useless unless they lead to fundamental decisions. Thus, while the incrementalists hold the view that decision-making involves a choice between two kinds of decision-making models, it should be noted that:

- the cumulative value of the incremental decisions specify or anticipate fundamental decisions; and
- the cumulative value of the incremental decisions is greatly affected by the related fundamental decisions (Etzioni, 1967:387-88).

In view of the above analysis, the mixed scanning theory regarding policy formulation brings along with it a number of advantages for decision-making process.

Firstly, it permits taking advantage of both the incrementalism and comprehensive rationality approaches in different situations. For example, ranking public officials often

focus on the overall picture and are impatient with details, but mixed scanning can be applied to both levels of analysis. *Secondly*, mixed scanning permits adjustments to a rapidly changing environment (such as issues of global concern, namely, global security, poverty and diseases) by providing the flexibility necessary to adapt decision making to specific circumstance. In some situations, incrementalism will suffice. In others, the more thorough comprehensive approach is needed. *Thirdly*, mixed scanning considers the capacity of the decision maker. All do not enjoy the same ability. Generally speaking, the greater the capacities of the decision-maker, the more encompassing the level of scanning he or she can undertake. The more scanning, the more effective the decision-making process becomes. It is understood that as the globalisation agenda has to do with the planet earth and everyone living in it, highly specialized and capable decision-makers are needed to discuss and take decisions on issues of globalisation. Two crucial questions regarding the usefulness of mixed scanning may be asked namely, how to determine the conditions under which mixed scanning, rather than the incremental and rational approaches should be used; and how to determine the extent to which each of these approaches should be applied?.

CONCLUSION

It seems clear that at least, facile value judgments on globalisation should be avoided. Proponents, theorists and writers do not represent a contest between good and evil and neither monopolizes moral and political wisdom. To be sure, certain forms of global divisions such as the unilateralism of the 1930s as discussed in the historical views on globalisation have had highly destructive effects upon human values. However, one should not make blithe assumptions about globalization's role in general. It is itself a politicized process based on specific conditions creating winners as well as losers.

The study of globalisation and its policy-decision making process will continue to pose a huge challenge to governments and other development stakeholders through out the world. Each of the decision-making theories represents a theoretical explanation of *what is* or *what ought* to be the best method of public decision-making and how it could impact on the world at large. Recognition was given to certain conditions that could influence the implementation process at the local, regional and the global levels. It is evident in this study, that the nature of the conceived public policies and programmes largely determines the extent to which each approach will be used for decision-making. For example, it is important to point out that the study discovered that, in the current highly dynamic environment, which is informed by globalization initiatives, a predominantly incremental or mixed-scanning approach could greatly simplify the decision-making process. Similarly, in a more stable system, where decisions can be isolated and the programmes can be agreed upon, the advantages of comprehensive rationality come into play more appropriately.

Finally, although the decision-making behaviour of the actors involved in the public sector can be described by each of these theories at one time or the other in the article, the fact remains that the responsibilities of the legislative, judicial and executive arms of

government elsewhere, seem to dictate the degree to which various approaches may be applied. Rigorous government programmes, coupled with its bureaucratic tendencies, require a more rational approach for appropriate decision-making. A successful interface with all the interest groups and other major administrative arms of government require a credible intergovernmental relationship that will enhance effective and outcome-based public decision-making process within the global configuration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bretherton, C. & Ponton, G. 1996 (ed). *Global politics: An introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bull, H. & Watson, A. 1984. *The Expansion of International Society*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, R. 1993. *Globalization, multilateralism and democracy*. In *approaches to world order*. Cambridge Press.
- Dickens, P. 1992. (2nd ed). *Global Shift: The internationalization of Economic activity*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Druker, P. 1985. *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dunn, W.N. 1994. *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Etzioni, A. 1967. *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Frohock, F. 1980. *Public Policy, Scope and Logic*. Englewood Cliffs. N.J: Prentice.
- Giddens, A. 1985. *The national state and violence*. Oxford University Press.
- Gill, S. 1995. *Globalization, market civilization and disciplinary neo- liberalism*. Millenium, 24(3).
- Hirst, P. 1995. *Globalization in Question*. Political Economy Research Centre, University of Sheffield, occupational paper No, 11.
- Hurrell, A. & Woods, B. 1995. Globalisation and Inequality. *The Millennium* 24(3).
- Jones, B. 1993. Thinking Big. *Review of International Studies*, 19(2).
- Lindblom, C. E. & Braybrooke, D. 1963. *A strategy of Decision*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lindblom, C. E. 1968. *The Policy-making Process*. Englewood Cliffs. N.J : Prentice-Hall.
- Nader, R. & Wallace, I. 1996. GATT, NAFTA and Subversion of the Democratic Process. In Mander, J. & Goldsmith, E. *The Case against the Global Economy*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Oxford.
- Smith, A. 1969. *An inquiry into the nature e and causes of the wealth of nations*. New York: Liberty Classics.
- Waters, C. 1995. *Globalization*. London. Oxford University Press.