

Comparative Analysis of Technology Frameworks

Sehl Mellouli¹, Jamal Shanin², Karim Hamza²

¹University Laval, Canada, ² Free University Brussels, Belgium

Abstract

Most of the frameworks concerned by policy making analysis and policy modelling, are spread across multidiscipline sciences like public policy; political science, computer science and social sciences. Frameworks address general forms of theoretical analysis, by identifying the elements and general relationships among different components and provide a general set of variables that can be used to analyse specific arguments. These elements can include: governance structure; policy process; stakeholders; and institutions structure. It also uses different political models and technological tools, to analyse or explain or predict specific political behaviour. So far there is no standard categorization or classification for these frameworks, in order to compare them. And with the growing development in the governance and technology concepts, there is a rising need to develop categorization criteria able to classify frameworks concerned by policy making analysis and policy. This chapter will go through the main frameworks used in understanding the policy making process, in order to make a general classification of these frameworks.

1. Introduction

Public policy scholars and policy scientists have developed frameworks, theories and models to better understand policy and policy-making processes (e.g., Clark, 2002; Sabatier, 1991; Sabatier, 2007) (e.g., McCool, 1995; Kraft & Furlong, 2007; Smith & Larimer, 2009; Birkland, 2010; Sabatier, 2007). A Framework refers to concepts in systems design to support structured and systematic analysis, design, implementation and assessment/evaluation. Frameworks may refer to design frameworks such as enterprise architecture frameworks, particular modelling frameworks in policy development, etc. Frameworks address general forms of theoretical analysis since a framework identifies the elements and general relationships among different components and provide a general set of variables that can be used to analyze specific arguments. Models are defined as a set of practical supports provided to policy-makers in order to take their decisions. Hence, models are more precise than frameworks since a model involves using specific assumptions about a limited set of variables and parameters to derive precise predictions about the results of combining these variables using a particular theory (Ostrom, 2011).

Each developed model uses a set of tools. These tools vary from implementation tools like programming languages, to the graphical user interfaces, to the adopted technologies such as multi-agent systems. This chapter will focus on frameworks and tools. At the Framework level, the chapter will provide general descriptions of the frameworks. At the tool level, the chapter will categorize the different tools used to develop models and frameworks.

The policy-making process can refer to the study of changes in and the development of policy and the actors, events and contexts that relate to this development. Different scholars of the policy process have emphasised various forms of processes. For instance, scholars of the policy cycle describe a process that is exercised through a sequence of stages: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, implementation, evaluation and termination (Lasswell, 1956; Brewer, 1974; Brewer & deLeon, 1983; DeLeon, 1999).

Most of the literature provides descriptive and explanatory insights that are supported by empirical investigations of various topics, such as agenda setting, minor and major policy change, problem solving, collective action, formal and informal institutions and policy designs. These insights contribute to an understanding of the logic of policy-making processes and the strategies for influencing these processes (Christopher et al., 2012).

The literature review allowed classifying frameworks concerned by policy making analysis and policy modelling into three main categories: (1) Frameworks focus on Policy Stage; (2) Frameworks focus on Institutions; and (3) Frameworks focus on Human factor and Collations.

2. Frameworks focusing on Policy Stage

This category of frameworks focus on the process of policy making and Different policy process stages like agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, implementation, evaluation and termination (Lasswell, 1956; Brewer, 1974; Brewer & deLeon, 1983; DeLeon, 1999). The main frameworks can be in this category is the multiple streams theory of agenda setting by Kingdon in 1984 and Governance Analysis Framework (GAF) by Karim Hamza in 2013.




Fig 1. Policy cycle

2.1. Multiple Stream Model

The multiple streams model of policy-making has been introduced by John Kingdon and extended by Robert W. Porter. Kingdon argues that for a specific policy to succeed, the following three streams of actions must occur: a problem must be clearly defined, feasible solutions must be offered and political consensus must be obtained (Porter, 1995). Moreover, Kingdon and Porter argued that certain policies may fail because (1) problems were narrowly defined only by the government; (2) solutions were one-sided, primarily focusing on the financial aspect of issues and neglecting contextual and implementation problems; and (3) political will existed only at the highest level, whereas the actual capacities of the implementing units were far below the capacities that were needed for successfully achieving reform. The analysis of policies through the lens of the multiple streams model of policymaking is recommended for other policymakers (Kingdon, 1984).

Kingdon's perspective claims that policy making can be conceptualised as three largely unrelated "streams": (1) a problem stream, consisting of information about real-world problems and the effects of past governmental interventions; (2) a solution stream/community that is composed of researchers, advocates and other specialists who analyse problems and formulate possible alternatives; and (3) a political stream, consisting of elections, legislative leadership contests and similar data sources. According to Kingdon, major policy reforms are produced if "a window of opportunity" joins these three streams; in other words, in response to a recognised problem, the policy community develops a proposal that is financially and technically feasible and politicians find it advantageous to approve this proposal.

The problems stream denotes which social conditions are perceived by individuals as problems that require resolution by government action. Citizens, the mass media and interest groups often define problems and their potential causes only from their own viewpoint. Additionally, in many cases, it is too difficult to clearly define the problem and its history because many state or non-state actors may lobby for their own views regarding the concerned problem (Kingdon, 1984).

The solutions stream consists of policy alternatives that are generated by state actors, state institutions, policy advocates and academics. Policy solutions must be well crafted, include sequence and content development and suggest the timing of reform. The solutions should include (1) the translation of policy directives into implementation programmes, (2) the generation of strategies for the adoption of the policy solution by different actors, (3) provide management strategies to address the solution's opponents and (4) take advantage of supporters of the reform to support the solution (Porter, 1995).

The politics stream consists of political events that may or may not be favourable to the policy that is being implemented. Similar to state turbulence or important elections, changes in government ministers and public protests can powerfully influence whether a particular problem will be solved (Kingdon, 1984).

The multiple streams model is useful because it argues that numerous real life contextual factors, such as political events, bureaucratic procedures and interest groups, largely shape the future of the political environment. This model forces all interested and involved actors to recognise the realities of policymaking and act pragmatically if they wish to successfully implement these policies. In addition, similarly to the traditional policy stages model, the

multiple streams model allows for policies to be dissected and analysed in broad, generalised terms (problems, solutions and politics). This analysis can be highly valuable to policymakers who are faced with social problems that must be fixed in a given political environment.

2.2. Governance Analysis Framework (GAF)

Additionally; the Governance Analysis Framework (GAF) was introduced as an analysis framework to assess state stability and ensure that all aspects of governance are covered. The Governance Analysis framework (GAF) includes four main phases. Phase I is the scope and objectives map, which is based on Kingdom and Porter's multiple streams policymaking model, used to examine the problem stream, the solution stream and the political stream. Phase II is the stakeholders map, which describes the main actors in the policy-making process and how they interact with one another inside the governance model. This phase adapts Rhodes's policy network analysis (PNA) and Sabatier's advocacy coalition framework (ACF). Phase III is the process and tools map, which describes the policy-making process applied within the governance model and it is based on policy network analysis (PNA) school plus the advocacy coalition framework (ACF). Finally, Phase IV is the governance map, which focuses on the general governance structure of the state under study and represents graphically the state's status with respect to turbulence and stability, using the Circle of State Stability model (CSS) (Hamza, 2013).

Table 1: Governance analysis framework (GAF)

Phase / Component	Phase I Scope Map	Phase II Stakeholders Map	Phase III Process Map	Phase IV Governance Map
Objective	Describe the main <u>streams</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Stream • Solution Stream • Political Stream 	Describe who are the main <u>actors</u> and their <u>relation</u> with each other inside the governance model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen Power • Executive Authority • Judicial Authority • Legislative Authority • Non-state Political Power 	Identify policy networks <u>collations</u> and their usage of <u>social media</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify Control level of main actors on social media. • Identify confrontation level on social media. 	Describe the progress (or not) of the state transformation from transition state toward a <u>state stability</u> .
Based on	Multiple Stream Model, (Kingdom, Porter, 1984/1995)	Policy Network Analysis [PNA], (Rhodes, 1995)	Advocacy Coalition Framework [ACF], (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999) and Social media	Circle of State Stability

Phase I - Scope and Objectives Map: The first phase describes the main scope of the governance model under study, which helps break down the model into its main components. The scope of this governance model should reflect the way a society is governed, help create conditions for orderly rule, support collective action and maintain links between the main actors in the political environment (Kooiman, 2003; Kooiman, 1993) (Hamza, 2013).

Additionally, the scope defined must balance certain key values. (1) Openness: working openly and communicating precisely the new policy in the governance model. The language should be accessible and understandable for the general public. (2) Participation: ensuring wide participation throughout the policy process from conception to implementation. Improved participation increases confidence in the end result and the institutions that deliver the new policies. (3) Accountability: the roles in the legislative and executive processes must be clearer. State actors must explain and assume responsibility for their decisions and there is a need for greater responsibility from all those who are involved in developing and implementing policy on all levels. (4) Effectiveness: policies must be effective and timely. (5) Coherence: the policies and actions performed in the governance model must be coherent and easily understood. Coherence requires political leadership and a strong sense of responsibility from the state actors to ensure a consistent approach within a complex system (European Commission, 2001) (Hamza, 2013).

In this phase, Kingdon and Porter's multiple streams policy-making model will be used to examine the scope. The multiple streams model describes policy-making when sets of multiple nonlinear activities (the "streams") are pursued. These streams define the problem, suggest solutions and obtain political consensus, which should occur simultaneously, thus creating an opportunity to facilitate changes (Kingdon, 1984) (Hamza, 2013).

Phase II - Stakeholder Map: Ideally, the governance model should apply to the entire range of stakeholders (actors) involved in the governing process. Thus, continuous two-way communication between the governors and the governed stakeholders can be maintained and the governance model can remain oriented toward the objective (the scope) for which it was designed. In this model, to avoid ignorance of the values inherent in stable governance mechanisms, the distribution of rights and responsibilities among the different stakeholders may require revision to balance the different actors, define the rules and procedures of decision-making and separate the main powers in a governance model, which are represented by the legislative, executive and judiciary powers. (Daugbjerg & Fawcett, 2010) (Hamza, 2013).

Therefore, a successful governance model should promote the role of non-state actors in society and public activities and increase the responsibilities of social actors outside the state boundaries (Galeotti & Josselin, 2001). Thus, the government's responsibility for the provision of social services must be redefined (Chhotray & Stoker, 2009) (Hamza, 2013).

This phase is inspired by the policy network analysis of Rhodes (1995). The policy network refers to clusters of different types of actor who are linked in political, social or economic life, have an interest in a given policy action and can help determine a policy's success or failure (Rhodes, 1997). This theory seeks to explain policy outcomes by investigating how networks, which facilitate bargaining between stakeholders regarding policy design and detail, are structured in a particular political environment. Additionally, the theory analyses variations in the interest patterns and thus helps map relationships between state and non-state actors and explain how the policy agenda is formed. This model consists of two basic elements: actors and the relations between them (Hamza, 2013).

Phase III - Process Map: This phase examines the main process and tools used during the policy-making decisions implemented in the selected governance model to understand the relation between these process and different stakeholders and analyse the impact of technological tools, such as the social media, on this process. The main component of this phase

includes the process section and the social media section and focuses on the use of ICT by different stakeholders (actors) of the society (Hamza, 2013).

Inspired by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith's advocacy coalition framework (ACF), the process section addresses problems that involve substantial goal conflicts, important technical disputes and multiple actors (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). The ACF framework has found that stakeholder beliefs and behaviour are embedded in informal networks. To enforce coordinated behaviour in the networks, actors form groups. These groups are comprised of individuals from a variety of backgrounds who share a particular belief system and show a degree of coordinated activity over time. This section also pays close attention to collective-action issues (Hamza, 2013).

Phase IV - Governance Map: The governance map aims to describe the progress of the governance transformation from the transition state toward a stable state, considering the relation between hierarchical and network governance control based on the Circle of State Stability model described above (Hamza, 2013).

The Circle of State Stability model is designed to represent graphically the impact of network governance on state stability in a specific state or country based on the following assumptions. First, there are two main types of governance structure: hierarchy and network governance. These two structures seek to control the state or the country. Market governance is assumed to be part of both hierarchy and network governance because market governance focuses on efficiency, which is an important objective for any type of governance. Second, state instability appears due to four main categories of instability conditions: confrontation, dictatorship, anarchy and failure (Hamza, 2013).

3. Frameworks focusing on Institutions

The second category focus on the institution performing the decision making or impacted by the policy making process. This institution can be government; sub-government or other organisations. The most famous framework that focuses on institutions is the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework developed by Ostrom in 1990.

3.1. Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD)

Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework is developed by Elinor Ostrom and other scholars associated with the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University. This Framework tries to understand the policy process, by outlining a systematic approach for analyzing institutions that govern action and outcomes within collective action arrangements (Ostrom, 2007). Institutions are defined within the IAD Framework as a set of prescriptions and constraints that humans use to organise all forms of repetitive and structured interactions (Ostrom, 2005). These prescriptions can include rules, norms, and shared strategies (Crawford and Ostrom, 1995; Ostrom, 1997). Institutions are further delineated as being formal or informal; the former characterized as rules-in-form and the latter as rules-in-use.

The IAD framework identifies key variables that should be used in evaluating the role of institutions in shaping social interactions and decision-making processes. The analytical focus of the IAD is on an "action arena", where social choices and decisions take place. Three broad categories of variables are identified as influencing the action arena: (1) institutions or rules that govern the action arena, (2) the characteristics of the community or collective unit of interest,

and (3) the attributes of the physical environment within which the community acts (Ostrom 1999; Ostrom 2005). Each of these three categories has been further delineated by IAD scholars into relevant variables and conditions that can influence choices in the action arena (Ostrom 1999; Ostrom 2005).

The IAD further defines the key features of “action situations” and “actors” that make up the action arena. The action situation has seven key components: 1) the participants in the situation; 2) the participants’ positions; 3) the outcomes of participants’ decisions; 4) the payoffs or costs and benefits associated with outcomes; 5) the linkages between actions and outcomes; 6) the participants’ control in the situation; and 7) information. The variables that are essential to evaluating actors in the action arena are 1) their information processing capabilities; 2) their preferences or values for different actions; 3) their resources; and 4) the processes they use for choosing actions (Ostrom 1999; Ostrom 2005).

In addition to the types of relevant variables that may help explain collective choices, the IAD has identified multiple levels of institutional analysis: (1) operational level; (2) the collective-choice level; and (3) the constitutional level (Kiser and Ostrom 1982; Ostrom 1990; Ostrom 1999). The operational level of analysis is where individuals collectively make decisions about day to day activities. The collective-choice level of analysis focuses on decisions about the choice of rules that govern operational activities. The constitutional level of analysis is concerned with the authorized actors for collective-choice decisions and the rules governing those decisions (Ostrom 1999; Ostrom 2005). Also any one decision-making group or action arena may operate at more than one level of institutional action (Ostrom 1999; Ostrom 2005).

4. Frameworks focusing on Human factor and Collations

The third category explores processes from the perspective of the **actions of human agents** and their attainment of goals with respect to devising policies and institutions. For instance, the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith in 1993, which emphasises the role of human agents, considers processes that emerge through conflict or competition among multiple coalitions over long periods of time (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). And the policy network analysis (PNA) school that focus on networks, the relationships among policy-making outcomes, the structure of a network and the inclusion or exclusion of certain individuals or groups from the network in question (Fawcett & Daugbjerg, 2012).

4.1. Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF)

The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) is a framework of the policy process developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith to address problems that involve substantial goal conflicts, important technical disputes and multiple actors from several layers of government; in other words, this approach seeks to address the entire policy process rather than merely agenda-setting (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). This theory was developed as a response to perceived inadequacies in the “stages heuristic” and other traditional approaches to the analysis of the policy process. The ACF theory claims that stakeholder beliefs and behaviour are embedded within informal networks (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). To enforce coordinated behaviour within these networks, actors form groups, which consist of sets of people from a variety of positions who share particular belief systems and demonstrate a degree of coordinated activity over time (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). This framework also devotes a great deal of attention to collective action issues (Schlager, 1999).

Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith note that real-world changes frequently occur in the aftermath of a specific situation and result in the redistribution of political resources and alliances among subsystems. ACF framework is used to enhance the available understanding regarding complex policy processes. The ACF includes the following four main assumptions: (1) the process of policy change and learning occurs over time; (2) the most useful way to consider policy change over time is to focus on policy subsystems, that is, the interactions among actors who seek to influence the policy-process outcome; (3) subsystems must include an intergovernmental dimension; and (4) public policies can be conceptualised in the same manner as belief systems, e.g., as sets of value priorities and causal assumptions about how to realise these priorities (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993).

As a framework, the ACF's policy subsystem is the primary unit of analysis. A long-term time perspective is needed to obtain an understanding of subsystem affairs; moreover, the expansive set of actors that are involved in policy systems may be aggregated into coalitions and policy designs are interpreted as translations of coalition beliefs (Sabatier, 1988). This interpretation will increase interest in understanding and explaining coalition formation, maintenance, stability and structure.

Within the ACF, policy formation and change are functions of competing advocacy coalitions within a policy subsystem. A policy subsystem consists of actors from 'public and private organisations who are actively concerned with a policy problem' (Sabatier, 1988). The actors within a policy subsystem are grouped into a number of advocacy coalitions that consist of individuals who share particular belief systems, e.g., sets of basic values, causal assumptions and problem perceptions and who exhibit a non-trivial degree of coordinated activity over time (Sabatier, 1988).

If coalitions manage to form a structure that different coalitions are likely to adopt (e.g., a loose structure with minimal coordination versus a well-defined structure with high levels of coordination), the stability and continuity of these coalitions will receive the highest levels of attention. One of the shortcomings of ACF is that this theory provides little conception of the strategies that coalitions are likely to pursue in pressing for preferred policies and confounding undesirable policies.

The initial condition for coalition formation is that individuals believe that they will benefit from acting collectively to change policy; once this condition is met, a number of other factors come into play. These factors are characteristics of individuals and the situation that are mutually supportive and promote stable relationships. Ostrom (1990) suggests the following set of conditions that support the stability and continuity of coalitions: (1) individuals who benefit from the collective goods that are provided by the coalition have clearly been identified; (2) the benefits that individuals receive from these collective goods are related to these individuals' contributions to the provision of the goods in question; (3) the individuals who are most affected by the rules can participate in changing the rules; (4) monitors who actively audit coalition members' behaviours are either accountable to the coalition members or are coalition members themselves; (5) members who violate the coalition rules are likely to be punished or isolated by other members; (6) coalition members have rapid access to low-cost local methods of resolving conflicts among members or between members and officials; and (7) the rights of individuals to form coalitions and to devise policy have not been challenged by external governmental authorities (Ostrom, 1990).

These conditions centre on fairly allocating the benefits and costs of collective action and on monitoring and enforcing agreed-upon behaviours. For a coalition to maintain itself over a period of time, it must not only be able to capture the benefits that it produces but also allocate these benefits and their production costs in a fair manner. In addition, the behaviours of group members must be monitored and actions that violate the agreed-upon standards must be punished. Monitoring is critical because individuals continually face incentives to defect by pursuing their own self-interests at the expense of the larger group. Finally, according to Moe, once a coalition gains control of public authority, its intent is to design and implement public agencies and policies that will effectively achieve its policy goals (Ostrom, 1990; Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

Additionally, Sabatier and Weible identify six categories of coalition resources: (1) formal legal authority to make policy decisions; (2) public opinion, (3) information, (4) the mobilisation of troops, (5) financial resources and (6) skilful leadership. These resources can be hierarchically arranged with respect to their usefulness to coalitions for the purpose of generating policy change (Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

Finally, the ACF views policy change over time as a function of three sets of factors. The first of these three sets of factors is the interaction of competing advocacy coalitions within a policy subsystem or community; typically, the advocacy coalition subsystem consists of actors from many state and non-state institutions that share a set of basic beliefs and that seek to manipulate the rules of various governmental institutions to achieve their goals over the course of time. The second set of factors comprises external changes to the subsystem that are caused by other policy subsystems or socioeconomic conditions; these changes may affect advocacy coalitions and may influence the decisions that emerge from the advocacy coalition subsystem. The third set of factors involves the importance of a stable legal system and constitutional rules to regulate the relationships between different actors in the aforementioned coalitions (Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

4.2. Policy Network Analysis (PNA)

The policy network analysis (PNA) school focus on networks; however, the PNA school are more concerned with micro-level examinations about the relationships among policy-making outcomes, the structure of a network and the inclusion or exclusion of certain individuals or groups from the network in question (Fawcett & Daugbjerg, 2012).

The term 'network' is frequently used to describe clusters of different types of actors who are linked together in political, social or economic capacities. Networks may be loosely structured but remain capable of spreading information or engaging in collective action. The literature on networks is often vague or abstract. However, the growing interest in network governance structures reflects the increasing shift of modern societies and economies towards mutuality and against hierarchies (Peterson & O'Toole, 2001).

The policy network analysis tries to examine how national policies can emerge from sector networks that link authorities across different levels of government and join public and private actors. Rhodes observes the difficulties that governments experience in attempting to steer disaggregated structures of interdependent organisations and perceives the emergence of network interactions as a common response to these challenges in advanced and industrialised societies. He mentions the term 'policy network', which refers to interest intermediation between public and private actors, a topic that has received considerable interest in the political science literature in recent years (Rhodes, 2006; Jordan & Schubert, 1992). In addition, Peterson

and Bomberg define a policy network as 'a cluster of actors, each of which has an interest in a given policy action and the capacity to help determine policy success or failure' (Peterson & Bomberg, 1999). Recently, analysts of governance have sought to explain policy outcomes by investigating how networks, which facilitate bargaining between stakeholders over policy design and detail, are structured in a particular sector. The policy networks theory attempts to define how networks are structured in any policy sector and thereby help explain and predict policy outcomes (Scharpf, 1999).

According to Adam and Kriesi, a policy network consists of two basic elements: actors and the relationships among these actors (Adam & Kriesi, 2007). Importantly, actors of regulation are institutionalised actors (Peterson, 2003); thus, institutionalised actors constitute the unit of analysis in most governance studies. Institutionalised actors are formally organised and have resources that are distributed within the organisation according to hierarchies or majorities (Scharpf, 1989). Policy network analysis begins from three basic assumptions. First, modern governance is frequently non-hierarchical. Few policy solutions are simply imposed by public authorities. Governance involves mutuality and interdependence between public and non-public actors and among different types of public actors. Second, the policy process must classify relationships between various groups and the government; these relationships are dependent on the relevant policy areas that are examined (Rhodes, 1997). Third, governments ultimately remain responsible for governance. Policy networks can help to narrow options and shift agendas by pursuing strategies that generate new political and economic forces (Thatcher, 1998).

The Rhodes model of policy networks has most likely been employed more often than any other model for the purpose of examining EU governance (Peterson & Bomberg, 1999). This model assumes that three key variables determine what type of policy network exists in a specific sector: 1) the relative stability of a network's membership, which refers to whether the same actors tend to dominate decision-making over time or whether network membership is fluid and dependent on the specific policy issue that is under discussion; 2) the network's relative insularity, which refers to whether the network is a cabal that excludes outsiders or a structure that is highly permeable by a variety of actors with different objectives; and 3) the strength of resource dependencies, which refers to whether network members depend heavily on each other for valued resources, such as money, expertise and legitimacy, or whether most actors in a network are self-sufficient and are therefore relatively independent of one another.

This framework help in describing and analysing variations in the patterns of interests and thereby facilitates the mapping of relationships between state and non-state actors and the determination of how the policy agenda is shaped (Rhodes et al., 1996). However, this approach has shortcomings in that it does not explain the changes inside networks; moreover, it does not sufficiently account for the roles of structure and strategic interaction within networks. Policy network analysis is increasingly used to make sense of policymaking environments. A frequent primary aim of this analysis is to determine which interests dominate bargaining within networks (Coleman & Perl, 1999).

This school of analysis is primarily concerned with how networks affect power and how these power relationships can privilege certain interests more than others during the making and delivery of public policy (Rhodes 1997). The approach disaggregates the analysis of networks to the sectorial or sub-sectorial level. Accordingly, the state is perceived as fragmented; therefore, the interest of the state varies among different policy sectors (Rhodes, 1996; Smith, 1993) and it is not unusual for various state authorities to hold conflicting views on policy. State

capacity also varies significantly across the various agencies of the state (Atkinson and Coleman 1989).

5. Conclusion

Most of the frameworks concerned by policy making analysis and policy modelling, are spread across multidiscipline sciences like public policy; political science, computer science and social sciences. Frameworks address general forms of theoretical analysis, by identifying the elements and general relationships among different components and provide a general set of variables that can be used to analyse specific arguments. These elements can include: governance structure; policy process; stakeholders; and institutions structure. It also uses different political models and technological tools, to analyse or explain or predict specific political behaviour.

These frameworks have in common three main elements with different degree of depth in analysis. These elements are: (1) People or the actors, who do what like collation and influence; (2) the process either it is related to agenda setting or one of the stages of the policy cycle; (3) political environment or what are the conditions surrounding the policy making process like political; social or economic conditions. Second is the depth of the analysis either it is Macro-Level like Nation or whole government or whole society; or the Micro-Level like specific sector of society or organisation; or sub-government.

The primary frameworks classification is divided into: **First**; Frameworks focusing on Policy Stage. This category focus on the process of policy making and Different policy process stages like agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, implementation, evaluation and termination (Lasswell, 1956; Brewer, 1974; Brewer & deLeon, 1983; DeLeon, 1999). The main frameworks can be in this category is the multiple streams theory of agenda setting by Kingdon in 1984 and Governance Analysis Framework (GAF) by Karim Hamza in 2013. **Second**; Frameworks focusing on Institutions. This category focus on the institution performing the decision making or impacted by the policy making process. This institution can be government; sub-government or other organisations. The most famous framework that focuses on institutions is the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework developed by Ostrom in 1990. **Third**; Frameworks focusing on Human factor and Collations. This category explores processes from the perspective of the actions of human agents and their attainment of goals with respect to devising policies and institutions. The most common framework in this category is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith in 1993 (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). And the policy network analysis (PNA) school (Fawcett & Daugbjerg, 2012).

References

- Adam, S., & Kriesi, H. (2007). The network approach. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of The Policy Process*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
- Atkinson, M., & Coleman, W. (1989). Strong States and Weak States: Sectoral Policy Networks in Advanced Capitalist Economies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 14(1), 46-67.

- Atkinson, M., & Coleman, W. (1992.). *Policy networks, policy communities and the problems of governance*.
- Birkland, T. A. (2010). *An introduction to the policy process* (3rd ed.). Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Brewer, G. (1974). The policy sciences emerge: To nurture and structure a discipline. *Policy Sciences*, 5(3), 239–244.
- Brewer, G., & deLeon, P. (1983). *The foundations of policy analysis*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Chhotray, V., & Stoker, G. (2009). *Governance Theory and Practice: A Cross Disciplinary Approach*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Christopher, M., Heikkila, T., DeLeon, P., & Sabatier, P. (2012). Understanding and influencing the policy process. *Policy Sciences*, 45(1), 1-22.
- Clarke, K., & Primo, D. (2007). Modernizing Political Science: A Model-Based Approach. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(4), 741-754.
- Coleman, S. (2003). The Future of the Internet and Democracy: Beyond Metaphors, Towards Policy. *Promise and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of Online Citizen Engagement*. Paris: OECD.
- Coleman, W., & Perl, A. (1999). Internationalized Policy Environments and Policy Network Analysis. *Political Studies*, 47(4), 691–709.
- Daugbjerg, C., & Fawcett, P. (2010). Governance Theory and the question of power: lesson drawing from the Governance Network and Policy Network Analysis Schools. *The Australian Political Studies Association Conference* (pp. 27-29). Melbourne: School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne.
- DeLeon, P. (1999). The stages approach to the policy process: What has it done? Where is it going? In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.). In *Theories of the policy process* (pp. 19–34). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- European Commission. (2001). *European Governance: a White Paper*. Retrieved April 1, 2012, from http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/governance/index_en.htm
- Fawcett, P., & Daugbjerg, C. (2012). Explaining Governance Outcomes: Epistemology, Network Governance and Policy Network Analysis. *Political Studies Review*, 10(2), 195–208.
- Galeotti, M., & Josselin, D. (2001). *Non-State Actors in World Politics*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave.
- Hamza, K. (2013). *The Impact of Social Media and Network Governance on State Stability in Times of Turbulence: Egypt After 2011 Revolution*. Institute for European Studies. Brussels: Vrije Universiteit.
- Jordan, G., & Schubert, K. (1992). A Preliminary Ordering of Policy Network Labelling. *European Journal of Political Research*, 21(1-2), 7–27.
- Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kooiman, J. (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. London: Sage.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governanc*. London: Sage.

- Kraft, M., & Furlong, S. (2007). *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Lasswell, H. (1956). *The decision process*. College Park: University of Maryland Press.
- Marsh, D., & Rhodes, R. (1992). *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McCool, D. (1995). *Public policy theories, models, and concepts: An anthology*. Upper Saddle River New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2011). Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1).
- Peterson, J. (2003). *Policy Networks*. the Department of Political Science, Institute for Advanced Studies. Vienna: IHS Political Science Series.
- Peterson, J., & Bomberg, E. (1999). *Decision-making in the European Union*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave.
- Peterson, J., & O'Toole, L. (2001). Federal Governance in the United States and the European Union: a Policy Network Perspective. In K. Nicolaïdis, & R. Howse (Eds.), *The Federal Vision: Legitimacy and Levels of Governance in the United States and the European Union*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, R. (1995). *Knowledge utilization and the process of policy formation: Toward a framework for Africa*. Washington, DC: USAID.
- Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rhodes, R. (2000). *Governance and public administration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652-667.
- Rhodes, R. A. (2006). Policy network analysis. In M. Moran, M. Rein, & R. Goodin (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of public policy* (pp. 425-447). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. (2007). Understanding Governance: Ten Years On. *Organization Studies*, 28(8), 1243-1264.
- Rhodes, R. A., Bache, I., & George, S. (1996). Policy Network and Policy Making in the European Union: A Critical Appraisal. In L. Hooghe (Ed.), *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance* (pp. 367-387). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier, P. (2007). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1991). Toward better theories of the policy process. *Political Science and Politics*, 24(2), 147-156.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (2007). The advocacy coalition: Innovations and clarifications. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the policy Process* (2nd ed., pp. 189-220). Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Sabatier, P., & Jenkins-Smith, H. (1993). *Policy change and learning: An advocacy coalition approach*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P., & Jenkins-Smith, H. (1999). The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Assessment. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 117-166). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Scharpf, F. (1989). Decision Rules, Decision Styles and Policy Choices. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1(2), 149-176.
- Scharpf, F. (1994). Games in Hierarchies and Networks: Analytical and Empirical Approaches to the Study of Governance Institutions. *Social Forces*, 73(2), 775-776.
- Scharpf, F. (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schlager, E. (1999). A Comparison of Frameworks, Theories, and Models of Policy Processes. In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policies Process* (pp. 233-260). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Smith, K., & Larimer, C. (2009). *The new policy theory primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Thatcher, M. (1998). The development of policy network analyses: from modest origins to overarching frameworks. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 10(4), 389–416.