

bureaucracy. Lowi, in fact, considers redistributive policies to be concerned with “not use of property but property itself, not equal treatment but equal possession, not behavior but being”, and believes, because of the secrecy enshrouding and the redistributive policy process, that the policy process, that the policy process which takes place primarily in the government bureaucracy has received the least study by social scientists.

Lowi’s remaining policymaking subsystems are less far-reaching in scope.

**Coercion: Probability and Targets:-** As Table-1 indicates, the neo-institutionalist approach is predicated on two dimensions: the probability of coercion and the target of coercion. The probability of coercion may be remote or immediate. In the regulative policy arena, for example, the possibility of coercion is quite immediate because violators of federal regulations may be punished. Moreover, violators of federal regulations may be punished as individuals; a company violating the Sherman Antitrust Act, for example, will be punished as an individual company.

Thus, we come to the target of coercion, which may be individual or systemic. In constituent and redistributive policy arenas, the government attempts to manipulate the conduct of the system itself through, for example, changes in the federal reserve discount rate, which can have a huge impact on the level of investments in the national economy. Yet these kinds of policies do not single out individuals as targets for coercion.

Lowi argues that from these policy arenas, which are determined by the target and probability of government coercion, emerge certain identifiable types of political behavior.

### **The Organized Anarchy Model**

A final major model of the incrementalist paradigm is the organized anarchy model of public policymaking, and it is illustrated in Figure-6 John W. Kingdon’s classic, *Agendas Alternatives, and Public Policies*, is an exemplary empirical representative of this literature.

**Streams of Problems, Politics, and Policies:** Basic to the model is the presence of three “streams” that flow largely interpedently of one another and which constitute the policymaking process.

**The Problem Steam:-** The first of these is the problems stream, which involves focusing the public’s and policymaker’s attention on a particular social problem, defining the problem, and either applying a new public policy to the resolution of the problem or letting the problem fade from sight. Problems typically are defined in terms of values, such as conservative or liberal orientations; comparisons, such as the United States versus Iran; or categories- for example, is public transit for the disabled a “transportation” problem or a “civil rights” problem? Categorizing the problem becomes quite significant in how the problem is resolved.

**The Political Stream:-** The second stream is the political stream. It is in the political stream that the governmental agenda- in the other words, the list of issues or problems to be resolved- is formed. The primary participants in the formulation of the governmental agenda comprise the visible cluster of policy actors, or those participants who are most readily seen on the public stage. They include high-level political appointees and the president’s staff; members of Congress; the media; and interest groups. A consensus is achieved by bargaining among these participants, and at some point a “bandwagon” or “tilt” effect occurs that is a consequence of an intensifying desire by the participants to be “dealt in” on the policy resolution and not to be excluded.

**The Policy Stream:-** The third stream is the policy stream. It is in the policy stream that the decision agenda, or “alternative specification,” is formulated. The decision agenda is the list of alternatives from which a public policy may be selected by policymakers to resolve a problem. Here the major forces are not political, but intellectual and personal. Ideas and the role of the policy entrepreneur, or the person who holds a deep and long abiding commitment to a particular policy change, are paramount. The major participants in the formulation of the