

An Overview of the Stages (Heuristics) Model as a Public Policy Analysis Framework

Onur Kulaç (PhD)
Hüseyin Özgür (Prof. Dr.)

Pamukkale University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Turkey

Abstract

Public policy analysis requires a comprehensive research and a framework in order to figure out the details of the policies applied. Thus, many public policy analysis models are used in various policy fields so as to examine the all stages of the public policy making and implementation process. Stages model is one of the most well-known and the oldest policy analysis frameworks that have been used by many policy analysts, academicians and independent researchers around the world. In this paper, firstly, the background of the stages model and its development process will be briefly dealt. Later on, the main advantages of the stages model will be put forth by comparing with other common public policy analysis models. Lastly, examples of the public policy analyses that stages model was taken as a main analysis framework in different policy fields and countries will be scrutinised. This paper reveals that the stages model is a suitable, easily applicable, efficient, attractive, and usable framework in analysis of public policies.

Keywords: Stages Model, Public Policy Analysis, Public Policy

Introduction

Although the concept of public policy is defined and described by various theorists in different ways, the definition of Dye (2008: 1) “whatever governments choose to do or not to do” emerges as the most comprehensive definition. In public policy process; problems are conceptualized and brought to the government agenda, alternatives and selected solutions are formulated by public institutions and numerous actors, policy proposals are applied, evaluated and revised (Sabatier, 2007: 3). Thus public policy process does not only consist of a just single decision, it is also a sequence of decisions and actions (Hill, 1997: 7). In this respect, public policies affect and encompass all citizens (Akdoğan, 2011: 77), as opposed to private sector

policies (Peters, 1996: 4; Kulaç and Çalhan, 2013: 207). As the social needs and problems are related to various public policy areas (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984: 13; Yıldız and Sobacı, 2013: 17; Çeliktürk, 2016: 119), many policies such as education, health, tourism, disaster management, energy, and security are made at the macro level. In addition to this, countless of public policies are formulated and implemented at mezzo and micro levels. For the mezzo level public policies; general health insurance policy and higher education policy can be given as examples. Moreover, policies such as abroad graduate scholarship policy (Kulaç and Çalhan, 2013; Kulaç, 2016) and employment of foreign doctors (Sezer and Yıldız, 2009) can be regarded as micro level public policies.

It is not easy to figure out the processes of public policies, which have complicated structures, political conflicts, and personal interests. For this reason, public policy process is scrutinised by dividing into specific stages (Rose, 1976; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Howlett and Ramesh, 1995; Mandal and Rawat, 1997; Jann and Wegrich, 2007; Dye, 2008 Sapru, 2010). As expressed by Dunn (1981: 35), public policy analysis is an applied discipline of social science, using many query methods and arguments to produce and transform knowledge about politics that can be used in political environments to solve policy problems. Furthermore, public policy analysis is a process in which questions such as what the government has done, why it has done it and what sort of outcomes have gathered as a result of the relevant policy are analysed. Along with policy analysis; the influences of political institutions on policy and the role of government in policy areas are put forth (Dye, 2008: 5). In public policy analysis process, comprehensive academic and other studies can be achieved by considering all the details that are thought to have an impact on the process and by using different decision-making and analysis models. In this paper, firstly, the stages model and its development history will be put forth. Secondly, the fundamental benefits of the stages model will be assessed so as to compare with some other main policy analysis models. Lastly, public policy analysis examples that stages model was applied will be examined.

Stages Model (Framework) as a Public Policy Analysis Model

The stages model, introduced by Laswell (1956) in seven stages, is one of the two earliest models (the other one is system model developed by David Easton in 1957) that maintain its validity and prevalence in public policy analysis. Thus stages model is an essential key reference point for public policy studies. The most significant and pioneering theory or empirical grounded studies to define, frame and illustrate the stages model that have taken its place in history as prominent and highly cited can be listed as Jones (1970), Dye (1972; 2008), Anderson (1975; 1979;

1982; 2014), Jenkins (1978), May and Wildavsky (1978), Nelson (1978; 1986), Brewer and DeLeon (1983), Peters (1996), Sabatier (1999; 2007). In stages model as one of the pioneering frameworks in public policy analysis, policy making process has a progressive cycle (Gosling, 2004: 92). With the widespread of public policy studies in 1970's and 1980's, stages model was reformulated and utilised by various scholars in different ways. In other words, the stages/phases of the stages model, also known as process/sequential model, have been differentiated over time and among scholars. Although originally the stages model was described by Laswell (1956) in seven stages; Jones (1970), Brewer (1974), Anderson (1975; 1979; 1982; 2014), Brewer and DeLeon (1983), Dorey (2005) divided stages/process model into five or six different stages and developed in their books which are also used as course materials. Even Anderson (1975; 1979; 1982; 2014) mentions about five different stages of stages/process model, as he stressed, formulation of public policy is the main focal point on his studies. The stages model which is applied currently has basically five stages. These stages are expressed as agenda setting, formulation, legitimation, implementation, and evaluation (Brewer and DeLeon, 1983; DeLeon, 1999; Sabatier, 1999: 6; 2007: 6). The most updated reformulation and development on the stages model is offered by Eger III and Marlowe (2006).

In agenda setting which is the first stage of the stages model, the issues such as how the problems arise and come to the public agenda are dealt (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 104). Moreover, in the process of agenda setting in which problems are transformed into policy designs (Hill, 1997: 115), problems and possible solutions gain or lose the attention of public and the elite (Birkland, 2005: 109). Agenda setting process is shaped by the specific priorities of policy makers (Macrea and Wilde, 1985: 232), thus even there are many issues that are likely to come to an agenda, only a fraction of them are carried to the public agenda by governments and other actors (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 112-113). According to Peters (1996: 45-50), it is not feasible for many problems to be on the agenda at the government level. Each social problem has a degree of importance and innovation (Gosling, 2004: 44-45), which highly affects the capacity of the problems to reach the government level. For example, governments seem to act quicker on urgent issues such as bird flu, aids, and oil crises (Knoepfel et al., 2007: 132-134).

In formulation stage, policy alternatives are developed in order to struggle with the current problems on the public agenda (Dye, 2008: 42; Ripley and Franklin, 1984). In this way, the number of policy options is reduced and the policy makers make their final choices/decisions easier (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 123). In other words, in the policy formulation

stage that is basically the pre-policy decision stage; a set of policy alternatives and solutions is generated and also narrowed so as to ease the final decision (Sidney, 2007: 79). In public policy formulation process various mechanism are developed to respond social problems (Jones, 1977: 49-50; Peters, 1996: 59), and a number of actors play crucial roles. These actors can be counted as parliament, government, public bureaucrats, political parties, pressure groups, think tanks and the media. In formulation stage which is one of the most functional stages of the stages model, the answers of some of the necessary questions are sought. These questions can be expressed as follow: What is the plan to deal with the problem? What are the goals and priorities? What are the costs and benefits to achieve goals? What are the positive and negative externalities in each alternative? (Cochran and Malone, 1999: 46).

Legitimation stage holds a key for public in public policy making process in which different alternatives are taken into account and policies are shaped accordingly. According to Kraft and Furlong (2004: 86), the decisions taken by policy makers are given a legal force or political activities are legitimised. It is difficult for policy makers to direct the legitimation stage independently from the thought that is highly common in the society. Similarly, Anderson (1984) emphasises that legitimation stage is influenced by the public and thus policy makers have to take into account requests and demands of citizens. Moreover, Anderson (1984: 63) reveals that the political future of the policy makers might be short if the request and needs of the citizens are not taken into consideration in the process of public policy formulation. Policies made by the policy makers in order to provide solutions to social needs and problems might lose its effectiveness over time. At this point, necessary regulations are passed on by making changes in the policies.

The implementation stage of the public policies takes place after the completion of legitimation process. As stated by Fitz et al. (1994) policy goals are transformed into actions in the implementation stage. The achievement of the policy objectives highly depends on the effective implementation (Ripley and Franklin, 1986). In this context, if the policies are not implemented coherently and efficiently, it is not feasible to reach the set goals even the policies are well-formulated (Edwards, 1980: 1). On the other hand, social, economic, technological and political conditions significantly influence the implementation stage of public policies (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 155). The fact that public practitioners have sufficient knowledge and experience about the policy area, increase the possibility of successful implementation of the policy (Peters, 1996: 107). Public support is also crucial for the smooth public policy implementation (Ringquist, 1993; Peters, 1996; Gosling, 2004; Anderson, 2014). Moreover, there are some

other factors that have an impact on the implementation process such as clearly written and easy-to-understand policy law text (Matland, 1995; Spillane et al., 2002; Birkland, 2005; Dye, 2008). Since the street-level bureaucrats are close to the problems, able to observe the practices on the spot and have discretion authorities; it is easier for them to understand the needs and expectations of the citizens. Thus the decisions and the behaviours of the street-level bureaucrats can have an essential effect on the outputs of policy implementation (Lipsky, 1980: 4-12).

Evaluation is the last stage of the stages model. In this stage, the results and the outputs of the implemented policies are attempted to put forth and assessed (Dunn, 1981: 339; Peters, 1996: 171). Additionally, it is mainly examined whether the policies and programs reach the determined goals and objectives (Jones, 1977: 186-187; Kraft and Furlong, 2004: 89). In other words, the overall success of the policies in meeting the aims and targets of the national program is measured in the evaluation stage/process (Peters, 1996: 171-172; Dye, 2008: 332). In evaluation stage, the effort spent in the public policy making and implementation process is tackled and scrutinised by using organisational methods based on performance, effectiveness, and productivity (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995; Peters, 1996). Moreover, the conscious or unconscious effects of the policies on the society are examined in detail (Dye, 2008: 55). In many public policy analyses (especially in evaluation stage), various numerical models and techniques are applied (Jones, 1977: 174), and empirical studies related to the sector that is affected by the policy are conducted. In empirical studies, surveys and/or interviews are the most common and convenient tools/methods in order to aggregate information from individuals about the implemented policies. Furthermore, the attitudes of the individuals toward policies can be measured by using these methods. Thanks to this, the weaknesses and the strengths of the policies are identified and the feedbacks are given. At the end of the evaluation stage, the policy cycle might be reversed and the process can be initiated from the first stage of public policy analysis (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 168; Jann and Wegrich, 2007: 53-54).

Main Advantages of the Stages Model

Public policy analysis characterised as a social and political activity (Bardach, 2005: xiii) is quite fundamental for the elaboration of policy outputs and their effects in detail. The desire of policy actors to play a role in the policy process with social, economic and geographical effects makes public policy process somewhat complicated (Weible, 2014: 3). Thus stages model offers a more systematic analysis by dividing policy into different stages in order to have a better understanding of public policy process (Laswell, 1971; Rose, 1973; Anderson, 1982: x;

DiGiammirano and Trudeau, 2008). The stages such as agenda setting, formulation, legitimation, implementation, evaluation, and even termination cannot be regarded as independent from each other. Each stage has an impact on the others and this highly facilitates to figure out the whole policy process. In this fashion, using stages model provides public policy analysts and other researchers with the opportunity to have broader perspectives on various public policies. As stated by Anderson (1982: ix-x) stages model provides researchers with a dynamic and developmental view of policy. Additionally, by applying stages model it is possible to make a comparison between different countries in case of each stage. On the other hand, various research methods and techniques can be adapted to stages model. In this context, stages model should not be regarded as a theory only for the USA; it also can be definitely used in various countries public policies (Anderson, 1982: x).

In stages model, official, unofficial and international actor's roles and effects on the policies are intensely considered. In each stage, various actors have different impacts and contributions. Especially think tanks play a key part by influencing policy makers (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995: 58; Yılmaz and Kulaç, 2016: 83) in both developed and developing countries in diversified policy areas (Özgür and Kulaç, 2015: 74). Therefore it is crucial to focus on the attitudes of the policy actors in order to conceive the overall applied policy. Furthermore to stick to the relations between policy actors is overwhelmingly functional so as to grasp the essential traces of the policies.

The results and the outputs of public policies are worthwhile for policy analysts and researchers. Hence considering these factors give an opportunity to policy makers to revise the policies. In stages model, particularly in the evaluation stage, the results and the outputs of the policies are assessed and compared with the goals set in the formulation stage. In this context, policy makers make a decision whether the policy should be redesigned or not. When compared to other public policy analysis models, in stages model every detail of the policy is more scrutinised. In other analysis models/approaches and frameworks such as elite, punctuated equilibrium, institutional and multiple streams some specific factors and mostly relations are addressed. Thus it might be not possible to have a comprehensive analysis as it is in the stages model. On the other hand, as stated by Cairney (2013; 2015); Schlager and Weible (2013: 295); Shanahan et al. (2013: 455); Weible (2014: 13), different and more than one public policy analysis models should be used and benefited in order to have a better understanding of public policy process. In this way, by combining other analysis models with stages model or using/applying them together, public policies might be analysed in detail and the background of the policies might be easily revealed and put forth. For example in agenda setting stage; punctuated

equilibrium model, multiple streams approach window of opportunity can be used to comprehend and explore the reasons, triggers and the secret agendas of the public policies. In this manner, although there are many new approaches, models, and even frameworks to be applied for public policy analyses, stages model still presents one of the most easily applicable, comprehensive, efficient and attractive frameworks especially for pioneering studies in different policy areas.

Application and Cases of the Stages Model

As stated in previous sections, stages model is applied in many public policy analyses. Even though some criticisms made by Sabatier (1999; 2007); Nakamura (1987); Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) stages model was used or taken as a framework involves various public policies areas. Several researchers from the most developed countries utilized either entire stages of the model (Brewer and DeLeon, 1983), most of the stages (a combination of two complimentary books by Ripley and Franklin, 1984; 1986) or most frequently a single stage like Kingdon's (1984; 2003) agenda setting. Unquestionable policy classics before 1999 utilizing the policy process/stages model are listed stage by stage by DeLeon (1999: 21-22). Although public policy literature is mostly developed by the scholars from Canada, some European countries, the USA and UK, it is feasible to claim that there are many studies produced by scholars/academician and researchers even from different underdeveloped and developing countries. In the study conducted by Haddad (1995), stages model/framework was applied to the education policies of Peru, Jordan, Thailand and Burkina Faso. In all cases, Haddad attempted to pose the questions such as "Were all policy options to deal with these issues identified? Were the implications of such options properly derived? Were these implementations fully evaluated in terms of their desirability, affordability, and implementability? Was the impact of the policy properly assessed in order to determine whether to continue the policy, modify it, or go on to a new policy cycle?" By these questions, Haddad (1995) achieved to have an extensive analysis of the policies implemented in Peru, Jordan, Thailand and Burkina Faso. In these public policy analyses made by Haddad (1995), the education planning activities of the mentioned countries were highly emphasised and main assumptions of the stage model were adequately used.

In the research paper authored by Cheng and Cheung (1998), the education policy of Hong Kong was analysed by benefiting from stages model. In Hong Kong after the establishment of Education Commission in 1984 assorted education policies were developed in order to have a well-educated and efficient workforce. Cheng and Cheung (1998) managed to analyse the education policies by focusing on the stages of policy. In this

manner; the identification, formulation, implementation and the evaluation of the education policies are scrutinised in detail.

In some of the research papers and other academic studies based in recent years (after 2003) on various policies implemented in Turkey, stages model was taken as the main framework so as to analyse the relevant policies. In the research paper authored by Kayıkçı (2003), the tobacco policy of the Turkey after 1980 was examined by using stages model. In this analysis; identification of the problem, agenda setting, enactment, implementation of the policy were stressed. Moreover, the actors of the tobacco policy are put forth in order to have a better understanding of the policy. Semiz (2009) also utilised stages model so as to analyse the intellectual property policy of Turkey. Especially by 2004, significant regulations are formulated about intellectual property policy in Turkey. In this context, Turkish government aimed to struggle against piracy. In the research paper written by Semiz (2009) the agenda setting, trigger, and the problem identification of the intellectual property policy were put forth. Furthermore, enactment and the implementation of the policy were dealt systematically. The outputs of the intellectual property policy were evaluated and the success of the policy was assessed accordingly. Thus it is obviously possible to state that stages model was functionally applied to intellectual property policy of Turkey by Semiz (2009). Domestic violence and violence to the woman are debatable occurrences in Turkey for ages. Çalı (2012) put an emphasis on the mentioned topic and intensely benefit from the stages model. In this paper, five main stages of the stages model were used and in each stage the policy for the prevention of violence against women was concerned and tackled. Acar and Okçu (2015) analysed the postal service policy of Turkey after 2000. In their analysis, the transformation and the development of the postal services in Turkey were evaluated. In this fashion, stages framework was taken as a basis and the suggestions were provided in order to have more efficient and effective postal services in Turkey. Thus, this valuable effort and attempt were overwhelmingly crucial so as to have better policies in postal services. Regional development agencies which have started to be established and developed in Turkey by 2006 are highly significant in order to moderate development differences between regions (Torlak and Kulaç, 2016: 81-83). In the research paper authored by Tahtalıoğlu and Özgür (2016), development agencies policy of Turkey was analysed. In this analysis, the stages model was used in an efficient way and all stages of the policy were put forth systematically. Moreover, suggestions were given in accordance with the results of the study. In the study conducted by (Kulaç, 2016), abroad postgraduate scholarship policy of Turkey was analysed and scrutinised. In this context, various public policy analysis and decision making model were applied within the framework of

stages model. In addition to this, the analysis was supported by the findings obtained from survey research; functional and essential policy suggestions were intensely presented in order to make a contribution to abroad postgraduate scholarship policy of Turkey.

Conclusion

Public policies emerge as a result of social needs or problem. Government bodies mostly attempt to sort out the problems that occur in the society and affect the citizens. Hence, countless of public policies in various areas are put into force so as to provide citizens with better life standards. Evaluating public policies is overwhelmingly significant for the revision of the policies. In this context, public policy analysis holds a key for the government to identify the weaknesses and deficiencies of the implemented policies. In public policy analyses, various models and/or frameworks are used by the researchers and the policy analysts. In each model and framework, it is feasible to find out the main focal points. In some cases in order to have a comprehensive analysis more than one model might be needed or even mandatory. Stages model, which is also called as textbook (Nakamura, 1987; Sabatier, 1999; Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1993), heuristics (Sabatier, 1999), process (Hill, 1997), sequential (Eger III and Marlowe, 2006) and stagist model (Dorey, 2005; Jenkins, 1978), is one of the most applied policy analysis models in the public policy studies. The number and the name of the stages were re-paraphrased in the last seven decades. Even the number of the stages was determined as seven by Laswell (1956); many scholars reduced the number of the stages in their research papers and books.

Due to high number and variety policy actors and the external effects, public policy has a complex structure. Thus, especially in the developing countries, understanding the policy process is quite difficult and time-consuming. At this point, applying stages model or using the framework highly eases the process of the public policy analysis. Moreover, as stated by Anderson (1982), it provides researchers and policy analysts with the opportunity to make comparisons between countries in identical policies. In this fashion, especially underdeveloped and developing countries might benefit from the successful examples of other countries. In this way, public policies of the underdeveloped and developing countries might be revised and developed. Even though stages model has numerous fundamental advantages for public policy analysis; it was criticised extensively by scholars such as Sabatier (1999; 2007); Nakamura (1987); Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993). However, stages model is still one of the most common and well-known applied models in many countries.

Even the stages model was introduced and advanced in developed countries; it is possible to point out that stages model has spread to many underdeveloped and developing countries especially in the last two decades. For example, as it was presented in the previous section of this paper, in Peru, Jordan, Thailand, Burkina Faso and Hong Kong the education policies was analysed within the framework of stages model. In addition to this, as discussed and given in the previous section, in many policy areas whether in micro, mezzo or macro level such as regional development agencies policy, abroad postgraduate scholarship policy, postal services policy, intellectual property policy and tobacco policy of Turkey, stages model/framework was successfully utilised. Therefore, it is possible to claim that stages model is one of the most efficient, comprehensive, systematic, practical, functional, and beneficial model/framework in public policy analysis.

Acknowledgements

This study has been mostly extracted from the 1st author's (Onur KULAÇ) doctoral dissertation, completed at Pamukkale University in 2016 under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ÖZGÜR (2th author of the paper). The authors of the paper express their appreciation to Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit, Pamukkale University for their support (Project No: 2017KRM002-009).

References:

- Acar, O. K. ve Okçu, M. (2015). "Gov.Tr'den Com.Tr'ye Bir Kamu Politikası Analizi Örneği: 2000 Yılı Sonrası Değişen Posta Hizmet Politikaları", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt: 20, Sayı: 4, s. 25-41.
- Akdoğan, A. A. (2011). "Türkiye'de Kamu Politikası Disiplinin Tarihsel İzleri", Kartal, F. (Ed.). *Türkiye'de Kamu Yönetimi ve Kamu Politikaları*, Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü, Ankara, s. 75-98.
- Anderson, J. E. (1975). *Public Policy-making*, Praeger, Holt, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (1979). *Public Policymaking: An Introduction, 2nd Edition*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (1982). *Cases in Public Policy-Making, Second Edition*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (2014). *Public Policymaking: An Introduction, 8th Edition*, Cengage Learning, Stamford, Connecticut.
- Bardach, E. (2005). *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*, CQ Press a Division of SAGE Publications, Washington D.C.
- Birkland, T. A. (2005). *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making, 2nd Edition*, M. E. Sharpe, New York.

- Brewer, G. D. (1974). “The Policy Sciences Emerge: To Nurture and Structure a Discipline”, *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 239-244.
- Brewer, G. D., and DeLeon, P. (1983). *The Foundations of Policy Analysis*, Brooks, Cole, Monterey, California.
- Cairney, P. (2013). “Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: How Do We Combine the Insights of Multiple Theories in Public Policy Studies?”, *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 1, p. 1-21.
- Cheng, Y. C., and Cheung, W. M. (1998). “Analysing Hong Kong Educational Policy: Application of a Comprehensive Framework”, Cheng, Y. C, Chow, K. W., Yeung, S. K., and Cheung, W. M. (Eds.), *Handbook on Educational Policy in Hong Kong (1965-1968)*, Centre for Research and International Collaboration, Hong Kong, p. 3-19.
- Cochran, C. L., and Malone, E. F. (1999). *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices*, McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- Çalı, H. H. (2012). “Aile İçi Şiddet: Bir Kamu Politikası Analizi”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Cilt: 16, Sayı: 2, s. 1-25.
- Çeliktürk, T. (2016). “Efficiency of Think-Tank’s Policy Recommendations in Turkey: Case of Kurdish Issue”, *European Scientific Journal*, September Special Issue, p. 119-129.
- DeLeon, P. (1999). “The Stages Approach to the Policy Process: What Has It Done? Where Is It Going?”, P. A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*, Westview Press, A Member of the Perseus Books Group, Boulder, Colorado, p. 19-32.
- DiGiammirano, F., and Trudeau, L. (2008). “Virtual Networks: an Opportunity for Government”, *The Public Manager*, Vol. 37, No. 1, p. 5-11.
- Dorey, P. (2005) *Policy Making in Britain: An Introduction*, Sage, London.
- Dunn, W. N. (1981). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Dye, T. R. (1972). *Understanding Public Policy*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Dye, T. R. (2008). *Understanding Public Policy, 12th Edition*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Easton, D. (1957). “An Approach to the Analysis of Policy Streams”, *World Politics*, Vol. 9, p. 383-400.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*, Congressional Quarterly Press, Washington, D.C.
- Eger III, R. J., and Marlowe, J. (2006). “Hofferbert in Transit: A Dynamic Stages Model of the Urban Policy Process”, *Review of Policy Research*, Vol. 23, No. 2, p. 413-432.
- Fitz, J., Haplin, D., and Power, S. (1994). “Implementation Research and Education Policy: Practice and Prospects”, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 42, p. 53-69.

- Gosling, J. J. (2004). *Understanding, Informing, and Appraising Public Policy*, Pearson, New York.
- Haddad, W. D. (1995). *Education Policy-Planning Process: An Applied Framework*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations, Paris.
- Hill, M. (1997). *The Policy Process in the Modern State, 3rd Edition*, Prentice Hall / Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire.
- Hogwood, B. W., and Gunn, L. A. (1984). *Policy Analysis for the Real World*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Howlett, M., and Ramesh, M. (1995). *Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*, Oxford University Press, Canada.
- Jann, W., and Wegrich, K. (2007). “Theories of the Policy Cycle”, Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., Sidney, M.S. (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis, Theory, Politics, and Methods*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, p. 43-62.
- Jenkins, W. I. (1978). *Policy-Analysis: A Political and Organisational Perspective*, Martin Robertson, London.
- Jones, C. (1970). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California.
- Jones, C. (1977). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy, 2nd Edition*, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Massachusetts.
- Kayıkçı, S. (2003). “Bir Kamu Politikası Süreci Analizi: 1980 Sonrası Türkiye’de Tütün Politikası”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Gelişme ve Toplum Araştırmaları Merkezi*, Sayı: 63, s. 2-25.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Harper Collins, Michigan.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, 2nd Edition*, Longman, New York.
- Knoepfel, P., Larrue, C., Varone, F., and Hill, M. (2007). *Public Policy Analysis*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Kraft, E. M., and Furlong, S. R. (2004). *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis and Alternatives*, CQ Press, Washington D.C.
- Kulaç, O. (2016). *Bir Kamu Politikası Çözümlemesi: Türkiye’nin Yurtdışı Lisansüstü Burs Politikası*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Kulaç, O. ve Çalhan, H. S. (2013). “Bir Kamu Politikası Süreci Analizi: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ve Yükseköğretim Kurulu Yurtdışı Lisansüstü Bursları”, *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Sayı: 10, s. 205-225.
- Laswell, H. D. (1956). *The Decision Process*, Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
- Laswell, H. D. (1971). *A Pre-View of Policy Sciences*, Elsevier Publishing Company, New York.

- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Macrae, D., and Wilde, J. A. (1985). *Policy Analysis for Public Decisions*, University Press of America, California.
- Mandal, U. C., and Rawat, J. (1997). *Public Administration: Principles and Practice*, Sarup Sons, New Delhi.
- Matland, D. E. (1995). “Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity- Conflict Model of Policy Implementation”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: JPART*, Vol. 5, p. 145-174.
- May, J. V., and Wildavsky, A. B. (1978). *The Policy Cycle*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California and London.
- Nakamura, R. (1987). “The Textbook Policy Process and Implementation Research”, *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 142-154.
- Nelson, B. J. (1978) “Setting the Public Agenda: The Case of Child Abuse”, May, V. J., and Wildavsky, B. A. (Eds.), *The Policy Cycle*, Sage Yearbooks in Politics and Public Policy Vol. 5, Beverly Hills California and London, p. 17-41.
- Nelson, B. J. (1986). *Making an Issue of Child Abuse: Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Özgür, H., and Kulaç, O. (2015). “An Analysis of the Studies on Think Tanks Success and Ranking”, *European Scientific Journal*, Special Edition, Vol. 2, p. 73-90.
- Peters, G. (1996). *American Public Policy: Promise and Performance*, 4th Edition, CQ Press, Washington DC.
- Ripley, R. B., and Franklin, G. A. (1984). *Congress, the Bureaucracy, and Public Policy*, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois.
- Ripley, R. B., and Franklin, G. A. (1986). *Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy, 2nd Edition*, The Dorsey Press, Chicago.
- Rose, R. (1973). “Comparing Public Policy: an Overview”, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 67-94.
- Rose, R. (1976). *The Dynamics of Public Policy*, Sage Publications, London.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1999). *The Theories of the Policy Process*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Sabatier, P. A. (2007). *The Theories of the Policy Process, 2nd Edition*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Sabatier, P. A., and Jenkins-Smith, H. (1993). *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, CO: Westview Press, Boulder.
- Sapru, R. K. (2010). *Public Policy Making: Art and Craft of Policy Making*, Phi Learning, New Delhi.
- Schlager, E., and Weible, C. M. (2013). “New theories of the policy process”, *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, p. 389-396.

Semiz, Ö. (2009).“Bir Kamu Politikası Analizi: Türkiye’de Korsanla Mücadele Odaklı Fikri Haklar Politikası”, *Ankara Barosu Fikri Mülkiyet ve Rekabet Hukuku Dergisi*, Cilt: 4, Sayı: 9, s. 9-40.

Sezer, M. S. ve Yıldız, M. (2009). “Türkiye’de Bir Kamu Politikası Sorunu Olarak Yabancı Doktor İstihdamı: Avustralya, Birleşik Krallık ve Kanada Örnekleri”, *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt: 11, Sayı: 3, s. 43-78.

Shanahan, E. A., Jones, M. D., McBeth, M. K., and Lane, R. R. (2013). “An Angel on the Wind: How Heroic Policy Narratives Shape Policy Realities”, *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, p. 453-483.

Sidney, M. S. (2007). “Policy Formulation: Design and Tools”, F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, M.S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis, Theory, Politics, and Methods*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, p. 79-87.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., and Reimer, T. (2002). “Policy Implementation and Cognition: Reframing and Refocusing Implementation Research”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 72, No. 3, p. 387-431.

Tahtalıoğlu, H. ve Özgür, H. (2016). “Türkiye’de Kalkınma Ajansları Politikasının Çözümlemesi: Süreç Analizi (Aşamalar Yaklaşımı)”, *Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt: 9, Sayı: 3, s. 161-184.

Tamzok, N. (2007). *Kamu Politikası Analizi: Elektrik Enerjisi Sektörü*, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Torlak, S. E., and Kulaç, O. (2016). A Comparative Analysis of the Regional Development Agencies Projects in European Union Countries and Turkey”, *Lucrarile Seminarului Geografic Dimitrie Cantemir*, Vol. 42, No.1, p. 81-92.

Weible, C. M. (2014). “Introducing the Scope and Focus of Policy Process Research and Theory” Sabatier, P. A. and Weible, C. M. (Eds.), *Theories of the Policy Process, 3rd Edition*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, p. 3-21.

Yıldız, M. ve Sobacı, Z. (2013). “Kamu Politikası ve Kamu Politikası Analizi: Genel Bir Çerçeve”, Yıldız, M. ve Sobacı, Z. (Ed.), *Kamu Politikası Kuram ve Uygulama*, Adres Yayınevi, Ankara, s. 16-42.

Yılmaz, M. A., and Kulaç, O. (2016). “An Analysis of Smoking Policy Attitudes of Low-Income Group and Cigarette Consumption Patterns Upon Increased Wage”, *European Scientific Journal*, September Special Edition, p. 82-90.