GOVERNMENT POLICY: MEANING, TYPES, MANIFESTATIONS, THEORIES, AND POLICY CYCLES

Adetayo Olaniyi Adeniran [1], Joseph Mosunmola Muraina [2], Joseph Olanrewaju Ilugbami [3], Adedayo Ayomide Adeniran [4]

[1]*Department of Logistics and Transport Technology, Federal University of Technology Akure, Nigeria*
[2]*Department of Geography and Planning Science, Ekiti State University, Ekiti, Nigeria*
[3]*Rufus Giwa Polytechnic-Owo Rector Office, Ondo State, Nigeria*
[4]*Department of Geography and Planning, University of Ibadan, Nigeria*

E-mails:adeniranao@futa.edu.ng[1]; jmosun07@gmail.com[2]; ilugbamijoseph@gmail.com[3]; ddone2@gmail.com[4]

Abstract. In any democracy, it is strongly advised that effective policies be created since they are crucial to how democracies operate. Government policy definitions and categories were widened. Government policy types were discussed concerning the sectoral groups comprising each given government. This is important because a policy's or its objective elements frequently suggest different meanings for different stakeholders. Policymaking is a process impacted by socio-political and other factors and is not a governmental function. Thus, there is a need to comprehend the theoretical underpinnings on which government policymaking and its execution may be evaluated and characterized. According to the elite/mass hypothesis, there are two groups in society: those who occupy positions of power and those who do not. Government policy is more influenced by those with access to knowledge and influence. It is a remarkable characteristic of group theory which is ideally in line with the legislative because the legislatures are where the voices of the people are expressed. Governmental institutions and government policy are closely related, claims institutional theory. The rational choice theory may need to be more accurate since participants in government policy must have access to all information to make informed judgments. The systems theory offers a more straightforward method for categorizing and comprehending the contributions and interrelationships made by institutions and policy players, including the function played by the external environment in policy formulation. Lastly, since democracy is a system of governance built on extensive public engagement, any ideology that supports any type of citizen participation (particularly in a democracy) should be endorsed by both politicians and public officeholders.

Keywords: Government policy; Policy manifestations; Policy execution; Policy underpinnings; Policy context and consequences

1. Introduction

Each democracy needs sound policies. Additionally, in a democracy, the proper application of those policies is crucial. According to Delamaza (2015), democracy is a kind of government. Under a democratic political administration, among the issues facing governance is erecting a foundation that enhances the practice of democracy without undermining the freedom to embark on purpose and functions and to ensure that social demands and conflicts arising from various interest groups and civil societies are tackled is one of their tasks (Dunne, 2021; Forcher-Mayr and Mahlknecht, 2020).

Given that both government policies and how they are carried out may strengthen a democracy, there is a need to define government policy more broadly and the ingredients of government policy execution (GPE) (Adeniran, 2016; Delamaza and Palma, 2022; Matuku-Mphahlele and Zandamela, 2022). These terminologies are essential due to the elements involved in the execution of government policy. Hence, the word government policy execution is a subset of the primary term government policy. Government policy may be described as a cycle or process with several steps to be taken before achieving a policy's goals. Typically, there are four or five stages:
   a) Stage for issue/ problem identification;
   b) Stage for setting agenda;
   c) Stage for policy formulation or policymaking;
   d) Stage for policy execution; and
   e) Stage for policy evaluation.

Policy phases will be significantly influenced by the particular technique employed (Zeb-un et al., 2021). Government policy is, first and foremost, a persuasive art, as Deygers and Vanbuel (2022) claimed. It is so named because it calls for the selection, enactment of legislation, and consultation of all relevant parties (Kofele-Kale, 2006; Nunes et al., 2019). According to Oyadiran and Akintola (2014), one objective of government policy is to guarantee that persons responsible for carrying out significant decisions in society, regardless of their position, are well-trained. This opinion was also agreed upon by Myrczik et al. (2022), De-Marchi, Lucertini and Tsoukiàs (2014), and Ozturk (2015).

According to Galli (2015), government policy should be viewed as both a declaration of goals and a negotiated outcome resulting from the execution process. One of government policy's most distinguishing features is how unstable and changeable it is (Deygers and Vanbuel, 2022). The assertion that proposed or envisioned government policies lacks any evident beginning or end is maintained in the study of Ashmore et al. (2020), which noted that they should be understood as analogous to seashells or jelly. It flows almost circularly at times. Myrczik et al. (2022) assert that when the policy is discussed, it implies addressing pertinent issues germane to human existence.

Falk and Tally (2016) identified the features of government policy, such as the intended direction that the legislator would want to guide the public, including the description of how the country's resources are to be used (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). It was also revealed by Oyadiran and Akintola (2014) that several variables might influence the overall government policy process. These include the legislators in charge, noting what the Constitution stands for. The issues that need to be resolved should be known to politicians or bureaucrats Koelble and Siddle (2014).

Also, a significant portion of those involved in the government policy process are local (government excluded). Consequently, it is crucial to get in touch with these influential individuals who know the community's situation, their challenges, and the issues that need to be fixed. The act of fashioning, enacting, monitoring, reviewing, or revising government policies is covered by Imenda (2014). Nokele (2022) argues that because it is crucial to the efficacy and reach of government policies, its execution should be the primary emphasis of the whole process.

Macheridis and Paulsson (2019) noted that government policies are centred on presumptions about what governments can do and what the effects of those actions would be since they would otherwise be the product of political activity and would, as a result, have political ramifications (Mellaard and van Meijl, 2017). Maggetti and Gilardi (2016) assert that it is uncommon to get a thorough explanation of the assumptions underlying government policy as a theory or model, much alone the context in which those assumptions must be employed or understood. But, as with every procedure, an idea or model is always presupposed (McCann and Ward, 2013).

Every story has two sides, and the government policy level confirms this truism. Government policy is two-dimensional or contains two storylines; given that politics and administration are a component of it, it has a two-dimensional structure. Creese, Dutton and Esteve-Gonzalez (2021) refer to this reality as the more significant number of pertinent legislative and administrative operations. Knill and Tosum's viewpoints on government policy may be contrasted to show how interdependent politics and the administrative side are. Government policy and politics should adhere to the same course (Molossi et al., 2023).

The role that legislators play in deciding the resource utilization of a country in the government mentioned above policy is regarded as the political side of the government policy process (Gray, 2018). On the other hand, the administrative side of the government policy process focuses on the executive and their actions to realize the stated objectives established by the government (Mellaard and van Meijl, 2017). The administrative side of the public process is responsible for ensuring that the adopted policy will persist throughout time, according to Deygers and Vanbuel (2022). Policymakers, administrators, and bureaucrats should encourage all significant stakeholders of the necessity of a specific policy and the reasons for that requirement for that execution to take place (Purtle *et al.*, 2023; Mellaard and van Meijl, 2017).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Manifestations of Government Policy

Everyday life is a manifestation of government policy. Also, it starts in casual conversations when regular people talk about things like how to improve government policy. As stated in the introduction chapter, creating government policies is a complex, multi-layered process (Mellaard and van Meijl, 2017). For the creation and execution of government policy, two guiding concepts (or significant areas of study) are essential. Public administration and political sciences/studies fall under this category. According to Andrews-Speed (2021), government policy encompasses several political science subfields. Implementing government policies, which come from the political (or policymaking) facets of government and are backed and endorsed by political administrators, is the priority over public administration's primary goal (Uddin et al., 2023).

Wilson's dualism (quoted by Guidi et al., 2020) contends that politics and administration cannot be divided into distinct roles when determining government policy from both the structural and functional perspectives. There, the line thins out to the consistency of a spider's web thread. According to Simeon (1976), institutions and practices that are exposed in and through economic, social, and political dynamics shape government policy. Government policy can also result from issue articulation (acknowledging a policy challenge), finding alternatives, and the political processes (Crabolu, Font and Eker, 2023).

According to Bertram (2020) the focus of political studies on government policy has been around for a while. Mellaard and van Meijl (2017) contend that the academic study of the government policy process is a part of political studies/sciences since politics deals with who gets what, when, and how. Political science may be necessary to government policy issues while maintaining its dedication to scientific investigation (Mellaard and van Meijl, 2017; Deygers and Vanbuel, 2022; Fischer et al., 2015). Politicians, pressure organizations, and 'passive beneficiaries of policy' are only a few stakeholders engaged in the government policy process (Jiang, 2018).

2.2. Underpinnings of Government Policy

Government policy is often regarded as being first and primarily a course of action (Makhetha, 2015). This course of action must demonstrate logical decision-making, as doing so will lead to responsible behaviour (Daniell, 2014). Wu (2022) define government policy as the process or series of actions taken by the government to solve a particular societal issue that was originally recognized. According to Guidi et al. (2020), the people whose lives will eventually be impacted by the outcomes of policy action are represented in the specialized policy subsystems where government policy is developed, implemented, and evaluated.

According to Paulsson and Macheridis (2022), who also concurs with Makhetha (2015) and Wu (2022), government policies are the result of a combination of systematic forces, political processes, institutional influences, rivalry among groups, elite preferences, belief in or advocacy of change through small steps, and rational planning (Fischer et al., 2015; Deygers and Vanbuel, 2022). Whatever decisions the government agrees on will fall under this (Kharel and Kharel, 2020; Jakonen and Sokka, 2022). Simeon (1976) concluded that policies are the climax of a complicated negotiation process and the outcome of several modest judgments made by decision-makers. Yet, Simeon (1976) maintains that ideology is at play both in the formulation of policies and during the policymaking process, suggesting that government policies indeed reflect ideology (or have a symbolic repertoire; Steven, 2021; Molossi et al., 2023).

The socioeconomic circumstances present in a particular geographic area that the government policy must address impact how the framework of government policies is developed claims Kharel and Kharel (2020). However, several factors, such as institutional frameworks, a country's party system, or the overall relationship between the government and the populace, can affect the process of formulating government policy (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). Government policy also incorporates a society's dominant ideas, dogmas, and beliefs (Simeon, 1976). Because of this, these components offer a framework for the underlying assumptions and arrangements that permit the examination of policies (Simeon, 1976).

Recognizing social issues and how societies choose to handle and solve them are essential elements of government policy, according to Parsons (2002) and Steinert (2016). Government facilitates reducing or removing these issues that society has identified (Parsons, 2002; Crabolu, Font and Eker, 2023). Guidi et al. (2020) assert that two features or functions, namely structural terms and/or functional words, can be used to conceptualize government policy. The structural component of government policy includes the interactions that may occur between the governments' policy players in the setting of the several specialized areas of the subject (Guidi et al., 2020). The many policy types considerably influence how government policy is framed (Crabolu, Font and Eker, 2023).

2.3. Types of Government Policy

Government policies can be created in several styles and/or types to address the need on the policy agenda. Lowi refers to this classification of policies as a policy categorization (1972). As a specific policy type would be associated with a variety of politics, categorizing policies is essential for studying politics (Oyadiran and Akintola, 2014; Aritz et al., 2017). Hence, a politically appropriate policy classification has been developed (Oyadiran and Akintola, 2014). The classification of policies must, however, be founded on intellectual and theoretical considerations that have an influence on actual political situations (Oyadiran and Akintola, 2014). The policy categorization aims to ensure that it supports the study of politics while avoiding omitting the public administration component or having a detrimental impact on the political environment as a whole (Oyadiran and Akintola, 2014).

The aim of government policy classifications or taxonomies5, according to Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019), is to comprehend the basic contrasts between policies and the political settings that influence the various types of

policies in place. It is simpler to express the typifications that role-players typically utilize to characterize government policies when approaches are categorized, according to Aritz et al. (2017). This suggests that using policy taxonomies makes it possible to accurately describe government policies (Aritz et al., 2017). Sol (2023) claims that employing policy taxonomies may assist in determining the scope and presentation of a policy.

According to Simeon (1976), policy taxonomies offer the chance to consider the amount of coercion and the equilibrium between individual and collective activities leisurely. Simeon (1976) thinks Lowi's (1972) proposed policy taxonomies are essential and fundamental for political science students. According to Munzhedzi (2020), there are four types of government policies, or policy taxonomies: distributive, redistributive, regulatory, and component government policies. Some taxonomies or classifications are considered to be governmental functions. According to Nico (2015), these policy categories may be used to pinpoint the specific effects of a policy, which might promote political discourse about how decisions are made and how to execute policies.

Also, the sectoral categories or clusters should serve as the foundation for policy classifications (Ahmad et al., 2021). The terms types and categories of policies were used interchangeably throughout the study. For instance, there may be a collection of regulatory or protective policies.

2.3.1. *Distributive government policy*
Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020) claim that the primary objective of distributive policies is issue-solving; as a result, they typically function in the most supportive political climate. The strong clientele, knowledge, leadership, and coherence characterize the context in which distributive policies are carried out (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023). It involves acting to address issues facing the general population (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023). Significantly, distributive policies may also be described as dealing with how additional resources, expenses, and advantages from the government are distributed to specific population demography (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019) revealed that distributive strategies address Lasswell's (1936) maxim of who receives what, when, and how.

According to Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019), distributive policies use general public funds (instead of user fees) to help a particular segment of a social group without considering resource limitations or financial constraints (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023; Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). As shown in election manifestos, when different political parties seek voters to approve of the resources and services they can deliver to them if they are elected to power (or held in power), the constituencies of elected politicians also benefit from distributive policies (Kraft and Furlong, 2013).

2.3.2. *Redistributive government policy*
Allocative government policies, sometimes referred to as redistributive government policies, deal with necessities like the funding of the welfare system, health care system, and education system (Ahmad et al., 2021). Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020) claim that redistributive policies occur when the government levies taxes on one group of people to benefit another. These resources are distributed between the wealthy and the socially disadvantageous and destitute groups (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). A redistributive strategy can be implemented despite ideological cleavages, following Guidi et al. (2020).

Concerning the aforementioned, Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020) assert that direct taxation and the transfer of resources from one socioeconomic group to another lead to the emergence of a distinctive characteristic that distinguishes distributive and redistributive policies from one another. A dispute is this trait (Jutta, 2016). Redistributive policies are exceedingly political, difficult, unfavourable, and polarizing to design and implement, which causes this conflict. They cause disputes that polarize the population along party lines (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023). Redistributive programs face this challenge since one group gains at the expense of another (Yanow, 2015). The discussion around distributive government policies is heightened because they

explicitly allude to an ideology or a class war. According to Donnelly (2015), the disadvantage of redistributive policy is that the government typically lacks the means to implement such a program.

2.3.3. *Regulatory government policy*

Regulatory policies, according to Munzhedzi (2020), typically address the need for policies relating to transportation, infrastructure, health, and other regulations and standards, or they prohibit people from acting in certain ways, such as selling illegal goods like dangerous drugs, participating in unfair competition in the market (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023). According to Anyebe (2018), regulatory policies are laws carried out by government agencies without any interference or money inducement.

A regulation policy can be a form of competitive regulation to regulate individual industries and their activities. It can also be a protective regulation meant to protect the general public. Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019) contend that regulatory approaches are questionable because they let the government meddle in private enterprises and people's daily lives. Another disadvantage of regulatory government policies, according to Creese, Dutton and Esteve-Gonzalez (2021), is that they significantly impact how much money is spent and how much assistance from other social actors is needed.

2.4. Constitution government policy

Oyadiran and Akintola (2014) developed the component policy as a subset of constituent policy. Both the government and/or the nation as a whole are considered to be two constituents of government policy, according to Oyadiran and Akintola (2014) and Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020). According to Meier's additional definition from 2007, constituent policies aim to advance the interests of the nation-state and the broader public. Constituency policies are portrayed by Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020) as being exceedingly detailed, meticulous, and in charge of significant initiatives. Meier's (2000) notion of component policies may be used to depict the presidential department where policies are executed, monitored, and coordinated. Constituent policies also cover governmental operations, including defence and foreign policy (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023).

The present democratic society can be classified under constituent policies because of their method of operation and provision for election laws (Yanow, 2015). According to Creese, Dutton and Esteve-Gonzalez (2021), there is a fact that constituent government policies only have an impact on the executive branch of government. As was said above, Oyadiran and Akintola (2014) identified the many kinds of government policies and found just four policy taxonomies. Not all government policies will fall within Lowi's (1972) taxonomy of approaches, as (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023) indicates. These policy taxonomies thus have the disadvantage of excluding alternative policies that might not fit the policy classification. A few new categories of approaches have been included in the classification of procedures since Lowi's (1972) policy taxonomies were first introduced.

The following section briefly discusses one more policy type that is mainly referred to as substantive government policy.

2.5. Substantive government policy

Government policies are crucial in a wide range of substantive sectors, according to Paulsson and Macheridis (2022). These substantive sectors include, but are not limited to, environmental issues, economic development, security, public service, international relations, primary education, social development and domestic affairs (Fischer et al., 2015). A substantive policy focuses on what the government should do (Simeon, 1976). A substantive policy may incorporate specific overarching goals (such as describing the anticipated results of the policy while it is being produced, for example) (Marie-Kim and Marie-Hélène, 2020). It might also consist of more concrete objectives the policy must achieve. Yudiatmaja et al. (2022) conclude that successful substantive solutions can resolve a policy issue.

2.6. Government policy Execution

The policy as it is carried out is the genuine policy of a government, according to Peters (2001). One of the main reasons why government policy execution is one of the most crucial stages in the whole government policymaking process is because it refers to the point at which a policy is implemented (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023; Aguerre and Hernan, 2015). According to Peters (2001), one of the main issues with our current political systems is how government policies are carried out. Many behaviours in the administrative and political settings where government policy is being implemented are taken into account throughout the execution process, claims Hurel and Rocha (2018). According to Galli (2015), politics substantially influences every action or step taken during the cycle of policy execution, with both a macro and micro political context (Galli, 2015).

The macro-political backdrop, which includes factors like legislation, economy, and what is happening or moving worldwide, is what Galli (2015) refers to as the external environment. On the other hand, according to Galli (2015), the micro-political context comprises things like the policy's mission, the competencies needed, the organizational culture, and the external environment. GPE is rather challenging since several factors must be considered, some of which the implementers have influence over and others of which they do not. Falk and Tally (2016) argue that it is incorrect to assume that implementing government policy only entails putting previously developed procedures into action since there is more to it than that. Implementing government policy involves using important inherent information.

Creese, Dutton and Esteve-Gonzalez (2021) assert that GPE bridges policymakers and policy addresses. The implementers aid this relationship. This GPE phase is essential because it makes it possible to execute the proposed or envisioned policy (Steven, 2021). This suggests that the result of the policy is transformed into its production. Aguerre and Hernan (2015) contend that policies and practices must be separated to understand the whole process of producing policies. As mentioned earlier, the role-players in charge of implementing the policies must thus not act entirely independently. As a result, they offer guidelines for applying already created and authorized policies.

3. Theoretical Review

Government policy theories are essential in the social, environmental, technological and engineering literature. These theories offer unique characteristics of political and human development. Among the theories of government policy are the political systems theory, group theory, institutional theory, rational choice theory, and the policy process model.

Many of the previous and present policies are formulated and implemented because they are influenced by systemic variables, political processes, institutional influences, game-playing, incrementalism, interest group, rational planning, elite preferences, and interest group interests. These theories will pose further issues regarding government policy and the primary channels from which sound decisions are formed. The following section will cover these theories.

3.1. The elite/mass theory

The elite notion holds that a small elite group controls the bulk (Zeb-un et al., 2021). This idea works best in the countries of Africa. Because the interests and well-being of the elite are prioritized under this theory, elite viewpoints that diverge from those of the general public can affect the development of government policy (Zeb-un et al., 2021; Jutta, 2016). The elite thesis is based on the notion that because the general public is allegedly uninformed and indifferent, their opinions shouldn't have any bearing on how government policy is formulated (Fischer et al., 2015).

The elite notion holds that only a caste that is acknowledged throughout society should influence government policy (Kraft and Furlong, 2013). This elite caste includes members of the governing class, political parties, business executives, wealthy individuals, and educated segments of society (Jutta, 2016). One way that the elite ideology is implemented is by whom the most influence over how government policy is decided (Jutta, 2016). Not all elites have an outsized impact on shaping government policy. Each elite aims to have a significant effect on a specific niche market. For instance, business executives would want to weigh in on decisions regarding tax legislation and import and export laws. The governing class, however, would like to have a voice in how the general public is governed, how money is allocated, and how resources are utilized.

It's also conceivable that these two exclusive groups come into contact with one another and interact as they use their influence and power. Zeb-un et al. (2021) assert that public administrators' perceived importance is influenced by the idea that they are members of the ruling class rather than citizens' servants. This idea may be explained as a small elite making decisions that cascade down to an uneducated civil society (Fischer et al., 2015). Zeb-un et al. (2021) assert that political power influences these decisions and that the bureaucracy is necessary to carry them out. The idea holds that only a select group of experts possess the authority.

3.2. Group theory

Politics is characterized by the interaction of groups, and the group theory incorporates organized interest groups in the creation of government policy (Jutta, 2016). These actors are shown as tenacious voice-hearing warriors. In light of this, it is possible, to sum up group theory as a battle between the voices of organized interest groups. Group theory includes, for example, individuals working in the agriculture sector and companies producing music. Organizations should be allowed to make a major contribution and have a say in determining government policy. In order to dispute the abuse, poor administration, and fraudulent execution of policies, as well as hold those responsible accountable, people should be able to challenge laws that are thought to be illogical, unsuited, or ineffective for the intended purpose.

Organizations ought to promote justice, transparency, the participation of the citizenry, and awareness in policymaking. The group theory is crucial and pertinent to government policy as a result. This is done so that organizations may play a big part in setting policy and assisting with enforcing previously approved or ratified legislation like the Constitution. Groups have an impact on government policy, whether it be a policy regarding environmental concerns or the welfare of the populous as a whole. This exemplifies how several interest groups from diverse socioeconomic domains may all voice their opinions on the policies they believe the government should adopt or reject and play a significant role in their creation. According to Zeb-un et al. (2021), group theory has some implications for political decisions. For instance, the dynamics of the cabinet are changed.

The disadvantage of the group theory is that it rewards more organized groups, has more members, has access to resources, has political allegiances, is well-liked, and has built ties with decision-makers (Galli, 2015). The less fortunate members of society lack all of the aforementioned resources and are at the other extreme of the spectrum (Jutta, 2016). According to Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019), group theory is criticized by academics studying government policy for giving organized interest groups too much sway and leaving it up to them to decide policy (Oyadiran and Akintola, 2014). Government employees also seem to be left on the side of the road (Tacon and Hanson, 2011).

Researchers in government policy believe that the degree of impact that organized interest groups have on policymaking tends to worsen the complexity and dynamic character of policymaking that is already present (Kraft and Furlong, 2013). It is also important to acknowledge that the elite/mass does have some roots in group theory (Carroll and Common, 2013). Although all groups (regardless of socioeconomic level or prominence) may be accommodated under the group theory, those with access to more resources are often the ones whose opinions

are heard when policies are being developed (Chaudhary, 2018). Their voices tend to be aristocratic. The voices of those groups that lack access to the same resources as the privileged are so muffled.

The term "extra influence" refers to the elite groups' intrusion into group theory and the creation of government policy. This is characterized by Guidi Guardiancich and Levi-Faur (2020) as having a solid clientele, knowledge, and leadership. Also, this increases the pressure on public servants and policymakers, which tips the balances in their favour when deciding the course of government policy.

3.3. Institutional-based theory

This theory is often known as the "classical theory" since it is interpreted classically to study government policy (Zeb-un et al., 2021). It is not a coincidence that Minkman, van Buuren and Bekkers (2018) state that the institutional approach arose as awareness of the importance of enshrining government policy-making in the framework of institutions expanded. This implies that the government's concerns about welfare should take precedence over other issues (Zeb-un et al., 2021). Institutional theory is deeply rooted in the formal and legal aspects of the governmental system (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). The institutional model's purpose is to evaluate the structures that regulate how the government is structured, its legal power and the norms of behaviour it adheres to while making decisions (Dunne et al., 2021). The institutional theory focuses primarily on the public's access to decision-making, government transparency, and, eventually, the separation of powers between the various levels of government (Zeb-un et al., 2021).

The institutional theory rationally asserts that the structures and codes of conduct that regulate the government and its departments significantly impact the various types of policy processes that take place, as well as how role-players in those processes will ultimately affect those processes (Kraft and Furlong, 2013). Political, economic, and sociological institutionalism are the three frameworks that institutional theory embraces (Minkman, van Buuren and Bekkers, 2018). Economic institutionalism stresses applying economic analysis to political institutions and government policy, whereas political institutionalism looks beyond the traditional forms of institutions to pay more attention to (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023). The institutional theory is essential in ensuring government policies' legitimacy, applicability, and coerciveness (especially true of regulatory laws, which impose obligations on the general populace) (Díaz-Llamas et al., 2023).

3.4. Rational choice theory

This is a contemporary theory used in social sciences. The public choice theory is another name for the theory of rational choice (Cagnin, 2017). It has a strong economic foundation (Jutta, 2016). Generally, it uses complex mathematical modelling, which has only been moderately helpful in evaluating marginal behaviours in competitive circumstances and is typically seen throughout an election period (Ashmore et al., 2020).

This theory is thoroughly developed and rigorous, and it could be used to address many government policy-related issues (Kraft and Furlong, 2013) and used to conclude. Opponents of this theory claim that the decisions made based on rational choice are faulty, unrealistic and unworkable.

Cagnin (2017) identified two distinct features of the rational choice theory. Its main focuses are methodological individualism and the assumption that people are reasonable. The sensible perspective contends that the ability to make decisions indicates a person's capability for logical reasoning. On the other hand, Ashmore et al. (2020) argue that a broad account of human behaviour supports all rational choice theories. According to Ashmore et al. (2020), the basic hypothesis holds that individuals are complicated, flawed mortals who strive for perfection despite whatever challenges they may encounter.

3.5. Political systems theory

This theory is the most complete among popular approaches (Kraft and Furlong, 2013). The theory aids government initiatives and institutions in transforming public inputs (such as environmental needs) into policy outputs (such as public opinion and pressure from interest groups) (Cagnin, 2017). The theory was designed to raise public awareness of policy issues and give the populace a platform to express grievances (Cagnin, 2017), allowing for the problems to be presented on the government's policy agenda (Uminska-Woroniecka, 2022).

Moreover, it represents the wider, shared socioeconomic, cultural, and political framework that serves as the foundation for decisions on politics and policy (Jutta, 2016). According to Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019), the language employed in political and policy studies has expanded as a result of the systems theory.

3.5.1. *Government policy Cycle*

In accordance with the four government policy functions, the policy process model (Jutta, 2016) recommends an analytical progression of the occasions that impact the formulation of government policies (Guidi et al., 2020). At each level of the policy process model, the connections between policy players are shown (Jutta, 2016). According to Appiah-Agyekum (2020), the policy model explains how decisions were made, makes understanding the timeline of events simpler, and supports the pragmatic nature of government policy (Guidi et al., 2020).

Moreover, it explains how these results in the understanding that can be applied to any political system and its decision-making procedures (Jutta, 2016). The best method to begin a discussion of policy theories and a strategy to organize the study of policymaking, according to Cagnin (2017), is to use the policy cycle. According to Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019), the traditional model is cyclical since formulating policies is continuous and always in "motion" as a rolling wheel.

The policy cycle's main lesson is that just because an issue has been identified and a decision has been taken, it doesn't mean everything has been fixed (Cagnin, 2017). That only denotes the beginning of the policymaking process. The model's stages are linked to each other like links in a chain cycle (Appiah-Agyekum et al., 2022). As Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019) noted, no policy decision or solution is ever final. The policy process model does succeed in capturing the essence of policymaking despite all of its flaws, and as a consequence, it correlates to political reality.

According to Lerma, Díaz-Baca and Burkart (2022), the conventional model of the policy process consists of four functional processes or phases:
  i.   Agenda setting;
  ii. Policy development;
  iii. Policy execution; and
  iv. Policy assessment

Two additional steps that Bertram, Maleki and Karsten (2019) add to the concept of the policy process are:
  i. Policy legitimization; and
  ii. Policy modification.

Guidi et al. (2020) postulate the results of policies and the related subsystems that must be implemented. This suggests that the stages theory serves as an example of how a government policy develops (or comes into existence). Guidi et al. (2020) assert that knowledge and information are the main forces behind policy construction.

In a significant sense, this is the reason why everyone involved in the policy process has to be sufficiently informed of how government policy is produced, as well as possess the knowledge, skills, and competence necessary to see the process through to the end (Rakšnys and Valickas, 2023). Moreover, it serves as a tool for

guiding and educating decision-makers on the procedures involved in carrying out government policy (Cairney 2012).

3.5.2. Agenda setting
Any social issue that the public brings up should be taken seriously (Aguerre and Hernan, 2015). But more importantly, agenda-setting in democracies is expected to be characterized by a high level of citizenry participation (Blackstock et al., 2020). Various media influences can manage, shape, and define the issues on the policy agenda (Fischer et al., 2015).

The topics included on the policy agenda can be influenced, controlled, shaped, and defined using these platforms or the participation of experts from a particular subject (Crabolu, Font and Eker, 2023). These are the three steps that makeup agenda setting:

a) Identification of issues;
b) verifying which problem is of significant essence; and
c) Outlining the dynamics of an issue (Cagnin, 2017).

According to Díaz-Llamas et al. (2023) and Falk and Tally (2016), only one element determines whether policymakers should pay attention at this early stage of the policy process. That aspect is the availability of information about social issues/issues. According to Steinert (2016), the public media's assessment and awareness of a societal issue has an effect on agenda shaping. This is due to the possibility that the press might impact public opinion, given the variety of media outlets available (Chetty, 2015).

3.5.3. Policy formulation
Before creating a policy, one must create a strategy for responding to the suggestions made during the first phase of the policymaking process. According to Cagnin (2017), creating policies entails defining goals, estimating costs, and assessing the specific outcomes this policy will produce. As a result, the suggested course of action and the policymaker's (s) ' intentions are both stated at this point in the policy cycle (Steven, 2021). Rational, logical solutions are chosen. Following the conclusion of this process, crucial policy instruments are selected (Cagnin, 2017). Falk and Tally (2016) assert that all necessary stakeholders, such as interest organizations, elected officials, legislators, and the public, should participate in policy development.

3.5.4. Policy execution
Only the events in the early stages of the policy process result in government policy. At this stage, it may be anticipated that a government policy will undergo changes, such as revision; the government policy may even be rejected at this stage (Kustec and Mcardle, 2012). A significant feature of government policy execution is that it may take on many shapes and forms depending on the institutional and cultural context (Welsh, 2019). Attention was called to an essential facet of carrying out government policy, especially given that it operates or is carried out at a time when "government" procedures are seen as having been transformed into "governance".

Moreover, Jaishia et al. (2023) classify government policy execution research as a political science and administration subject. This suggests that overly-simplistic hierarchical models are being abandoned and that a broad spectrum of stakeholders is starting to participate in policymaking (Iroulo and Boateng, 2023). Also, politics ends when administration begins. Politics and administration are related. According to Mügge and Alenda-Demoutiez (2019), the institutions of democracy and the rule of law have entrenched a tight hierarchy in the relationship between these two disciplines.

3.5.5. Policy Outcomes and Evaluation
At this stage, a policy is evaluated to determine its success (or failure) (Cagnin, 2017). The effective execution of the procedure, the judgments taken about the policy, and whether the policy generated the intended results as described in the stage of defining the agenda and formulating the policy are all crucial factors to take into account when evaluating policies (Cagnin, 2017; Steven, 2021). Lessons will be drawn from this, recognized, and

typically serve as the basis for future policy choices (Appiah-Agyekum et al., 2022; Cagnin, 2017). This is done by carefully reviewing all of the information gleaned from evaluating the policy's outcomes (Mügge and Alenda-Demoutiez, 2019).

Many government policy actors, such as think tanks, government organizations, external consultants, nonprofit groups, the media, and the general public, can engage in this activity (Fischer et al., 2015). When this process is finished, the policy can be sent back to the legislator, who can then choose whether to change it (possibly signalling the start of a new policy cycle) (Steven, 2021).

The policy cycle is advantageous. Welsh (2019) identified the main reasons for this:
a) Since it is a logical process that may depict the variety of reality, it is plain and easy to grasp.
b) Each phase disseminates knowledge to a particular section of the setting in which government policy is produced (Welsh, 2019). This could aid the policymaker in selecting the many variables and tactics available.
c) The policy cycle shows that policymaking is flexible.
d) The process of establishing policies follows a chronological order.

The policy cycle also identifies the point at which the policymaking process should start, which makes it a helpful tool for the decision-maker.

Conclusions

Definitions and classifications of government policy were expanded in this study. It is essential to keep in mind different types of policies are defined in different ways but must be simple to comprehend. As the objective of a policy is more likely to shape society, the distributive or substantive policy may be seen by one group of participants as a regulatory policy. Still, another group may not see it as such. Therefore, policy classifications aid in outlining the various ways that policy stakeholders frequently describe policies and the development of practicability and reality of the policy that will be implemented.

The elite/mass idea holds that society is divided into two groups: those in positions of authority and those who do not. Those with access to and influence take a more active role in creating government policy, which is in line with the elite/mass theory. The exciting aspect of group theory is that it aligns more with the legislative branch of government than the bureaucracy. This could be because the legislature is where the general population's opinions are represented.

For the institutional theory, it was revealed that institutions and policy are closely related. The institutional theory's foundation is procedural legislation and how it could help or impede political goals in various governmental structure sectors. Although the rational choice theory assumes that government policy actors have access to all the information necessary to make well-informed decisions, this theory can be misleading and unrealistic because it believes that government policy actors will have the knowledge and ability to make rational decisions.

To categorize and understand the contributions and linkages made by institutions and policy players and the role played by the external environment in producing policy, however, the systems theory offers a more understandable method. It was contended that as democracy is an administrative system built on broad public involvement, politicians and people in public office should support any concept that fosters citizen engagement in any form (especially in democracies).

The participation of the citizenry at all proper steps of the policy cycle is only fair because government policy is created with the general public in mind; nonetheless, caution against dismissing any of these models or theories.

They provide different viewpoints on politics and government policy and information on how these two function in the institutional and political domains. They directly give rise to theories of politics and government policy, which provide light on how issues are discussed during policymaking.

It is essential to remember that government policy and how it is carried out are about 'outcomes' for the policies being implemented. It entails gathering all the inputs (needs) from the community and rating each demand according to priority. These inputs from the community or other role-players decide the issues listed on the policy's agenda. Second, the bureaucracy must recognize the outside world since external variables, except for the community, significantly impact government policy. Laws, the environment on a global scale, technology, traditional views, politics, diversity, and complexity are some of these external elements.

References

Adeniran, A. O. (2016). The rational approach of Obafemi Awolowo's Principles in enhancing efficient leadership and good governance through intellectual enormity. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, 49, 101-107.

Aguerre, C., and Hernan, G. H. (2015). Internet policy formation in Latin America: understanding the links between the national, the regional, and the global. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2809883

Ahmad, F., Draz, M. U., Chang, W. Y., Yang, S. C., and Su, L. (2021). More than there source curse: exploring the nexus of natural resource abundance and environmental quality in north-western China. *Resour Policy*, 70, 101902. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2020.101902

Andrews-Speed, P. (2021). How may National culture shape public policy? The case of energy policy in China. *The Energy Journal 43*(3). http://doi.org/10.5547/01956574.43.3.pand

Anyebe, P. A. (2018). An overview of approaches to the study of public policy. *International Journal of Political Science (IJPS)*, 08-17.

Appiah-Agyekum, N. N. (2020). Primary healthcare implementation in practice: evidence from primary healthcare managers in Ghana. *African Journal of Primary Health Care and Family Medicine,* 12*,* 1-7. https://doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v12i1.2183

Appiah-Agyekum, N. N., Kayi, E. A., Appiah-Agyekum, J., and Otoo, D. D. (2022). Capacity issues in primary health care implementation: examples from Ghana. *Health Education*, 122(1). http://doi.org/10.1108/HE-06-2021-0095

Aritz, J., Walker, R., Cardon, P., and Li, Z. (2017). Discourse of leadership: The power of questions in organizational decision making. *International Journal of Business Communication,* 54(2), 161-181. http://doi.org/10.1177/2329488416687054

Ashmore D. P., Thoreau, R., Kwami, C., Christie, N., and Tyler, N. A. (2020). Using thematic analysis to explore symbolism in transport choice across national cultures. *Transportation,* 47, 607-640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-018-9902-71

Bertram, D. (2020). Accounting for culture in policy transfer: A blueprint for research and practice. *Political Studies Review,* 1-18. http://doi.org/10.1177/1478929920965352

Bertram, D., Maleki, S., and Karsten, N. (2019). Factoring in societal culture in policy transfer design: the proliferation of private sponsorship of refugees. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 21(5). http://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-019-00738-0

Blackstock, K., Novo, P., Byg, A., and Waylen, K. A. (2020). Policy instruments for environmental public goods: Interdependencies and hybridity. *Land Use Policy,* 107(3), 104709. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104709

Cagnin, I. F. (2017). The study of macro and micro implementation of social policy, de Paul Bierman. *Revista Brasileira de Políticas Públicas e Internacionais - RPPI*, 2(2), 175-180. http://doi.org/10.22478/ufpb.2525-5584.2017v2n2.37386

Carroll, P., and Common, R. (2013). *Policy Transfer and Learning in Public Policy and Management*, *London*: Routledge https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203749395

Chaudhary, D. (2018). Agriculture policy and rural development in Nepal. *Research Nepal Journal of Development Studies,* 1(2), 34-46. https://doi.org/10.3126/rnjds.v1i2.22425

Chetty, R. (2015). Behavioral economics and public policy. *American Economic Review: Paper and Proceedings,* 105(5), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20151108

Crabolu, G., Font, X., and Eker, S. (2023). Evaluating policy complexity with Causal Loop Diagrams. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 100(11), 103572. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103572

Creese, S., Dutton, W. H., and Esteve-Gonzalez, P. (2021). The social and cultural shaping of cybersecurity capacity building: a comparative study of nations and regions. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing 25*(2). http://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-021-01569-6

Daniell, K. (2014). The role of national culture in shaping public policy: a review of the literature. HC Coombs Policy Forum Crawford School of Public Policy. ANU College of Asia & the Pacific

Delamaza, G. (2015). *Enhancing democracy: Public policies and citizen participation in Chile*. New York: Berghahn.

Delamaza, G., and Palma, J. F. (2022). From above or from below? Chilean NGOs, the State and education reforms. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. http://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2022.2137480

Deygers, B., and Vanbuel, M. (2022). Advocating an empirically-founded university admission policy. *Language Policy,* 21(3), 1-22. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09615-6

Díaz-Llamas, J. L., Soto-Ceja, E., Bravo-Olivas, M. L., and Chávez-Dagostino, R. M. (2023). Ecological footprint of an artisanal fishing cooperativein a lagoon body. *Revista Bio Ciencias*, 10 e1399. http://doi.org/10.15741/revbio.10.e1399

Dunne, L., Craig, N., Miller, S., Connolly, P., Lackman, J., Aber, L., Yoshikawa, H., Fitzpatrick, S., Pham, P., Vinck, P., and Walmsley, P. (2021). *Promoting Social Cohesion and Peacebuilding Through Investment in Early Childhood Development Programs.* In book: Transitioning to Peace. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77688-6_17

Falk, M., and Tally, K. (2016). Cultural participation in Europe: Can we identify common determinants? *Journal of Cultural Economics,* 40, 127-162. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-015-9242-9

Fischer, F., Torgerson, D., Durnová, A., and Orsini, M. (2015). Introduction to critical policy analysis." In Handbook of Critical Policy Studies, edited by F. Fischer, D. Torgerson, A. Durnová, and M. Orsini. Cheltenhamn, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. 1-26. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783472352.00005

Forcher-Mayr, M., and Mahlknecht, S. (2020). Critical entrepreneurship education in general education and TVET: two concepts of practice in a South African township. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education,* 11(2), 65-84. http://doi.org/10.2478/dcse-2020-0019

Galli, A. (2015). On the rationale and policy usefulness of ecological footprint accounting: The case of Morocco. *Environmental Science & Policy,* 48, 210-224. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.01.008

Gray, S. (2018). Achieving compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code: learning from the implementation of another international agreement. *International Journal of Sport Policy,* 11(4), 1-14. http://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1550798

Guidi, M., Guardiancich, I., and Levi-Faur, D. (2020). Modes of regulatory governance: A political economy perspective. *Governance,* 33(1), 5-19. http://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12479

Hurel, L. M., and Rocha, M. S. (2018). Brazil, China and Internet Governance. *Mapping Divergence and Convergence,* 22, 67. http://doi.org/10.5278/ojs.jcir.v0i0.2267

Imenda, S. (2014). Is there a conceptual difference between conceptual and theoretical frameworks? *Journal of Social Science,* 38(2), 185-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2014.11893249

Iroulo, L. C., and Boateng, O. A. (2023). Bureaucratic acquiescence as an institutional strategy in the African Union. *African and Asian Studies,* 22(1-2), 113-134. http://doi.org/10.1163/15692108-12341583

Jaishia, M., Sharmab, G. P., Nepalic, P. B., Gauchana, D., Shresthad, R. K., Timsinae, K. P., and Neupanea, H. (2023). Government framework for agriculture service delivery at the local level in Nepal. *Nepal Public Policy Review,* 3(1). https://doi.org/10.59552/nppr.v3i1.28

Jakonen, O., and Sokka, S. (2022). Finnish cultural policy as public funding: Regime view across policy domains. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift 25*(3), 293-313. http://doi.org/10.18261/nkt.25.3.9

Jiang, Y. H. (2018). Confucian political theory in contemporary China. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21, 155-173. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-041916-020230

Jutta, V. (2016). Participatory turn in cultural policy? An analysis of the concept of cultural participation in Finnish cultural policy. *Nordic Journal of Cultural Policy,* 19(1), 59-77. https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN2000-8325-2016-01-04

Kharel, K. R., and Kharel, S. (2020). Analyze the effectiveness of resource mobilization of local government. Management Dynamics, 23(1), 169-182. https://doi.org/10.3126/md.v23i1.35577

Koelble, T. A., and Siddle, A. (2014). Institutional complexity and unanticipated consequences: The failure of decentralization in South Africa. *Democratization,* 21(6), 1117-1133. http://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2013.784270

Kofele-Kale (2006). *The international law of responsibility for economic crimes: holding state officials individually liable for acts of fraudulent enrichment*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Kraft, M. E., and Furlong, S. R. (2013). Politics, analysis and alternatives. Los Angeles: SAGE. Landsberg, C. n.d. South Africa's African agenda: challenges of policy and implementation.

Kustec. S., and Mcardle, D. (2012). National law, domestic governance and global policy: A case study of anti-doping policy in Slovenia. *International Journal of Sport Policy,* 6(1), 1-17. http://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2012.662692

Lerma, L M., Díaz-Baca, M. F., and Burkart, S. (2022). Public policies for the development of a sustainable cattle sector in Colombia, Argentina, and Costa Rica: a comparative analysis (2010-2020). *Front. Sustain. Food Syst., 6*, 722522. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.722522

Macheridis, N., and Paulsson, A. (2019). Professionalism between profession and governance: How University teachers' professionalism shapes coordination. *Studies in Higher Education,* 44(3), 470-485. http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1378633

Maggetti, M., and Gilardi, F. (2016). Problems and solutions in the measurement of policy diffusion mechanisms. *Journal of Public Policy,* 36 1), 87-107. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X1400035X

Marie-Kim, C., and Marie-Hélène, G. (2020). Changes in practitioners' attitudes, perceived training needs and self-efficacy over the implementation process of an evidence-based parenting program. *BMC Health Services Research,* 20(1). http://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05939-3

Matuku Mphahlele, M., and Zandamela, H. L. (2022). Capacity Development-oriented Service Delivery Structures and Programmes: Case Study of a Mineral-rich District Municipality. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance,* 12(1), 78. http://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v12i1.19363

McCann, E., and Ward, K. (2013). A multi-disciplinary approach to policy transfer research: geographies, assemblages, mobilities and mutations. *Policy Studies,* 34 (1), 2-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2012.748563

Mellaard, A., and va/n Meijl, T. (2017). Doing policy: enacting a policy assemblage about domestic violence. *Critical Policy Studies,* 11(3), 330–348. http://doi.org/0.1080/19460171.2016.1194766

Minkman, E., van Buuren, A., and Bekkers, V. J. J. M. (2018). Policy transfer routes: An evidence-based conceptual model to explain policy adoption. *Policy Studies*, 3(2), 222-250. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2018.1451503

Molossi, L., Hoshide, A. K., de Abreu, D. C., and de Oliveira, R.A. (2023). Agricultural support and public policies improving sustainability in Brazil's beef industry. *Sustainability,* 15(6), 4801. http://doi.org/10.3390/su15064801

Mügge, D., and Alenda-Demoutiez, J. (2019). The lure of ill-fitting unemployment statistics: How South Africa's discouraged work seekers disappeared from the unemployment rate. *New Political Economy, 25*(104), 1-17. http://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2019.1613355

Munzhedzi, P. H. (2020). Evaluating the Efficacy of municipal policy implementation in South Africa: challenges and prospects. *African Journal of Governanceand Development,* 1(9), 89-105.

Myrczik, E., Heikkilä, R., Kristensen, N. N., and Purhonen, S. (2022). Missing out on culture-or not: Danes and Finns' cultural participation, the pandemic, and cultural policy measures. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift,* 25(2), 1-24. http://doi.org/10.18261/nkt.25.2.4

Nico, C. (2015). Differentiating between access, interaction and participation. *Conjunctions,* 2(2), 7-28. https://doi.org/10.7146/tjcp.v2i2.23117

Nokele, K. (2022). Context and Realities of Policy Implementation in South Africa: Quo Vadis. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation (AJMRI),* 1(6), 10.54536/ajmri.v1i6.898

Nunes, S., Barlow, J., Gardner, T., Sales, M., Monteiro, D., and Souza Jr. C. (2019). Uncertainties in assessing the extent and legal compliancestatus of riparian forests in the eastern Brazilian Amazon. *Land Use Policy,* 82, 37-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.11.051

Oyadiran, P. O., and Akintola, O. E. (2014). Public policy making and implementation in Nigeria: the Millennium Development Goals in perspectives. *International Journal of Diversity*, (1), 1-22.

Ozturk (2015). Sustainability in the food-energy-water nexus: evidence from BRICS (Brazil, the Russian Federation, India, China, and South Africa) countries. *Energy*, 93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.09.104

Paulsson, A., and Macheridis, N. (2022). The policy unconscious: educational labor, the research-and-teaching relationship and the unquestioned meaning of higher education. *Critical Policy Studies*. http://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2022.2064889

Purtle, J., Stadnick, N. A., Wynecoop, M., and Aarons, G. (2023). A policy implementation study of earmarked taxes for mental health services: study protocol. *Implementation Science Communications,* 4(1). http://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-023-00408-4

Rakšnys, A. V., and Valickas, A. (2023). The application of complexity theory in the context of public governance challenges. *Viešoji politika ir administravimas,* 21(4), 195-205. 10.13165/VPA-22-21-4-14

Sol, S. L. (2023). Participation is important, but-" Professional rationalities of balancing acts in publicly funded cultural institutions. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift,* 26(1), 42-56. http://doi.org/10.18261/nkt.26.1.4

Steinert, C. (2016). The impact of societal preferences on national monetary policy outcomes: A revival of economic pluralism. *Politikon,* 31, 2. http://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.31.2

Steven, H. (2021). *Audience development and cultural policy*. New directions in cultural policy research. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan

Tacon, R., and Hanson, A. (2011). Sport policy and the structure of sport in the UK. In book: Managing sport business: An introduction: Routledge

Uddin, J., Ullah, A., Saqib, N., Kousar, R., and Usman, M. (2023). Heterogeneous role of energy utilization, financial development, and economic development in ecological footprint: How far away are developing economies from developed ones. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research,* 30(20). http://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-26584-3

Uminska-Woroniecka, A. (2022). We were taken on the ride. Leadership trait analysis in the circumstances of international crisis-the decision of Aleksander Kwasniewski in the context of intervention in Iraq. *Teoria polityki,* 6, 215-235. http://doi.org/10.4467/25440845TP.22.007.16007

Welsh, J. (2019). Ranking academics: toward a critical politics of academic rankings. *Critical Policy Studies*, 13(2), 153-173. http://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1398673

Wu, D. (2022). *Implementation and public diplomacy*. In book: U.S. Public Diplomacy Towards China. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95644-8_3

Yanow, D. (2015). Making sense of policy practices: interpretation and meaning. In handbook of critical policy studies, edited by F. Fischer, D. Torgerson, A. Durnová, and M. Orsini.Cheltenhamn, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. 401-421. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783472352.00031

Yudiatmaja, W. E., Solina, E., Yudhi, I., and Samnuzulsari, T. (2022). Paid plastic shopping bags policy: What the factors drive the implementation? *Journal of Governance and Public Policy,* 9(1), 13-23. http://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.v9i1.11152

Zeb-un, N., Mustafa, G., Yaseen, Z., Arslan, M., and Imran, M. (2021). Theoretical approaches to study the public policy: an analysis of the cyclic/stages heuristic model. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology,* 18(10), 1307-1321.

Adetayo Olaniyi ADENIRAN Department of Logistics and Transport Technology, Federal University of Technology Akure, Nigeria.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/orcid.org/0000-0002-6870-1212

Joseph Mosunmola MURAINA Department of Geography and Planning Science, Ekiti State University, Ekiti, Nigeria.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/orcid.org/0009-0006-5764-3594

Joseph Olanrewaju ILUGBAMI Rufus Giwa Polytechnic-Owo Rector Office, Ondo State, Nigeria.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/orcid.org/0009-0005-8114-5264

Adedayo Ayomide ADENIRAN Department of Geopgraphy and Planning, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/orcid.org/0009-0001-0241-6232