The Role of Rationality in Public Policy Theories with Emphasis on Habermas's Communicative Rationality

Ali Shah Hassani

Economics Faculty Member at Khatam Al Nabeein University, Kabul, Afghanistan

E-Mail: Hassani57@gmail.com; a.hassani@knu.edu.af

Abstract

Governments are witnessing many challenges, issues and needs around them every day, and they are expected to give appropriate answers to all of them. These answers are defined as "public policy" in academic literature. Public policy is trying to formulate the criteria of a good and desirable policy by adopting an objective and action-oriented view and thus guarantee the survival and efficiency of the government. Among a wide range of concepts and core principles of social sciences, "rationality" has a special place. Review of existing research literature of public policy shows that rationality has a high position as a central value in these theories. This article has tried to analyze the concept and types of rationality, using the meta-study method, to analyze the rationality used in public policy theories. The research hypothesis was that there are three non-rational approaches, instrumental rationality and Communicative rationality in policymaking theories. To verify the above hypothesis, a relatively extensive study was conducted in public policy theories. This research has been done with the aim of answering this question to determine whether public policy theories have benefited from a rational approach. If yes, what kind of rationality did he use? For this purpose, due to the multiplicity of public policy-making theories, we tried to study and examine most of these theories. The research result shows that the theories of public policy started and developed with the approach of instrumental rationality, and in recent years, it has moved away from it and shifted its direction towards the approach of communicative rationality. The meaning of the communication rationality approach is that in an assumed society, belief, value, and behavior that results from public agreement in a free, equal and free from domination, has communication rationality.

Keywords: *Rationality; Instrumental Rationality; Communicative Rationality; Public Policy; Substantive Rationality*

1. Introduction

Management Knowledge, while being a relatively young and short-lived science that has been around for a hundred years, has witnessed extensive theoretical developments. Two major factors can be considered prominent in the course of the remarkable evolution and transformation of this science; first one is its birth and growth in the era of the scientific revolution and the peak of scientific, technological,

economic and social progress and advancements of mankind, and the second is the deep connection between the field of knowledge and practice (implementation) in this science. Management Knowledge is considered one of the most widely used contemporary sciences because most of today's human activity takes place within the framework of organizations and most of today's human needs are met through organizations.

Governments are always faced with numerous challenges, issues, and needs and they are expected to respond appropriately to all of them. These responses are defined as "public policy." in management. Naturally, reaching to a decision requires preparations and processes that a significant part of which involves determining criteria in response to the question "What should be done?" This leads to a selection among a set of solutions or policies. Public policy knowledge aims to establish the criteria for good and desirable policies by adopting an objective and action-oriented perspective, thereby ensuring the survival and effectiveness of the government (Imami, Alishiri, and Sajadiyeh, 2020, p. 106).

Among the wide range of concepts and core principles in social sciences, "rationality" occupies a special place (Ventriss, 2002, p. 35; Simon, 1978, p. 3; Boomin, 2018, p. 766). An examination of the existing resources in the field of public policy indicates that rationality holds a prominent position as a core value in these theories (Dunn, 2012, p. 200; Fischer et al., 2017; Regan, 1978, p. 83). This article in addition to examining the concept and types of rationality, aims to explore the rationality employed in public policy theories. The article focuses primarily on Habermas's communicative rationality. The theories presented in the field of public policy began and developed with an instrumental rationality approach but have recently shifted towards a communicative rationality approach. Today, we witness significant theories in the field of policymaking that are based on and rely on this relatively new form of rationality.

Communicative rationality is a relatively new and effective approach in social science studies introduced by Habermas. This article attempts to examine and analyze the role of rationality by emphasizing and focusing more on communicative rationality in public policy-making theories.

2. Research Questions

2.1 Basic Question: "What is the role of rationality in policy-making theories?"

2.2 Sub Questions:

2-2-1. What is the role of instrumental rationality in policy-making theories?

2-2-2. What is the role of communicative rationality in policy-making theories?

2-2-1.What is the position of the non-rational approach in policy-making theories?

3. Research Methodology

In this research, we attempt to analyze selected theories of public policy in terms of the role of rationality in their formulation. The premise is that all three approaches—irrationality, instrumental rationality, and communicative rationality—are present in policy-making theories. To confirm this hypothesis, a relatively extensive study was conducted on theories of public policy. The goal is to introduce examples of public policy theories that embody the irrational approach, instrumental rationality, and communicative rationality, using a meta-synthesis method. The main objective of meta-synthesis is to combine and analyze research works conducted in a specific field.

This research was conducted with the aim of answering the question of whether public policy theories have utilized a rational approach. If so, what type of rationality have they employed? To this end, given the multitude of public policy theories, an effort was made to study and analyze most of these theories. In total, eight prominent theories of public policy were examined and analyzed: the rational approach to decision-making and policymaking, the theory of bounded rationality, incrementalism, the garbage can model, the narrative policy framework, the punctuated equilibrium framework, the advocacy coalition framework, and the multiple streams framework. These theories were studied using primary sources, namely the works of their authors. Before studying these theories, a review of articles and scientific resources was conducted to explore rationality and its various approaches as part of the research literature. For the meta-synthesis of the theories, the method proposed by Sandelowski and Barroso (2007) was utilized. Based on this method, a seven-step process was employed in the analysis, which is illustrated in Figure (1).

Figure 1: Ultra-combination stages (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2007)

4. Research Hypothesis

It seems that all policy-making theories, are affected by one of three approaches—non-rational, instrumental rationality, and communicative rationality—. This means that some policy-making theories can be analyzed within the framework of the non-rational approach. Some have been shaped and developed under the influence of instrumental rationality, while others have used communicative rationality to analyze the nature and content of policy-making.

5. The Importance of Rationality in Policy

Rationality has always been a focal point of the public policy literature (Ryan, 1999, p:36; Gershuny, 1978). Waldo (1955) has spoken of rational action, Herbert Simon (1997) has presented a model of rational decision-making, and Max Weber (1972) has spoken of the "rational organization or bureaucracy." Rationality has also been considered as "the heart of modern public administration" (Schreurs, 2002, p:279) and the reference point of the policy-making process (Dorstewitz and Kuruvilla, 2010, p:263).

6. The Concept of Rationality

An important characteristic of humans is that they have beliefs about themselves and the world around them. This dimension of humans, which is related to their cognitive faculties, has sometimes been called the "belief-formation process" and the "belief-regulation process." The fundamental question in this

regard is: Do humans build beliefs or regulate their beliefs in a particular way? Are these two processes based on specific principles and follow a specific logic? Questions such as these are related to the issue of rationality, and one of the tasks of contemporary epistemology is to analyze this term and discuss the conditions for its realization.

Both concepts of reason and rationality are historical concepts. If we want to take a common denominator from the totality of existing perceptions and define reason as the power of understanding and discrimination, we will come close to the basic meaning of this concept. Reason describes one dimension of human ability. Humans can be described as "rational" in comparison to other beings, but not all human behaviors are characterized by rationality. Some behaviors, values, and beliefs are rational and some are irrational (Khan Mohammadi, 2010, p. 136).

Rationality is sometimes contrasted with arationality. Aristotle's definition of human as a "rational animal" is of this type of rationality. What he means is that humans have the ability to reason. This does not mean that humans are rational in all their actions. This type of rationality is called "generic rationality." The human species has the ability to reason.

Rationality is sometimes contrasted with irrationality. In this interpretation, rationality describes human behaviors, values, and beliefs. Some behaviors, values, and beliefs may be irrational. Such behaviors are examples of "irrationality." There are also actions that, in addition to having rational status, are actually rational. These types of actions have normative rationality. The concept of normative rationality implicitly implies the desirability of rationality.

The term normative rationality is used in three cases: a) Sometimes rationality is used to describe beliefs. For example, we say that the belief in p is reasonable; b) Sometimes rationality is used to describe actions and behaviors, for example, we say that behavior x is reasonable behavior; c) Sometimes values are characterized by rationality and we say that this or that value is a reasonable value.

The three uses above show that "rationality" is used in three different contexts, and each of these three uses has a specific title. Philosophers use the term "theoretical rationality" in the context of evaluating beliefs—or even propositions or decisions. Theoretical rationality is concerned with what we should believe. In contrast, "practical rationality" is concerned with behaviors and deals with what behaviors we should perform, and finally, "value-based rationality" deals with what things we should value (Stenmark, 1995, p. 5).

7. *Rationality and its types in Weber's thought*

Max Weber is the starting point for discussions of rationality in contemporary sociology. Stefan Kalberg has attempted to identify the types of rationality in Weber's thought. While acknowledging the semantic ambiguity of this word, he considers rationality to be the almost central theme of Max Weber's works. He identified four types of rationality in Viber's works (Kalberg, 1980, 1157).

As previously noted, rationality is a description of human action. Therefore, in Weber's thought, four types of action can be identified, which have an abstract aspect. Therefore, parallel to the types of action, there are types of rationality, which are explained in order.

7-1. Theoretical rationality

Theoretical rationality is not oriented towards action, but towards ideas, and is a type of mental action that influences practical action. Theoretical rationality makes the world meaningful in a particular way, and everyday actions are generally carried out in accordance with that meaning. Theoretical rationality is a relative concept and is related to the structured interpretation of the world and giving

meaning to life, and in this concept there is no criterion for measuring its correctness. That is, it is not known by what criterion theoretical rationality is measured.

7-2. Practical rationality

Practical rationality means pragmatic action carried out in terms of everyday interests and with active calculation to achieve certain practical goals. This type of rationality is used in a type of life where the individual considers personal interests and thinks only about personal interests and benefits. Practical rationality is based on the primacy of benefit and the negation of religious idealism. Of course, it should be noted that it is practically impossible for purely practical rationality to cast a shadow over the entire society because value rationality and theoretical rationality, albeit indirectly, have psychological effects. This means that although people do not refer to religious matters in everyday life, they are affected by them in practice. Therefore, it is not reasonable to imagine a society in which purely practical rationality prevails.

7-3. Intrinsic or essential rationality

Intrinsic rationality is "the choice of means through values to achieve goals within the context of a value system, or in other words, the application of rational calculation to unlimited and future goals or values" (Azad Aramaki, 1996, pp. 39-57). Intrinsic rationality refers to the values within which individuals choose their goals and, considering those values, pursue legitimate ways to achieve those goals based on practical rationality. Therefore, an individual pursues goals within the framework of a value system in terms of the values determined by the social system. If the values of this system are compatible with the goals, this system is rational. For example, in Weber's thought, a system based on Protestant ethics is compatible with the growth of capitalism and therefore has intrinsic rationality. In Weber's thought, the only type of rationality that can produce "methodical ways of life" is intrinsic rationality.

7-4. Formal rationality

Formal rationality is aimed at rationalizing social structures in such a way that the individual within such a structure is forced to exhibit rational behavior. An example of such rationality can be found in the bureaucratic system. While practical rationality indicates a vague tendency to calculate and solve everyday problems through patterns of action, based on means-end rationality and taking personal interests into account actually, formal rationality legitimizes the same means-end rationality calculation by referring to rules, laws, or regulations that are of general application (Kalberg, 1980).

8. Habermas and the Idea of Communicative Rationality

Communicative rationality refers to the intersubjectivity of truth. Therefore, truth is based on a comprehensive consensus about the correctness and validity of a judgment and the health of society depends on the development of the ability to understand. In a given society, belief, value, and behavior that results from general agreement in a free, equal, and domination-free environment has communicative rationality (Khan-Mohammadi, 2010, p. 175).

As previously stated, rationality is a description of human action. To understand Habermas's concept of communicative rationality, the concept of "communicative action" as the center of Habermas's thought must first be explained.

9. Conceptualization of Communicative Action

The subject of discussion is human action. Among the actions that can be categorized, Habermas seeks to represent and promote "communicative action." Action is opposed to behavior in the literature of social sciences. Behavior refers to instinctive, habitual, mechanical, and repetitive action. The concept of action, however, refers to an active, creative, and mental process (Ritzer, 1995, p. 529). Most human behaviors have two layers. The Overt layer is the visible behavior that the actor performs, but the covert layer is the thought process that includes meanings and symbols. Any behavior that has both layers is called action (ibid., p. 286).

Human actions are, in one sense, of two types: individual and social. Social action is action directed at the reaction of other human beings, even if the actor is alone and merely thinks in his mind that someone might see him. Individual action is action that is thought-oriented action. in this behavior, the behavior of other human beings is not considered.

The second category of action is parametric action as opposed to strategic action. Thinking is the constituent part of action. The actor is a rational person who chooses one of the possible options with reflection and deliberation. But these options sometimes have certain possible consequences due to nature. In this case, the actor chooses one by examining the results. Such an action is called "parametric action". But most human actions are of the type of strategic action. Because social actions have possible consequences that are not exactly certain. "Strategic action" is called a type of social action whose possible consequences are not exactly certain and depend on the decisions of others.

The concept of strategic action is based on two assumptions: first, that all humans have the power of thinking and reasoning; second, that all actors pursue their own personal interests and use their intelligence to gain the most benefit (Little, 2003, pp. 80-82).

By understanding the concept of "strategic action", we can better understand the concept of "communicative action" because Habermas categorizes the two against each other. Therefore, communicative action can be explained as a central concept in contrast to strategic action. According to Rasmussen, action can take two forms, one is strategic action and the other is communicative action. The first type involves rational purposeful action aimed at success, while communicative action aims at reaching a certain understanding. The agreement reached through communicative action has a rational basis. Neither party can impose it.

10. Principles and Components of Communicative Action

1) Rationalism: Habermas believes in a rational human being. Reason is a capacity that is deposited in the human being, but this capacity grows and becomes actualized through social interaction and the process of socialization. (Nowzari, 2002, p. 69).

2) Communitarianism: In the German tradition in which Habermas grew up, society is considered the collective manifestation of people's knowledge, wisdom, and identity.

3) Individual and Society: On the one hand, Habermas is a subjectivist and believes in rational man, which means that he cares about the individual, and on the other hand, based on the German tradition, he attributes an independent identity to society. He does not consider society to be merely an algebraic sum of individuals.

11. *Conceptualization of Communicative Rationality*

Habermas means by this concept a type of positive cultural rationality that is opposed to instrumental rationality. Communicative rationality is a comprehensive rationality, because it includes both means and goals, but it is not existential and is focused on goals that humans themselves have determined, instate ultimate goals (Bashirieh, 2001, p. 233).

Although Habermas uses many thinkers view in reconstruction of his thought, but Weber is central in his analyses. Communicative rationality is in fact a reconstruction of a specific perception of Weber's basic concepts. Therefore, it can be said in short that a specific type of rationality, I mean value rationality versus instrumental rationality, and a specific type of action, I mean communicative action versus strategic action, and finally a specific type of rationalization, namely lifeworld rationalization versus system rationalization, are components of communicative rationality.

According to Habermas, Weber has reduced human social action to strategic action by basing it on the principle of profit-seeking. This means that all humans seek to gain more benefits and, as they collectively seek to dominate nature, they seek to employ each other. Therefore, the principles governing the relationship between humans and nature govern the relationship between a man and others. The output of such principles is the rule of instrumental reason and ultimately the collapse of humans in an iron cage. Although Habermas accepts such a relationship between humans and nature and the instrumental attitude governing it, he does not accept its extension to human relations. Even more than this, he believes that such a model in human relations is not original, but rather contingent. Humans are the only creatures that have the power of speech and have a social life and symbolic action. The need to understand and comprehend, as a necessity of social life, with the tool of language, implies a special type of action that Habermas interprets as communicative action. The existence of communicative action in the human lifeworld, the goal of which is solely understanding and not domination and profit-seeking, is essential for Habermas, and the objective existence of such action should not be ignored in analyses.

One of Weber's basic concepts, which is at the top pyramid of communicative rationality, is the concept of rationality. As mentioned earlier, four types of rationality can be identified in Weber's thought, each of which contains specific subjective meanings: goal-oriented rationality, value-oriented rationality, emotional and sentimental rationality, and traditional rationality. In Weber's view, instrumental rationality within the framework of which goal-oriented action takes place enjoys quasi-normative acceptability. In other words, goal-oriented actions enjoy greater rationality, and as a result, great desirability, and the domain of values is outside the realm of rationality. However, Habermas raises the question of why "only rational purposeful action and not value-rational action should be attributed structuring effects?" He wants to confront Weber's moral skepticism with this question. In fact, Habermas is interested in "value-oriented rationality." In the act of communicating a purpose, the speaker invokes the values in the lifeworld to validate his claim. For example, in response to the criticism that he has the authority to give orders to others, he says: In our life, the boss has the right to give orders to his subordinates. What is important for Habermas is the process of value formation. Values that are the result of general agreement and are formed in a process free from domination have authority for members of society, and citation of those values has validity (Habermas, 1984, p. 25).

Habermas agrees with Weber that emotional action, and even more so traditional action, has little rationality and is therefore not normatively desirable. However, in rejecting instrumental rationality and turning to value rationality, he distances himself from Weber and in fact elevates rationality from the sociological to the philosophical level, believing that values must also be rational.

Habermas does not believe in inherent and universal values, but rather considers values to arise from the life world of humans. That is, social values cannot be divided into good and bad in their essence,

but it is the general agreement of humans that evaluates them as good or bad. What is important for Habermas is the legitimacy of norms. Under what conditions do norms established in society gain legitimacy? Habermas' answer is that norms that are the result of the agreement of all interested individuals have rational validity. In Habermas's words, "only those norms can claim validity that have obtained or can obtain the approval of all those affected by that norm as participants in practical discourse" (Habermas, 1990, p. 66).

12. The Conceptual Scope of Rationality in Policy

By reviewing the existing literature on rationality, we realize that there are a multitude of different definitions and approaches to it. Therefore, it is necessary to present a typology of rationality in the literature and knowledge of management and policy-making using specific criteria.

One of the thinkers who has studied the typology of rationality from the perspective of policy-making is Alexander (2000). He has tried to analyze different approaches to rationality using three criteria: 1) The subject matter of rationality in the planning and policy-making literature. From this perspective, he has introduced the three subjects of "beliefs", "actions" and "statements" as the focal point of the discussion of rationality. On the other hand, rationality has also been categorized based on two criteria of "deliberative" or "communicative". The first is related to having reason and the second is related to using reason for action. The third criterion for classifying rationality has been focused on being "ideal" or "realistic" of rationality. By multiplying the intersection of these three criteria, four types of rationality can be defined, the subsets of which constitute specific forms of rationality (Emami et al., ibid., p. 110).

12-1. Rationality as pure wisdom:

Classical rationality, known as pure reason, is the forerunner of all forms of rationality related to planning and policy-making. This type of rationality dates back to the Enlightenment era, which began in the 17th century. This rationality is the same as Cartesian reason, which is based on the individual's inner beliefs about the world and replaces traditional and religious norms (Gellner, 1992). This rationality has two characteristics: being holistic and being transcendental.

12-2. Rationality as the logic of action:

Weber, following his severe criticism of pure Cartesian rationality, has revived rationality by introducing a social aspect and developing complex distinctions between types of rationality. These distinctions depend on differences in the relationships between values, goals, beliefs, and action (Alexander, 2000, p. 246). The reference points for the mental processes involved in rationalization include interests, abstractions about the world and values and worldviews, laws, and regulations. The pure end-means calculation is only one instance of this multiple process. The distinction between means and ends has led to the formation of two types of rationality: substantive and instrumental. Formal (instrumental) rationality, for Weber, is defined as a real matter and is based on the calculation of the most appropriate means or procedure for achieving an end. This is the instrumental rationality common in the literature on management and public policy, which focuses on instrumentally choosing the most efficient option (Friedman, 1987, p. 98). This form of rationality is now known as the classical rational model. The main manifestation of instrumental rationality in policy models can be found in the "rational decision-making" model.

12-3. Rationality as the Logic of Argument

In contrast to instrumental and substantive rationality, which focuses on the logical relationship between action and belief, another set of rationalities is less action-oriented and more interaction-oriented.

The subject of this set of rationalities is statements and communication. This set of rationalities is generally referred to as the theory of reasoning. The argument of the supporters of this school is that knowledge and cognition are neither meta-empirical, nor empirical, nor individual, but are fundamentally a social construct. Therefore, instead of being attributed to agents or actions, rationality should be related to social interactions (Forester, 1980, p. 277). In his book "Theory of Communicative Action", Habermas presented communicative rationality as an alternative to conventional rational action. Unlike instrumental rationality, this rationality does not choose among actions according to goals, but rather evaluates the relevant interactions. It has also provided different criteria to show the degree of rationality of choices, such as: How demagoguery and deceptive are the messages? Are misleading communications the result of accidental, calculated, or pervasive distortion? In fact, the goal of rational action is to achieve individual goals, but the goal of communicative action is to reach a consensus between parties (Alexander, 2000, p. 246).

13. *Examining Rationality in Public Policy Theories*

Public policy theories encompass a wide range of theories that differ in the role of rationality in shaping their epistemological framework. In this section, we briefly introduce several major theories of policy and examine the role of rationality in each. There are many theories in the field of public policy, and it is not possible to introduce and examine all of them in this article. Among the existing theories, we introduce several important and fundamental theories of policy that have both a significant theoretical position and have attracted the attention of the management scientific community and have significant applications in the field of practice, and we examine them in terms of the role of rationality.

We divide all public policy theories into three categories in terms of rationality:

13-1. Irrational Theories

In the body of public policy theories, there are theories that consider rationality in the policy-making process to be futile and impractical. The irrational approach tells us that in practice, people do not behave rationally or with bounded rationality. Not everything proceeds on the basis of rationality. Among this theories is a theory known as the "garbage can model." This theory was presented by John P. Olsen and his colleagues (Olsen, 1972).

When there is no agreement on the goals and means to achieve them, decision makers face both uncertainty and ambiguity. Under these conditions, the garbage can model seems to best describe the organizational decision-making process as it occurs in the organization. The model is particularly suited to situations where the environment or technology is not fully understood or where key players enter and exit the decision process, with other activities taking up their time and attention. The reason for naming the model the garbage can is to emphasize the randomness of the decision-making process.

Olsen and her colleagues have described the garbage can decision process as a random sequence of events that intersect to produce solutions to a set of problems in the presence of a random set of individuals at a random moment in time.

In the garbage can model, problems, solutions, participants, and option opportunities are independent flows, events, and processes that exist within and across the organization, similar to randomly selected waste materials that are mixed together in a garbage can. Whenever some solutions, participants, and option opportunities are linked together, a problem may be identified or solved. However, because of the randomness of the process, options may be selected without solving a problem, and some problems may never be solved. And where there are no problems, solutions may be proposed.

The garbage can model is in direct conflict with the assumptions of the rational model of decision-making. Such a model contradicts these assumptions that decisions can be clearly defined; that the means to achieve them are identifiable in advance and can be evaluated according to criteria that seem appropriate. Instead, it suggests that decision-making represents an arena within which organizational members take action in light of their conflicts and differences (Jo hatch, p. 445).

Jhon P. Olsen and his colleagues explain that we do not form organizations to achieve goals and define them as "a set of people who have come together to achieve common goals." The people who come together in an organization each have their own goals that come together to form the organization. Olsen says that looking at organizations this way is ridiculous. What you call an organization does not exist in the real world. We are actually dealing with something called organized anarchy. We do not have a common goal. If we accept that an organization is organized chaos, the decisions you make in this organization will be different. Rational decision-making no longer makes sense because there is no predetermined goal and no predetermined factor can be included in the decision-making process. The garbage can theory gives us a more realistic picture of the situation. Olsen and his colleagues proved their theory in the form of mathematical models. They conducted their study on universities and proved the correctness of their theory by conducting studies and calculations (Olsen et al., ibid.).

In the theory of organizational chaos, decision-making is not rational because different factors and flows influence you to arrive at an option. Just as the organization is not rational, decisions are not rational either.

13-2. instrumental rationality approach theories

Rational theories are based on cost-benefit. That is, we check whether the decision we make is the best decision or not. The best decision (optimal decision) is the decision that gives you the least cost and the most benefit. The early theories of policy-making fall into this category .Let's review some of these theories.

A) Theory of Absolute Rationality

The rational decision-making model is considered as the first general policy-making models and is widely discussed in management under the topic of decision-making. This dominance is to the extent that in some sources this model and its definition of rationality are presented as the most important definition of rationality in policy-making and management science (Shafritz, 2008, p. 249). The main goal of this model is to achieve the best and most efficient policies. Accordingly, policy-making is a rational and intellectual activity in which a main actor makes decisions about options in a logical way and using objective knowledge (Simon, 1977). The decision-maker in this model is depicted as an economic human being who seeks to maximize benefits. The selection of the most appropriate alternative is also carried out by taking specific steps (Lindblom, 1957).

B) bounded rationality theory:

A theory that seeks to find a satisfactory solution by applying rationality at a limited level.

Bounded rationality assumes that human has limitations. Herbert Simon, considering the existence of serious limitations in the rational decision-making process, reduced the requirements for choosing alternatives proposed by the absolute rationality approach. Some of the limitations presented for the absolute rationality approach are: 1. Mental limitations of the decision makers; 2. Decision-maker's lack of mastery of science and technology; 3. Environmental influences; 4. Inapplicability of wise decisions; 5. Environmental (legal) limitations; 6. Resource limitations.

Bounded rationality theory was presented to respond that critics. The bounded policy model was proposed by Simon in his critique of the absolute rational model of policymaking and by questioning some of its assumptions (Simon, 1957, p. 198). From Simon's perspective, it is impossible to achieve any high level of rationality through individual and discrete decision-making. This is because the vast amount of information required to analyze and evaluate different alternatives is so vast that even approaching objective rationality is unimaginable. Because of this cognitive limitation, policymakers will not achieve optimal goals but will pursue those goals at a satisfactory level.

C) The theory of incrementalism

This theory was proposed by Lindblom. He answers the question of why the incremental model is better. He gives several reasons. 1. It reduces the risk of decision-making. For example, after analyzing the situation and establishing the university, now that you want to create a vice-chancellor, you have already taken your risk. Now you are not taking a radical risk anymore. 2. The rational model has many problems that were discussed earlier, even if it is limited. 3. The incremental model is less of a headache (because a new decision is made based on past decisions by making little changes) and therefore has been more popular. 4. Public decision-making is more political than rational. That is, the more you go through the logical process, the more likely and feasible something is to be accepted. Here we are looking for a feasible alternative, not the best. 5. Usually, the person who makes the decision makes this decision in comparison to previous decisions. The opposition to your decision is minimized in this type of decision-making. Lindblom proposed gradualism for these reasons (Lindblom, 1963).

D) Punctuated equilibrium theory

Punctuated equilibrium theory is based on one of bounded rationality theories, namely Lindblom's incremental theory. This theory says: Decisions are of two types: foundational or path-length. Foundational decisions are radical decisions that have no precedent. Here, our study is radical and comprehensive.

Punctuated equilibrium theory seeks to explain how policy changes and why and how policy changes occur. The only policy theory that explains both policy stability and change is the theory of Punctuated equilibrium. Policy stability usually occurs at the subsystem level. The reason for the stability of the policymaking subsystem is the existence of something called negative feedback within the system. Lindblom explains that when the system reaches stability, the subsystems try to maintain themselves and the main system. That is, they try to stay in place and not change much. That is, if elements or factors are trying to change, the subsystems try to repel or minimize this change. But in some places, we see, these minimal changes turn into radical changes that we call radical decisions. The theory comes to answer these radical changes. There is always pressure for change, which negative feedback tries to resist and prevent the system from being disrupted. Here, the systems themselves, which were previously the source of resistance, become the catalyst for change. Gradually, the elements of change become more numerous and more active, leading to radical and macro-level change. Radical changes occur at the level of the system itself, not at the level of the subsystem (Weibel and Sabatier, 2018, pp. 55-103).

As we saw in the brief explanation of the theory of discrete equilibrium, this theory is based on one of the theories of bounded rationality, namely Lindblom's incrementalism, which explains how widespread and radical changes occur in the policy-making process. According to this theory, the policy-maker does so as long as he has the ability to resist changes, but as soon as he sees that the gap in the status quo has increased and there is no longer any ability to resist, he gives in to radical changes with rational and logical calculation. This decision is made at the level of the macro system and with utilitarian calculations (instrumental rationality) by the leadership of the institution.

13-3. Rational theories with a communicative rationality approach

In the previous lines, it was said that in a given society, the belief, value, and behavior that results from general agreement in a free, equal, and domination-free environment has communicative rationality. This is the key concept in communicative rationality. Below, we examine some of the most important public policy theories that have emerged with such an approach and their content shows such a perception.

1. Multiple-stream framework

This theory was presented by Kingdon. The general view of this theory is that it wants to show how an issue is placed on the policy agenda. In terms of the multiple streams framework, we need to put three elements together to enable policies to be placed on the agenda and implemented. These elements or streams are:

1) Problem stream: Whenever a policymaker or citizen sees something outside of their ideal states, there is a problem. This definition shows that a problem is something that is formed in the mind before it is real. A problem has perceptual and interpretive elements. The multiple-streem framework does not see problems as objective objects or factors. Rather, they are socially constructed. That is, the problem is constructed intersubjectively.

2) Policy Stream: The policy stream is the flow that produces solutions. These are the agents, academics, researchers, consultants, etc. Their job is to provide suggestions on policy issues. The problem for which they produce solutions may not be the one that was considered as a problem in the previous stage. The solution that we produce is like a complete soup that has been softened and stirred. In order for such a soup to be prepared, it must go through the process of social policy debate. The notable point is that in the policy stream, the type of interactions between people is of the type of dialogue. In the next stream, people do not discuss with each other. Rather, they lobby and bargain.

3) Political stream: In a political stream, the interaction of people is of the type bargaining, and lobbying. Three elements guide the political stream. A) National ideology: Something that the majority of people think about and point to. For example, that there should be justice and no discrimination. B) Interest groups. The more this group opposes an idea and of course the stronger they are, the more likely they are to destroy that idea. And vice versa. C) Government and policy/legislators. In this element, their changes and composition can be very decisive.

Kingdon says that these three streams come together, or should come together. This three streams results in determining an appropriate policy when all three streams come together behind a window called the agenda window. The agenda window is where you might take action or make a decision by opening it.

Kingdon uses Cohen's model to describe the American political system and tries to identify the problems in the policy-making process by this model: The policy-making process involves many people with different interests and goals. Some of them are able to highlight problems but are unable to provide solutions. Policymakers who have to decide on solutions are under time pressure and do not have enough time to carefully consider solutions. Policymakers delegate the review of proposed policies to expert staff, who may also be affiliated with certain groups. Competing actors who may have innovative solutions wait months or years for their words to find a buyer.

All these factors combine to make policy change very difficult. It is not possible for analysts to predict changes as expected. In short, for change in public policies to occur, there must be simultaneously: sufficient attention to the problems, an acceptable solution available, and the necessary morality for change in the political system. All these factors must be in continuous and satisfactory

interaction and communication, so that the policy is produced and put into action. Achieving such a vision is an interactive process and an intersubjective agreement between the three main streams described above (Weibel and Sabatier, 2017, pp. 17-54).

2. Advocacy Coalition Framework

The main problem on the path to change is the conflict of interests and goals, which often manifests itself in the form of power struggles, and this is the political narrative of change. The framework of the advocacy coalition is one of the developmental frameworks in the policy process and was proposed by Sabatier and Smith. There are three main foundations for this theory: 1) The macro-level assumption means that although most policy-making is carried out by a series of experts related to a subsystem, the behavior of these individuals is influenced by indicators of the larger social and political system. 2) At the micro-level, it is assumed that decision-making is based on the social psychology of individuals. Social psychology studies the effects of the presence of others on the behavior of the individual or his behavior under the influence of the group. It is clear that the influence of others on the individual requires the existence of reciprocal relationships between himself and others. 3) At the intermediate level, it is also stated that the best way to solve the problems that arise due to the multiplicity and multiplicity of policy-making actors is to integrate them into a coherent and integrated advocacy coalition.

The advocacy coalition framework suggests that stakeholder behaviors and beliefs are shaped within an informal network and that policymaking is accrued in to these networks among key policymakers. This system assumes that policymakers are always trying to translate their beliefs and values into real policies for society and enact them into law before their competitors do so. In order to succeed in this task, and to fear the success of competitors, they must find allies with similar thinking and share resources with these partners to gain more power. The advocacy coalition provides the best tools for integrating the behavior of hundreds of organizations and individuals operating in a subsystem, and there are usually between 3 and 5 advocacy coalitions in each policymaking subsystem.

There are two general factors that influence the behavior and resources in an advocacy coalition: 1) the degree of consensus and unanimity required for a general change in policies. 2) the openness of the political system.

As we see, this theory, instead of having a goal-oriented instrumental rationality approach, considers policies and guidelines to be the result of coalitions of individuals and groups and also the result of the process of mental and intellectual interaction.

3) Narrative Policy Framework

The narrative policy framework begins by recognizing that when something is important to us, such as a story, it cannot simply be important to me and enjoyable for myself, but must have something to say to groups and collective actions. If stories play a role in our individual, group, and social lives, can they not also be influential in policy processes? This is the premise of the narrative policy framework.

Narrative policy is ontologically a social reality. What the narrative policy framework accepts is that many of the policy realities we seek to understand are concepts that replace goals with the meanings they interpret. What we know as policy reality are concepts that we have interpreted to become these policy realities. If you want to understand the meanings, you need to understand the policy narratives associated with the actors who make sense of that policy narrative. That is, if you want to understand how a policy is shaped, you have to put yourself in the shoes of someone who has been in that context.

In general, we can introduce five basic assumptions as assumptions of narrative policy:

1) Social construction: This means that we accept that people have different perceptions of objects and processes. NPF or narratives are formed based on a social construction.

2) Limited relativity: Although we may have different policy realities from objects and processes, due to the existence of belief systems, norms, culture, etc., this relativity is limited. That is, it cannot be so relative that it is always different from what it was in the past.

3) Structural elements that are generalizable: The narrative approach builds a structural foundation on narratives.

4) Simultaneous operations at three levels: Within the framework of narrative policies, the analysis we conduct occurs simultaneously at three levels: individual, group and coalition, institutional and cultural levels.

5) Narrative plays a central role in how people process and justify information (Jones & Shanahan, 2014, pp. 1-27).

Conclusion

Rationality is present as a central value in public policy theories and have a high position among their proponents. Rationality refers to a social action that has three components: goal, awareness of the goal, and action plan. By reviewing the scientific literature formed around rationality, we can list three basic categories of rationality: substantive rationality, instrumental rationality, and communicative rationality. Since public policy theories have been formed in the context of Western worldview and culture, the substantive rationality approach has no place in them. In the series, three categories of public policy theories were analyzed on the basis of rationality: one category of theories that have an irrational approach and are actually against instrumental rationality, such as the garbage can model. The second category is a set of theories that have an instrumental rationality approach, such as the theories of gradualism, discrete equilibrium, and bounded rationality. The third category is the theories that have a communicative rationality approach. The communicative rationality approach means that in a given society, beliefs, values, and behavior that result from general agreement in a free, equal, and domination-free environment have communicative rationality. We analyzed the theories of multiple currents, advocacy coalition, and narrative policy in this category.

In summary, it can be said that the evolution of rationality in public policy theories is from instrumental rationality to communicative rationality.

References

1. Alexander, Ernest R. (2000). Rationality Revisited: Planning Paradigms in a Post-Postmodernist Perspective. Journal of Planning Education and Research. 19(3
2. Azad Aramaki, Taghi (1996) "Sociology of Rationality", Qabsat, Volume 1, Issue 1.
3. Bashirieh, Hossein (2001), History of Political Thought in the Twentieth Century, Third Edition, Tehran, Ney Publishing House.
4. Boonin, D. (2018). The Palgrave Handbook of Philosophy and Public Policy. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Emami, Seyed Mojtaba, Alishiri, Mohammad Mahdi, and Sajjadieh, Ali Reza; (2010) Critical Evaluation of Rationality in Public Policy-Making, Quarterly Journal of Public Policy, Issue 3.

6. Fischer, Frank; Miller, Gerald; Sidney, Mara S. (2007). Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods. Boca Raton. FL: Taylor & Francis (Public administration and public policy)

7. Forester, J. (1980). Critical theory and planning practice. Journal of the American Planning Association.

8. Friedmann, J. (1987). Planning in the Public Domain: From knowledge to action. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

9. Gellner, E. (1992). Reason and Culture: The Historic Role of Rationality and Rationalism. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell .

10. Harold Brown, (1997) Rationality, translated by Zabihullah Javadi, Qabsat, issue 1.

11. Hobermas, jurgen, 1984, Modernity, an incomplete project, Https://archive.org/stream.

12. Jay M. Shafritz, J. Steven Ott. (1996). Classics of Organization Theory, Wadsworth Publishing Company.

13. Jo Hatch, Mary; Organization Theory, translated by Hassan Danaeifard (2017), Tehran, Mehraban Book Publishing House.

14. Kalberg, Stephen, 1980, *Max Weber's types of rationality: Cornerstones for the analysis of rationalization processes in history, The American jurnal of Sociology*.

15. Khan-Mohammadi, Karim, (2010), Quran and Communicative Rationality, Ney Publishing House.

16. Lindblom C. (1959). The science of muddling through. Public Administration Review.

17. Little, Daniel (1993), Varieties Of Social Explanation: An Introduction To The Philosophy Of Social Science, translated by Abdolkarim Soroush in Farsi, first edition, Tehran, Sirat.

18. Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, Johan P. Olsen(1972), Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 17, no 1 (Mar., 1972).

19. Michael D. Jones, Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Mark K. McBeth,(2014),The science of stories : applications of the narrative policy framework in public policy analysis, Palgrave Macmillan.

20. Nozari, Hossein Ali (1992), Rereading Habermas, first edition, Tehran, Cheshme

21. Ritzer, George (2004) Sociological Theory in the Contemporary World, Translated by Mohsen Salasi, Eighth Edition, Tehran, Elmi.

22. Shafritz, Jay M.; Borick, Christopher P. (2008). Introducing public policy. New York: Pearson Longman.

23. Simon H. A. (1957). A behavioral model of rational choice. In: Models of man, social and rational: mathematical essays on rational human behavior in a social setting. New York: Wiley.

24. Simon, H. A. (1978). Rationality as process and as product of thought. The American Economic Review.

25. Simon, H. A. (1978). Rationality as process and as product of thought. The American Economic Review.

26. Stenmark, Mikaeal, Rationality in Science, Religion, and Everyday Life, University of Notre Dame Press (1995) .

27. Ventriss, Curtis (2002). The need and relevance for public rationality: some critical reflections, Administrative Theory & Praxis.

28. Weible, Christopher M. | Sabatier, Paul A.(2017), Theories of the policy process, Fourth Edition, Westview Press.

Copyrights