52. The planner *is always in his office* enjoying air conditioning, *whereas* the analyst *is judged by how s/he is to the people in the localities. The planner's conversation is concerned with how the new plan is more ambitious than the old, but the analyst conversation is about learning from field experience to modify existing projects.* Aaron Wildavsky, **Op. Cit.,** p. 411(words in italics are quoted).

53. *Ibid.,* p. 409

54. I would rather use under- developed because these countries are not lacking resources. They do lack good management instead. Words in italics in this paragraph are quoted from the same page numbered 411.

55. Aaron Wildavsky, **Op. Cit.**, p. 410(summarized, those in italics are originally quoted).

56. *Ibid.,* p. 411.

57. *Ibid*., p. 412.

34. Verne W. House, **Models of Policy Making**, Montana State University, p. 245.

35. Jerri Cockrel, **Public Policymaking in America**, cooperative extension service, University of Kentucky,

36. Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon E. Cuba, **Op. Cit.,** p. 562.

37. Sophie Jacquot, « Approche Séquentielle », in : **Dictionnaire des politiques publiques**, Op. Cit, p. 86

38. Ibid.p 38

39. Ibid

40. Patrick Hassenteufel, **sociologie politique : l'action publique.** France : Armond Collin, 2008, p. 294.

41. Renaud Payre, Gilles Pollet, « Approches socio- historique », in : **dictionnaire des politiques publiques**, Op. Cit., p.104.

42. Yves Surel, **Idées, intérêts, institutions dans l'analyse des politiques publiques**, Chronique des politiques publiques, pp. 161- 178.

43. Chloé Anne Vlassopoulou, **Politiques Publiques comparées pour une approche définitionnelle et diachronique,** CURRAP**, Les méthodes au concret,** PUF, 2000.

44. Richard Simeon, Op. Cit., p.554.

45. Steve Jacob, « Evaluation », in : D**ictionnaire des Politiques Publiques**, Op. Cit., pp. 259-260.

‒   See as well : Claudes Rochet, **Politiques Publiques de la staregie aux resultats**. Belgique : Edition de Boeck Université, 2010, pp. 85- 86.

46. Ferdous Arfina Osman, P**ublic Policy Theories and Their Implications in The Developing Countries,** p. 37.

47. Ibid.p 46

48. Ferdous Arfina Osman, Op. Cit., p.47.

49. *Ibid.,* p. 39.

50. Aaron Wildavsky, « Schools of Public Policy in Poor Countries". **Policy Studies Journal**, University of Kansas and Syracuse, vol. 14, No. 3, March 1986, pp. 407- 413.

51. *Ibid.,* p. 408.

14. Jean Leca, *Op. Cit.*, p. 235.

15. Patrick Le Galés, « Gouvernance », in : **Dictionnaire des Politiques Publiques**, *Op. Cit.*, p. 300.

16. *Ibid*., p. 301.

17. John Grahm, Bruce Amos, Tim Plumptre, "Principles for Good Governance in the 21st century". In: **Policy Brief,** No. 15, August 2003, p.3.

18. Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon E. Cuba, "Research, Evaluation, and Policy analysis: heuristics for disciplined inquiry". **Policy Studies Review,** A journal of the Policy Studies organization and Harrison Institute for Public Policy, Center for Public Affairs, College of Public Programs, Arizona State University, February 1986, pp. 546- 565.

19. Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon E. Cuba, *Op. Cit.*, p. 551.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 552.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 553.

22. *Ibid.,* p. 558.

23. *Ibid.,* p. 562.

24. Laurie Boussaguet, Sophie Jacquot et Pauline Ravinet, **Dictionnaire des politiques publiques**, *Op. Cit*., p. 7.

25. Patrice Duran, « genèse de l'analyse des politiques publiques », in : **Dictionnaire des politiques publiques**, Op. Cit*.,* p.291.

26. *Ibid.,* p. 290

27. *Ibid.,* p. 292.

28. *Ibidem.*

29. *Ibid*., pp. 292-293.

30. *Ibid.,* p. 294.

31. *Ibid.,* p. 299.

32. Richard Simeon, « Studying Public Policy », **Canadian Journal of Political Science**, vol 9, n° 4, 1976, p. 548.

33. *Ibid.,* p. 549.

References

1. For more definitions of public policies as being a combination of three terms: *politics, policy, and polity*. See, Stéphane Paquin and others, **L'Analyse des Politiques Publiques**. Canada: les presses de l'université de Montréal, 2010, pp. 7-8.

2. For more information about The actor(s) and their cycle, See: Emiliano Grossman, " Acteur", dans: **Dictionnaire des politiques publiques**. France: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 3eme édition, 2010, pp. 31-37.

3. J. E., Anderson, **Public Policymaking: An introduction**. Boston: Hounghton, Mifflin Company, 2003, p.1.

4. J. E. Anderson, *Op. Cit*, p. 3.

5. « Une politique publique, c'est un peu comme un éléphant- vous le connaissez quand vous le voyer, mais vous ne pouvez pas facilement le définir. » In, Daniel Kuber et Jacques Millard, **Analyser les Politiques Publiques**, France : Presses universitaires de Grenoble, septembre 2009, p. 8.

6. It is a reference to Incrementalism; which *is neither revolution, nor drastic policy change, nor even carefully planned big steps are ordinarily possible…* in: Charles E. Lindblom, **Still Muddling, but not through,** Yale University, November/ December, 1979, p. 517.

7. Martin Van Creveld, **The Rise and Decline of State**. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 415.

8. *Ibid*, p. 416.

9. *Ibid*, p.418.

10. Pierre Muller, L'Etat en Action Revisité. Pôle Sud, N°21, 2004, p. 41.

11. Jean Leca, « Etat, De l'Etre au Faire …et Retour », in : **Le Dictionnaire des Politiques Publiques**. France : Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 2010, pp. 234-238.

12. *Ibid*., p.240.

13. Ricard Blame, « Bien Collectifs », in : **Dictionnaire des Politiques Publiques**, *Op. Cit*., p. 108.

23

Conclusion :

The task of this paper was not simple and easy, however well-outlined it tried to be. At every point we encountered tough theoretical, methodological, and ideological problems. It was doubly hard to undergo a mission of giving an overview of public policy and answering all epistemological concerns of public policies or what was once called 'policy sciences'.

We concluded, likewise, that all the approaches, theories, models, methods cannot be blindly applied for analyzing policies in developing countries without factual, empirical study of the political systems and societies of these countries.

Governments in these countries are Altruists and idealists. This is why public policy schools are not working and analysts are discarded and ignored.

Uncertainty is the rule. Information is inadequate. And the citizen is a *servant*. Within such context public policy schools cannot work.

- Being ignorant about the real meaning of policy analysis which requests analysts to be:[56]

- ◆ First *incrementalists*. They are concerned with side and marginal changes rather than grandiose wider changes. They are in terms of *Wildavsky* "*localists at heart*". They are *decentralizers*.[57]
- ◆ Second, they are *empiricists. They are data grubbers and field-searchers.*
- ◆ Third, they are *mini- economists*. They are interested in the value of goods or services recieved. Their starting point is *opportunities costs* according to the *alternatives resources.*
- ◆ Fourth, they are *students of organization* because support and cooperation are as important as the analysis itself. *They work on projects as teams... they learn how to collect data under difficult conditions, make sense out of it with simple models, integrate their proposals into organizations.*[58]
- ◆ Fifth, they are perfection seekers; in the meaning that *completed work* is their ultimate goal. Their success lies on the implementation of their analysis, of their product.
- ◆ Sixth, they are not bureaucrats. They cherish purpose more than process, and for whom results are more important than routines.

In a nut shell, the raw material of public policy is the field, the scene, and the first- hand experience. It is in the words of *Wildavsky, "getting one's hands dirty"*. Aware of these realities about the policy analysts central governments in under- developed countries think of them as threats and impediments because analysts are against big governments. They are *pro- market.*

For *Wildavsky,* governments in these countries tend to be threatened by some society force and which tries to take control over it. This force might be a tribe, a political party, or an army (or all three together). He goes on thinking of governments in poor countries to be Altruists and idealistic; that is to say that using idealism to cover their selfishness the thing that *leads them to act coercively towards others who do not share their ideals,* because *they consider opposing views evil...* and *prevent feedback...*"[52]

Furthermore, he noticed that the countries of those altruists are rich, but their people are poor. This fact can apply for Algeria today for it is agreed on to be very rich, but its people are poor in comparison to the resources it has.

He, likewise, tried to give out some traits to these altruists which consist of:

- Thinking immensely, especially when it comes to creating change. For them, only this kind of change can reduce disparity between intention and reality; in the sense that there is a continuously increasing knowledge gap between aspiration and achievement (the how of realizing those big and immense changes).

These people ignore the very fact that change starts small until it gets sweeping. They are not in favor of incrementalism.

- Being generalists, therefore the specific does not interest them. In fact, there is a disparity between the ability to cover a large number of cases and the ability to deal appropriately with specific ones.

- Being planners[53], but they are bad planners because they suggest plans which cannot be implemented for being made by those who are most distant and, therefore, most ignorant; while the people who are closest to the consequences and who have the best information will not or cannot act. This justifies his claim that idealism, as a result, is "*a prescription for disaster; in trying to do the most with the least information.*"[54]

Indeed, there are no reliable centers for information, about predictable action on which citizens can depend to moderate their uncertainties because the environment in poor countries[55]is *turbulent.*

As a result, the theoretical luggage (approaches, models, theories, methods, and techniques) for analyzing policies founded in most industrial countries is useful but surely not sufficient for analyzing policies of developing countries due to contextual variations and differences. To be more precise, the structure of political system in the developing countries differs greatly from the developed countries due to certain common socio- political and economic features of developing countries that lead to a quite different policy context specific to them. These features are the following:

1- Pluralism is least practiced in developing countries because societies are less organized, as there is a lack of national interest due to colonialism[48].

2- Decision making is highly centralized and societal forces get lesser scope to voice their demand.[49] All stages of policy process are put into the hands of the ruling elite. Ferdous illustrates this opinion by citing Walt's observations that in developing countries, huge examples of retaining power by government without popular support exist.[50]

3- Scarcity of financial resources in developing countries has made donor agencies (International Organizations such as The World Bank, the World Commerce Organization, and the like) another dominant actor.

Although almost of the developing countries, says Ferdous, share the above features, but each country has its special features which differentiate them from each other. For instance, Algeria and Bangladesh though they both belong to developing countries, but each of these two countries has its peculiarities.

In addition to this view, *Aaron Wildavsky* wrote a paper about **Schools of Public Policy in Poor Countries**[51] where he questioned the desirability of founding such schools in those countries. He even claimed that the value of these schools depends greatly on how much useful policy analysis is for these countries, but before asking such a question, one should rather ask about the kind of government wanted by these peoples who believe in " the ideal government" is the one that stays poor in order to make its people richer.

- In addition to many other approaches such as: systemic, institutional, elite, group (pluralist), network, management, and techniques such as: Cost and Benefit, and the like, and the theoretical heritage of social sciences in general and political science in particular. All these approaches and techniques, which need another paper *per se*, were borrowed from other sciences such as: social sciences, sociology, economy, psychology, law, physics, biology, and others. This is in fact the distinct trait of public policy analysis, interdisciplinarity.

3. Some focus on implementation and evaluation:

We should always bear in mind that policy *is not simply a rational intellectual process;* its *goals are not simply given.*[45] This is why resistance may appear during implementation. As a result, what is recommended in this case? Perhaps the answer is two things to be taken into account. The first is so much understanding of what such policy is about? And what is it for? The second thing is so much commitment on behalf of executers.

Many works are more interested in evaluation; that is to say focusing on the effects of public policies following criteria of management which are: pertinence, efficiency, and effectiveness[46].

- Studying public policies in developing countries:

We learned through the points tackled above that public policy, or policies, is as though hybrid product made by many creatures. It is "*a complex interactive process influenced by the diverse nature of socio-political and other environmental forces. These environmental forces that form the policy context lead to the variation in policies and influences the output and impact. Due to the contextual differences, public policies of the developed countries significantly differ from those of the developing countries. Although the policies of developed countries have proved their effectiveness in many cases, those cannot be, applied in understanding the dynamics of policy process of developing countries. Public policies in the developing countries possess certain peculiarities of their own by virtue of being influenced by an unstable socio- political environment, and face various problems and challenges.*"[47]

18

notion of *referential,* Peter Hall who suggested the notion of *paradigm* which developed later to be "*forum*" (division of community rather than ideas), Paul A. Sabatier who emphasized on *the system of beliefs.* For the beliefs, there are three types:

-deep core beliefs (hard to evolve)

-core beliefs

-secondary beliefs

However, the approach was not safe from criticism because it never tells in reality what the ideas behind particular policies are. Furthermore, they are too abstract and they are sociologically poor (neglect the importance of individuals and groups).

These approaches have known another adjustment which is the emphasis on discourse, speeches, and narratives of actors.

4. **Socio- historic approaches :(diachronic)**

The starting point of this approach is that every political fact is no doubt a historic fact. Its place of birth was North- America along the renewal net of dialogue between history, social sciences, and political sciences. It studied the development of contemporary states and the forms of collective (public) action.

5. **Three "I" approach[43]:**

This approach viewed public policy as being a combination of the following three elements: idea, interest, and institution. And whenever one of these variables changes, as a result public policy changes. According to this approach, change in any public policy occurs in those variables respectively.

7. **Comparative approach[44]:**

The first comparative works in public policy were privileging comparison through variables. At the end of the 1950's, most variables for comparison were much more economic and statistic. Other works that appeared later on focused on political variables through asking the following question: does politics matter?

benefit ratios about populations, income levels, neighborhood housing patterns, and the like, but they say little about the how clients experience the policy as enacted"[37] .Within this context, many approaches and techniques were suggested such as:

1. **Stages approach:**

It was the dominant approach of analysis in the USA since 1970 and especially during 1980's until it became as Robert Nakamura put it *a kind of textbook approach.*[38]

Harold D. Lasswell was considered to be the pioneer of analyzing public policy or governmental action as being a process. He suggested 7 functional stages for any policy analysis; *invocation, application, termination, and appraisal* [39]*,* in addition to the contributions of many other scholars like- Brewer, Anderson, Jones, Deleon, and many others. However, the contributions of Charles Jones are considered to be remarkable. He suggested 5 stages instead for any policy process, which are[40]:

- Problem identification
- Program development
- Program implementation
- Program evaluation
- Program termination

This approach was criticized for its linearity. Simply because policy process does not always go this determined way. It oftentimes skips stages because of the complexity of public action.

2. **Sociology approach**[41]**:**

It appeared right after the stages approach. According to this approach state, inspired by sociology of organization, is a range of actors; individual and collective. It is as well an interaction between local and national, public and private actors.[42]

3. **Cognitive and normative approaches:**

They include works which insist on the weight of knowledge, ideas representation and social beliefs in making policy. The writers ranked in this mainstream are: Bruno Jobert and Pierre Muller who focused on the

isolated studies which have been made, and the different methods and approaches which contributed less in the way of explanation.

The study of public policy, for him and for Pierre Muller in his book; *les politiques publiques* has been linked, as in Algeria, a great deal to public administration simply because bureaucratic agencies are central element in the public policymaking process. However, this assumption *ignores ideologies, values, structures of power, and influence, and so on.*[34]

Moreover, it is linked to technologists; that is to say policy making is just a technical matter, a question of enlarging the list of alternatives and prescribing the more effective and efficient ways of choosing between them, as though the trend was more prone for what was named 'Policy Analysis'.

Indeed, public policy study is more than public administration and analysis. It rather takes these tracks:

1. Some focus on the making: (emphasis on politics)

The study of policy at this level focuses on more traditional concerns of politics which are: power, conflict, and ideology. Here, politics explains policy.

At this level, many models for making policies were developed. Mary Ellen Wolfe summarized them into five models, which are as follows: Kings and kingmakers (who has the power; elite), Clusters Iron Triangle (who has power; groups), Rational comprehensive (how are decisions made, rationally, comprehensively), Muddling through (how decisions are made, incrementally), stages in the decision making process (what are the regularly occurring steps in the policymaking process? Process).[35] In the USA for instance three models are applied: King and kingmakers, stages of decision making, and triangle and power clusters.[36]

2. Some focus on the analysis: (advice on the choosing of alternatives)

The study of policy at this level focuses on problem- solving, and in most cases seeking, theoretically, for the best effective solutions. *Policy studies tended to be top- down inquiries which tell about cost-*

founding reference was: Who gets what? When? And how? By Harold D. Lasswell. The idea was at the very beginning neither clear nor definite. It included both values and practices.[27]

The reasons for policy sciences genesis were all centered on "the amelioration of the democratic practice.[28] That is to say the ultimate goal was "realization of human dignity both in theory and practice".[29]

It seems then that the project was very ambitious, but scientifically ill-assured to be downright convincing. It was not until 1960's in the USA and the beginning of 1970's in the European countries that the project was concretized under the angle of what has been known as "policy analysis" ever since.

It is worth mentioning that most progress in policy analysis known especially right after WWII was not due to social scientists, but rather to specialists in operational research and applied mathematics.[30] However, many other intellectual tracks contributed to enhance policy analysis such as: sociology of organizations, decision (E. Lindblom, Herbert A. Simon, James G. March and many others), in addition to the contributions of Robert A. Dahl. Still the contributions of public administration are remarkable in flourishing public action[31], without forgetting the writings of David Easton who insisted on the interdependence between policies and political support.[32]

All this mixture of fields and intellectual tracks made policy analysis an interdisciplinary mosaic. The obverse side of the coin here is ambiguity and complexity because the human mind, however genius it may be, will remain limited and the human spirit will stay a mystery.

3. Study of Public Policy:

According to the Canadian scholar in Public Policy Richard Simeon, "policy study [in democratic countries] *has been given urgency by increasing pessimism about the ability of government to cope in an era of 'demand overload" and the "fiscal crisis of State"*[33].

He goes on saying that urgency is neither new, because this task is *one of the oldest tasks of political science* in general, nor clear because of

- **Policy or Polices?**

    Along the process of the building scheme of such a field, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon E. Cuba via their article[19] attempted to distinguish between policy analysis, research, and evaluation, and came across the very fact that the distinction between these terms have become fussy because each of these terms has the academic legitimacy as "a scholarly activity". However, these terms differ in aims because research is- besides being a disciplined inquiry- *undertaken to resolve some problem, while evaluation is undertaken to establish value.* [20]While policy analysis is defined according to Nagel as "*the how-to-do-it methods associated with determining the nature, causes, and effects of governmental decisions or policies designed to cope with specific social problem*". [21] But this definition focused rather more on one reality of policies which is *policy- in-action* and discarded the other two realities which are *policy- in- intent* and *policy- in- experience*. For this reason policy is singular when the reality is viewed singularly, but in a case of multiple realities which may take at least three previous forms: the *policy-in- intention, the policy- in-action, and the policy- in- experience*[22]*;* then policy is viewed as policies in plural. To emphasize this opinion, we quote this "*one policy- in- intention may spawn multiple policies- in- implementation.*"[23] Policies are, after all, plural because *policy options represent different realities and may exist at different levels (intention, implementation, and experience).*[24]

    2. **Genesis of Public Policy Sciences:**

    It is a relatively recent discipline. It is still an exotic field for many students, teachers, and even decision makers. It *suggests approaches to open the "black box" of state. Its content is the programs of public action through questioning problems treated and the genesis of solutions*".[25] It is in short a way of thinking about the state(*penser l'état).*

    The place of birth of such an emerging discipline was democratic. It first appeared in the USA around 1930. It was early announced by Charles E. Merriam in 1921 who was calling for the use of science in action[26]. However, the logic of this approach (was not a science yet) was not entirely new because of the contributions of pragmatism. The

coordination and various ways of controlling the different groups and sectors of society in order to achieve definite and collectively discussed objectives [17].

Good governance was first related to public choice (rationality), and to public management later. It refers to effective public action through organizing competition between agencies. However, the so-called good governance is just an ideal despite all the efforts of clearly defining its scope.

Inside every democratic state, there are three institutions responsible for promoting good governance: government, private sector, and civil society. On the international scene there are three organizations: The IMF, The World Bank, and The United Nations. For instance, the United Nations set nine standards for promoting good governance. They are: *participation, rule of law, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, equity, strategic vision, and rule of law*[18].

If we compare the standards of these organizations we notice that the common standard is effectiveness, that is to say rational relations between objectives and results. Some other scholars especially specialists of public management add two more standards to achieve quality in governing which are efficiency (that is rational relations between means and result), and pertinence (that is the rational relations between objectives and the means).

With this widespread ideal in almost all corners of the globe, the literature concerning public policies is focusing more and more on public policies as being not just practices of any state but rather the best ones through the use of science in order to manage a sector and to solve a problem.

What interests us from these definitions is the reality of this ideal in developing countries including our country Algeria. Sure, Algeria is still living through different crises which hinder the process of promoting good governance which are, in short, identity, legitimacy, consensus, participation (democracy), and distribution crises. Therefore, its way towards good governance realization is not paved; it has rather a very long way to go. Hopefully, it will someday make it.

is the form of organization.[7] In other terms, it is *an invisible being known as corporation.*[8] At its birth, State was strong and dominant, but with the emergence of market it became fragmented and weak. As a result, other organizations carried and will carry out the traditional functions of state, and *sometimes sovereignty will be divided.*[9] However, the state returns at every withdrawal especially during crises and when the market gets too wild and devastating[10].

It is worth citing that the role of states all around the world is relative according to the nature of the political systems founded in those countries. The role of Anglo- Saxon states differs from the European ones, and these two differ from the other countries of the globe[11].

State is a recent invention, but still vague, ambiguous, and open-ended. It is a complex paradox. This is why debate over it still open, especially over the desired kind of state: strategic state, privatized state, well- governed state, and the like. Through this we understand that there is a huge shift from trying to define state (structuralism) into its functions (functionalism).[12] For public policies, state is founded at its heart[13], simply because state is the ultimate organization which owns the means of coercion. In fact, the latter makes state more powerful, in many cases, than other actors such as the market. Here, one should cite another concept which emerged along the dichotomy of state vs. market; that is interest. Mansur Olson tried to define the collective action as a problem founded on the relation of paradox between individual interest and collective interest[14]. Therefore, interest, in addition to institution, is a key element in any public policy.

Concerning the ways of access to state, there are actually three ways. First is by top *(par le haut)* which refers to the governmental work. The second is by the bottom (*par le bas*) which happens in the streets. And the third and last is by the middle (*par le milieu*) which includes the process of governance[15].

- Public Policy and Governance:

It is taken for granted that governance is profoundly related to government which has proved incapable of handling social, economic, and political problems.[16] It is, in other words, different forms of

He simply considered public policy as *"relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor [2] or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern."* [3] Moreover, authors such as David Easton, in addition to these characteristics of public policy in general, considers every public policy authoritative; i.e., it is developed by governmental bodies and officials who have the legitimate use of coercion, the quality which private organizations do not have[4].However, this does not mean that the private sector is not influential in the process of making public policies, especially in the more liberal democracies.

It is worth citing that Public Policy is oftentimes confused with laws and routine decisions. To avoid falling into such a trap one should pay close attention to very fact that public policy is not just finished once formulated, but it rather includes execution and assessment.

In nut shell, public policy is a combination of the dichotomies:

1. Public outcome vs. Expressed biased interests;

2. Official vs. participation of non- governmental organizations or individuals;

Despite what has been done and said to make it clear, it is still, unfortunately for some unclear. In this context, we mention the accurate description of public policy by an anonymous British official who described public policy as being *"an elephant who can be recognized when being seen, but cannot be easily defined."*[5]

If we interpret well this saying, we may conclude that public policy is too huge to be put into a simple definition. Furthermore, it is too complicated, as Lindblom emphasized this trait in considering Public policy as *muddling through6*. To get a better understanding of public policy, we ask: What is it? How does it work? One should go back to more familiar concepts such: state, governance, and the like.

- **Public Policy and Government/ State :(rise/fall, dominance/disappearance of state):**

Roughly speaking, the modern state was born in 1648, the date of the Westphalia Treaty signing. Etymologically, state is not government. In brief, the latter is the people who rule - it is a means - while the former

Public Policy:
"Concept Clarification, Genesis, Study, and Reflection on the Developing Countries such as Algeria"

Bouzourine Nadjoua

Introduction:

Public Policy is no doubt among the subjects; and fields; which currently recommend serious academic discussion and more communication not only in different institutions of higher education but even in mass media. Indeed, a lot has been said about it, but still not enough to give it the epithet of science. There is still a desperate need to settle the issues of: content, methodology, and objectives. Moreover, what makes the field vague and confusing is the terminology, and different connotations used to describe the concept of public policy and its levels such as: policymaking, implementation, evaluation and the like. For some scholars, "public policy", singular, or "public policies", plural is a science *per se*. For some others, it is the analysis which is supposed to be a science. It seems, then, stopping for a very long while to put some dots somewhere before going any farther is an inevitable and a necessary step. This paper hopes to clarify concept of public policy and tackle the genesis and evolution of public policy and its study, without forgetting to open a window for discussing the difficulties of studying public policies in developing countries such as Algeria.

1. Concept Clarification:

Most of the definitions stated [1]describing Public Policy are meant to emphasize the outcomes of the state actions. Among the contributors to settle the issue of public policy concept clarification was J. E. Anderson. He tried to simplify the concept through using three main variables: behavior, official actor or actors, and an area of public activity.

9

Public Policy:

"Concept Clarification, Genesis, Study, and Reflection on the Developing Countries such as Algeria"

Bouzourine Nadjoua

Faculty sciences policy's and relations internationals

University of Algiers -03-