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= Abstract =

근본적으로 합리성 개념은 사회학적인 측면에서 기술적, 경제적, 사회적, 법적, 그리고 정치적인 합리성으로 구분된다. 경제학적인 측면에서는 실체적 또는 종합적 합리성의 개념을 추가하고 있다. 정책선택의 저변에는 다양한 합리성의 기초가 자리잡고 있다. 본 연구는 정책선택의 기본적인 개념이 되는 합리성의 개념과 합리성과 정책의 연계성에 관해 설명하고자 한다.

Political rationality is the rationality of decision-making structures (Diesing, 1962, p. 170). Substantive rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of multiple forms of rationality—technical, economic, legal, social—in order to make the most appropriate choice under given circumstances (Dunn, 1994, p. 274).
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Public policy is a sort of rational response. It is that a complex pattern of interdependent collective choices, including decisions not to act, made by governmental bodies and officials (p. 85). This paper will try to explain the concept and role of these theories.

Conceptions of Political Rationality

Diesing defines that political rationality is the rationality of decision-making structures. Because politics is concerned with decision and how they are made. The three components appear in all decision structures: discussion relationships - talking and listening, asking questions and answering them; suggesting courses of action and accepting them; a set of beliefs and values, more or less held in common by participating members; the commitments already accepted by a group, and the courses of action in which it is already engaged (Diesing, 1962, pp. 172-176).

In addition, there several kinds of processes occur within decision-making structures. March and Simon have distinguished four of these, which they call problem solving, persuasion, bargaining, and "politics" (March and Simon, 1958, pp. 129-131).

In problem solving the participants assume that they share relevant goals and criteria; they work out a course of action through a joint examination of the problematic situation, assembling information, making predictions, giving and weighing suggestions, and continuing until everyone is satisfied with the result. Persuasion involves mainly the testing of disputed beliefs and values by reference to more general criteria shared by the participants. Emphasis is on the views of the persons involved rather than on the immediate problematic situation. In bargaining, the participants work out their own objectives and strategies privately before meeting together. Politics is a preparation for bargaining; participants assume that bargaining will eventually be necessary, and try to establish as strong a bargaining position as possible in advance.
In practice these four kinds of process are usually combined in various ways. Any decision-making structure must have two characteristics to exist at all. First, it must make possible the presentation of a plurality of facts, values, norms, and action alternatives: "differentiation." Second, it must possible a unified resolution with incorporates at least some of the presented material: "unification" (Parsons and Bales, 1955, Chap. 5). Both characteristics together are irreducible prerequisites for any decision, since together they constitute the meaning of "deciding." Therefore any structure that does not embody them both is not a decision structure.

Generally, ideological unity conflicts with ideological diversity, and centralized authority based on unequal power conflicts with widely dispersed equal authority based on dispersed and equal power. This means, in practice, that an increased unification usually decreases differentiation.

Technical decision, requiring goals given by higher authorities, are made at the lowest level; economic decisions, involving a co-ordination and comparison of the goals of different sections, are made at higher levels. Socioeconomic and integrative decisions are made at still higher levels, since these involve the modification of organization goals; and political decisions, involving the preservation and correction of the total structure, are made at the highest level (Parson, 1960, Chap. 2).

Political decisions made by a person in a central role of a decision structure are based on three principles or imperatives: maintain independence in the face of all pressure, act to so structure the group that pressures are moderate and balanced, and prepare for future pressures. The effect of adequate political decisions is to increase the functional rationality of the decision structure involved. Increase of rationality results especially from carrying out the second and third imperatives, which deal directly with the structuring of the group.

Political rationality is the fundamental kind of reason, because it deals with the preservation and improvement of decision structures, and decision structures are the source of all decisions. Unless a decision structure exists, no reasoning and no decisions are possible; and the more rational a decision structure is, the more rational are the decisions it produces.
Characteristic of Substantive Rationality

Dunn defined that substantive rationality is a characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their capacity to promote the most appropriate choice among two or more forms of rationality (Dunn, 1994, p. 330).

Moreover, substantive rationality refers to behavior "appropriate to the achievement of given goals within the limits imposed by given conditions and constraint" (Gould and Kolb, 1964, pp. 573–4). By this definition, the rationality of behavior depends upon the actor in only a single respect - his goals. Given these goals, the rationality behavior is determined entirely by the characteristics of the environment in which it takes place (Simon, 1976, pp. 130–131).

Suppose, for example, that the problem is to minimize the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet, where nutritional adequacy is defined in terms of lower bounds on intakes of certain proteins, vitamins, and minerals, and upper and lower bounds on calories, and where the unit prices and compositions of the obtainable foods are specified. Given the goal of minimizing cost and the definition of 'nutritionally adequate', there are no two ways about it - there is only one substantively rational solution.

Classical economic analysis rests on two fundamental assumptions. The first assumption is that the economic actor has a particular goal, for example, utility maximization or profit maximization. The second assumption is that the economic actor is substantively rational. According to the above concepts, substantive rationality is related to the cost-benefit analysis that allocating resources is to increase economic efficiency. Also the cost-benefit analysis allows the development of ratios of cost versus benefits.

In addition, cost-benefit analysis has, a means of measuring relative gains and losses resulting from alternative policy or programmatic options, been concerned with the public decisions of government officials. This analysis has been applied to many different kinds of public program and projects. The earliest applications of cost-benefit analysis were in area of dam construction and the provision of water resources, including efforts to
analyze the costs and benefits of hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation, and recreation. Other more recent applications include transportation, health, manpower training, and urban renewal.

Rational Responses of Political and Substantive Rationality

Public policy is a sort of rational response by governmental officials and decision-maker choose do or not to do. Government do many things: they regulate conflict with societies; they distribute a great variety of symbolic rewards and material services to members of the society; and they extract money from society, most often in the form of taxes. Thus, public policies may be regulative, organizational, distributive, or extractive — or all these things at once.

Public policies may deal with a wide variety of substantive areas—defense, foreign, affairs, education, welfare, police, highways, taxation, housing, social security, health, economic opportunity, urban development, inflation and recession, and so on (Dye, 1978). Public policy is developed by several steps of policy process (Jones, 1984, p. 29):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Activities</th>
<th>Categorized in Government</th>
<th>With a Potential Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception/Definition</td>
<td>Problem to Government</td>
<td>Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation</td>
<td>Action in Government</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget (Resource)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Government to Problems</td>
<td>Varies (Service, Payments, Facilities, Controls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Program to Government</td>
<td>Varies (Justification, Recommendation, Change, Solution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment/Termination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Charles Jones, Public Policy, 1984
Through the agenda-setting phase, certain problems come to be viewed as needing action, while others are postponed. Naturally, there is great deal of ebb and flow in what is considered most important.

Obviously, before policies are acted upon, they must get the attention of major decision makers. From among all the many and competing claims on their time and interests, decision-makers must select issues that will be given priority and those that will be filtered out. Through the combination of political rationality and substantive rationality, the public policy can make decision to act or not to act.

In the management sense, decision-makers can reach the rational public policy by the steps of policy process. A rational public policy is one that is correctly designed to maximize "net value achievement" (Haveman, 1970). A policy is rational when it is most efficiency - that is, if the ratio between the values it achieves and the values it sacrifices is positive and higher than any other policy alternative. Also the idea of efficiency involves the calculation of all social, political, and economic values sacrificed or achieved by a public policy.

Conclusions

This paper has tried to explain what political rationality, substantive rationality, and public policy are about. Political rationality offers the approach to decision-making structure. It suggest what is best decision-making structure for decision-maker. Substantive rationality suggests and scientific approach to decision-making by the cost-benefit analysis. It means that decision-makers should pass policies with highest net benefit ratio. At the result, the criteria of political rationality is establishing cost-benefit ratios in political terms. Decisions made and measured by even the most objective economic-quantitative criteria. Public policy offers the perspective approach to the rational decision-making.

Conclusively, political rationality, substantive rationality, and public policy are coexist in a conceptional way.
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