A Proposed Style to Rationalize Decision-Making in Public Policy Making in Gulf Cooperation Countries

Ahmed Mustafa Elhussein Mansour

Department of Political Science, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, United Arab Emirates University, United Arab Emirates

Abstract

The approach of this paper is both normative and analytical. The normative aspect intends to present one possible rational approach, i.e., Multigoal Analysis, to address the challenges posed by some types of public policy problems in the Gulf Cooperation Countries and to help provide manageable information on public policy problems to address uncertainty surrounding them. Many important public policy issue areas present considerable challenges to policymakers in the Gulf Cooperation Countries. The traditional economic tools such as cost-benefit analysis (CBO) and cost-effectiveness (CE), emphasize the criteria of efficiency and admit only quantitatively monetized criteria. Therefore they are not suitable for some ill-structured types of public problems encountered by the Gulf Cooperation Countries policymakers because they involve many criteria. Unlike the economic tools, the Multigoal approach integrates economic, social, political, administrative as well as other types of criteria that are important to policymakers in the Gulf Cooperation Countries. Unfortunately, at present policy advisors in the GCC in different areas of ill-structured problems are drawn from economists and business administration specialists who, by their very training, do not consider any criteria beyond efficiency and effectiveness. The analytical side of the paper seeks to review critically in public policy analysis the literature and to analyze the particular political context in the Gulf Cooperation Countries and the types of public problems it produces.

Keywords: multigoal analysis; policymakers; public policy; market failures; evaluation criteria; alternative policies, the GCC.

Introduction

This article is intended to promote rational thinking as an as an aid to policy making in not only Gulf Cooperation Countries but also all developing countries. Sometimes in most Gulf Cooperation Countries (GCC), public policies are made without considering the unintended side effects of these policies and their impact on other issue area on their societies. Hence, the major objective of this paper is not to analyze a specific public policy problem or problems in the GCC, but rather to present the tool of Multigoal Analysis to be used in analyzing public problems within the context of the professional policy analysis field. Public policy making is a complex enterprise in which the policymaker should integrate a bundle of sometimes contradictory goals and criteria with available policy alternatives that score differently in different criteria. Therefore, in many cases, the fusing of these policy goals into public policy decision-making is not an easy enterprise because it involves considerable painful tradeoffs between them.

In the first half of the 20th century and first decades of the 21st centuries, policy sciences have developed into a very mature field of inquiry and policy scientists, from different social sciences perspectives, create many disciplinary methods to analyze and address public problems and to design public policies and programs to deal with them (Kraft and Furlong 20018; Gruber, 2011; deDLeon and Vogenbeck, 2007; Torgeson, 2007; Wgner; 2007). Chief among these methods is the rational, or the so-called, positivist, policy analysis approach. Policy makers may use this approach to address public problems in areas such as health, environment, energy, the arms race, terrorism and many other areas. These are important public policy issue areas that present considerable challenges to modern policymakers, especially in the GCC. This paper presents one possible rational approach to address these policy issue areas using public policy analysis and design: The Multigoal approach.

Unlike the purely economic policy analysis techniques such as cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness, which admits only quantitatively monetized criteria with only the goal of efficiency as an overriding concern of the

policy maker, the Multigoal Analysis approach integrates different criteria and facilitates the evaluation of different alternative policies against them. Therefore, it is a comprehensive approach to analyzing public problems, designing feasible alternative policies to solve them, establishing measurable criteria to compare them and using decision rules to choose the alternative that scores highest in all criteria.

Alternative policies may include market solutions, or government solutions or solutions generated from different innovative smart practices or other successful experiments worldwide. Following the rational choice tradition (i.e., applied political economy), this paper utilizes the diagnosing of public problems in term of situations of market failure or government failure or both and explores the kind of criteria that may be used to evaluate policy alternatives. Because of the GCC's integration into the globalized market system and their consequent adoption of economic neoliberalism concepts, they adopt market solutions to some of their public problems, such as macro and micro privatization, outsourcing and public-private partnerships,

A question may arise here: Why the Multigoal Analysis which is derived from the rationalistic model? The answer is that most models and theories in the field of public policy studies, except the rationalist model, fall short of providing helpful advice and recommendations to policymakers in GCC. This failure may be made clearer by examining the evolution of public policy analysis and policy design in details. Thus the paper consists of six sections with the introduction. The first section discusses the methodology and sources of data. The second section provides an overview of the literature on public policy studies and policy analysis. The third section examines descriptive and normative models in public policy; the fourth section discusses comparatively the context of public policy in the GCC by highlighting similarities and difference among them. The fifth sections discuss the Multigoal Analysis within the context of the rational model and the nature of ill-structured types of public policy problems in the GCC Finally; a conclusion analyzes and addresses in detail the question of whether the GCC countries can or cannot benefit from the Multigoal Analysis Tool? Specifically, the conclusion raises and tries to answer two questions.: Do the GCC need the rational Multigoal Analysis? Do they have the institutional capabilities and professional skills to perform it?

Methodology and Data

The Paper uses a qualitative approach utilizing the case study methodology. As the qualitative approach is useful in highlighting important trends in thought and opinions, it permits us to achieve depth into the research question at hand. Analytically, the paper facilitates a modified version of the elite model to analyze public policy making in the GCC and advise the adoption of the Multigoal analyses for use in the GCC public policymaking. Traditional methods of collecting data in the qualitative methodology include data collection tools such as unstructured or semi-structured face to face interviews as well as participant observation and focus groups. However, many of these data collection methods are not feasible in this study due to some political factors, time, and the wide scope of the study and limited resources. Therefore, the paper depends mainly on the author's observation, who lives and teach in some GCC universities for fifteen years. It also utilizes secondary sources such as government and international organizations reports as well as other secondary sources of data such as books and published articles.

Literature Review and The Theoretical Model

Public policy studies and analysis is one of the most recent rapidly flourishing fields of inquiry in social sciences that captures simultaneously the interests of policymakers, professional administrators, and academics. Accordingly, in its 1974 Guidelines for "Professional Master Programs in Public Affairs/Public Administration, the American National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPA), acknowledged policy analysis as one of the subject matters for training public managers (Beckman, 1977). The discipline is deeply rooted in western culture, and the theories of politics are originating in the early contributions of Greek philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle who attempted to comprehend human behavior in a political context and its role in making decisions. Other early western philosophers who had their footprints in the discipline include Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Adam Smith and many others (Birkland, 2011). Using different perspectives, these philosophers, apart from

planting the seeds of modern social sciences, attempted to advise on the proper role of government. The relationship between social science and the need to use knowledge derived from that place dates to the emergence of these sciences and the concurrent needs of empirical knowledge by the states and other organizations to understand social behavior (Wagner, 2007).

While the study of politics dates to the writings of these early philosophers, the history of modern public policy studies and analysis is a recent phenomenon and may be traceable back to the writings of the political scientist Charles Merriam in 1922. Merriam "sought to connect the theories and practice of politics to understanding the actual activities of government" (Birkland, 2011, 7). Robert Dahl and Richard Lindblom urged scholars in 1953 to focus on the study of public policy instead of the traditional focus on ideologies and institutions as the most important aspects of the political system. Many historians of the discipline of public policy trace its origin back to the intellectual developments during the latter years of the 19th century when there were mounting concerns about using rational scientific methods to facilitate the improvement of social conditions. During this era, John Dewey who supported the establishment of a practically oriented social science has a significant influence on the later development of the discipline (Heinemann et al. 2002).

However, the modern roots of the discipline originated in political science departments with Harold Lasswell's call for the establishment of policy sciences. The new proposed science should focus on "policy" to assist policymakers (Lasswell, 2011; Deleon, 2008; Deleon &Vogenbeck, 2007; Torgersen, 2007; Wagner, 2007; Lerner, D, Lasswell, H., 1951). The original Lasswell's idea hopes to integrate all the social sciences, and in some cases physical sciences, to reorient themselves in a unified whole to provide useful information to policymakers. In fact, his proposed policy science conceives a consequential role to enhance democracy and assist in the enlightenment of the public in the face of the mounting impact of the beguiling propaganda. He also called for the professionalization of the role of the policy analyst (Torgersen, 2007; Deleon and Vogenbeck. 2007) thereby paving the way for the establishment of modern policy analysis.

It was not just a mere coincidence that the policy sciences flourished in the post-war era, dominated by the ethos of the Keynesian economic revolution. Unlike the classical economic thought prevalent before the second world war, widened the scope of public policy in society and highlighted the need for aids to help the state in its new interventionist role (Elhussein, 2002). Therefore, it is logical to argue that the policy analysis field flourished in post-war II, in the form of Keynesian economics, to assist in the new job of using public policy to solve the problems of post-war economic problems. Hence Keynes recommends the use of fiscal and monetary policies to address the problems of post War II economic depression. In the developing countries, early in the 1970s, Ilchman and Uphoff (1971), and Uphoff and Ilchman (1972) highlights the failure of the traditional political and economic disciplines to help the emergent leaders of the then newly independent states to provide practical advice their political leaders regarding the post-independence difficult problems facing them. Hence they call for the integration of politics and economics in one political economy approach geared to provide practical advice to the new leaders. However, this project as ambitious as Lasswell's original scheme. Although their scheme is very important and they provide a good framework for their political economy approach, political scientists ignore this scheme and fail to develop it further.

Lasswell's original idea opts to fuse all social sciences into his proposed policy sciences scheme by removing the borders separating them. Nevertheless, the field develops into two main streams: an approach with a focus on policy in different social sciences and a field in itself (i.e., normative policy analysis) (Elhussein, 1989). Whereas the first stream is labeled "policy studies," the second stream stands out as a new discipline under the name of "policy analysis. Whereas the former utilizes the descriptive-analytical traditional and new models of political science, the later adopts a rational normative, prescriptive approach. The policy study stream is seen now in the incorporation of a policy focus into the traditional social sciences by adding courses on public policy to their traditional disciplinary curricula. Whereas the former catches the eyes of political scientists and concentrates on the political and policy process aspects of public policy, the later develops multidisciplinary perspectives and attracts some political scientist, economists and operation research specialists who facilitate the techniques of these disciplines to help in policy analysis and design.

The public policy studies stream usually study the policy process and the roles of official and unofficial actors such as interest groups in the democratic process. Policy analysis, on the other hand, uses the tools of applied political science, welfare economics and operation research techniques to analyze public problems and provide practical solutions for them. This fact should not imply the existence of total harmony within the two existing streams. For example, Sabatier (1995), who belongs to the policy study stream, divided policy research by political scientist into four types depending on the main focus of the study. These include (1) substantive area research, (2) Evaluation and impact studies, (3) policy process, and (4) policy design. Substantive policy research concentrates on case studies relating to the politics of a single policy issue area such education, healthcare, transportation, and foreign policy. Most of the studies in the substantive approach are not designed to build theories around their subject areas and therefore shun off as atheoretical (Sabatier, 1995).

Welfare economist is essential contributors to the second type of evaluation and impact studies. They usually emphasize certain economic criteria such as social welfare function and efficiency. A political scientist who contribute to this type succeed to include more political criteria such public participation, and distributional effects of policy. They also effectively criticized the traditional economic techniques utilized in evaluation research such as cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness. They also manage to fuse evaluation research into the policy process highlighting the use or nonuse of policy analysis by policymakers (Sabatier, 1995). The third type of the policy process advises political scientists to concentrate on the processes of policy formulation and implementation. They argue that emphasis on the policy process will enable researchers to apply and integrate the discipline accumulated knowledge about human behavior in institutions to develop theories of the policy process. The fourth type of policy design has its roots in Lasswell's policy sciences and is concerned with designing policies and the efficacy of different policy tools (Sabatier, 1995).

It is noticeable that whereas the first and the third types belong to what we call now the policy study approach, the second and the fourth types fit into policy analysis as a field in itself. Sabatier argues that despite the contribution of the four types to policy research, the "third has been the most fruitful" (Sabatier, 1995, 11). However, and despite the undeniable fruits of the third approach, but the approach fails to deliver these fruits in term of providing helpful hands to policymakers in developing or developed countries. At present, one can group all models used in public policy into two groups: descriptive and normative models.

Descriptive and Normative Models of Public Policy

It is safe to argue from the outset that most models and theories of public policy processes (the political stream) are not specifically geared towards providing practical advice to public-policy making in developing countries in general. This is because these models are founded on certain cultural and political assumptions that are not present in most developing countries including the GCC. Therefore, they possess, at best, limited utility in explaining public policy processes and national policy styles in developing countries and the GCC (Cairney and Heikkila, 2014). In many instances, these models do not fit neatly and comfortably within the boundaries of our categorizations of policy studies into the political stream and policy analysis because each category may involve different implicit or explicit normative and or theoretical traits. However, at present it may be useful to categorize public policy models in term of their purposes, forms of expression, methodologies, and models into two models: descriptive and normative models. The two models encompass most political models used in public policy studies.

Descriptive Models

Descriptive models usually attempt to explain and predict the causes and the outcomes of public policy using sometimes sophisticated inferential and descriptive statistical techniques. Descriptive models contain all the traditional models of policy studies in political science. These traditional models fall roughly into two main categories: traditional political explanatory models and the modern political explanatory models. Most of the former emerged before the emergence of public policy studies. The traditional political explanatory model may be further be subdivided into two subcategories (1) models of how policy is made and (2) models of who makes policies and who benefits from them (Theodoulou and Cahn, 1995). Whereas the former subcategory, according

to (Theodoulou and Cahn, 1995; Dye, 2013; Kraft and Furlong, 2015) includes models such as system theory, structural functionalism or institutionalism, and policy cycle approaches, the latter include elite models and group theory (Theodoulou and Cahn, 1995). However, these models do not exhaust the list of the traditional models used by political scientists to analyze public policy processes (see, for example, Moran, Rein and Goodin, 2006 and Fischer; Miller, and Sidney, 2007).

The second subcategory of who makes policies and benefit from them includes the group model, the elite model, corporatism, and sub-governments (Theodoulou and Cahn,1995). We may add to this group Paul Sabatier's Advocacy Coalition Framework because it is closely related to the model of sub-governments and the concept of the iron triangle in the USA. However, and except for the elite models, all the others are culturally-biased towards and emerged from the USA political context. The group model, though it assumes the presence of active interest groups, may have limited validity in illuminating the national style of policy-making of many GCC and especially the role of ethnic groups therein. Being uninterested in policy processes in developing countries, western public policy studies fail to develop models that may help to analyze the policy-making processes of these countries. To be useful, such models must take into consideration the features common to all GCC, the role of tribes and patron-client relationships characterizing the current elite-masses relationships, the cultural traits, and the nature of political systems, which with few exceptions, belong to different types of monarchical rule.

By contrast, the modern political explanatory category contains more sophisticated modern models of the policy process. They include incrementalism (Lindblom, 1959, 1992), advocacy coalition framework (ACF) (Sabatier and Weible, 2014), Multiple Stream Approach (MSA) (Kingdon, 1995), punctuated equilibrium (Baumgartner and Jones, 2009), institutional analysis and development(Ostrom, Cox, and Schlager, 2014), policy feedback theory (Mettler, and SoRelle, 2014), social constructionist theory (Schneider, Ingram and DeLeon, 2014), the narrative policy framework (McBeth, Jones and Shananhan , 2014), innovation and diffusion models in policy research (Bery and Bery, 2014; Kraft and Furlong, 2018). It is worth noting here that the two models of politically explanatory models are not completely antithetical to rationalistic approaches (or policy analysis as a field in itself) and may be used by adherents to rationalistic (normative) models involved in practical policy analysis and design. For example, by incrementally modifying existing policies, new policy alternatives may emerge. Moreover, Bery and Bery diffusion models model may explain the drive of the GCC to emulate innovative, successful experiments from western and non-western countries. All GCC are involved in one way or another in importing successful innovative policies from each other and other western countries

The aforementioned current models of public policy are not frequently used to explain and describe different styles of policymaking in the developing countries and GCC. Except for the institutional analysis and development models, based on the concept of utility-maximizing of human nature that underpins all political actors' behavior irrespective of the type of political systems, may provide some insight into the public problems of the developing countries and the GCC. For example, Khodr (2014) comparative study on Kuwait and Qatar, in which she has utilized Baumgartner and Jones' punctuated equilibrium as well as Bery and Bery's diffusion model, is one of the few exceptions in the study of public processes in the GCC. This is because all models in this category are associated with the USA pluralist political system and other similar systems in the EU countries. They all assume the existence and the active involvement of different official and unofficial political actors (i.e., interest groups) in the policymaking processes. As such they are of limited utility in the socio-political context of the GCC where, in most cases, active participation in the policy process is limited to the top political elites.

However, this conclusion does not rule out altogether the roles played by individual citizens, ethnic groups, and the modern media in the GCC. For example, in the United Arab Emirates, and all the GCC for that matter, domestic violence, and child abuse incidents had not been seen as constituting criminal activities, but their publication by the media has led to the adoption of the Child Protection Law in the UAE and similar laws in other GCC. Moreover, and as a result of the integration of almost all the GCC in the globalized international system, the political regime became more sensitive and responsive to pressures from international interest groups and NGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. The pressure of these international groups,

among others, forced many Gulf countries to observe, sometimes symbolically, the question of human rights and the environment. For example, the recent Saudi government policy to permit women to drive cars resulted to some extent from internal pressures embolden by the pressure of international human rights groups. Similar policies of women empowerment had preceded the Saudi venture in this respect. Women empowerment policies abundant in the UAE, Qatar, Oman, and Kuwait.

Normative Models

By contrast, the normative models (sometimes labeled positivist or rationalistic models) are not only interested in explaining and predicting the outcomes of public policies but also to provide practical advice and options to policymakers (Dunn, 2004). The users of this model claim that they employ what they call the rationalistic model (Weimer and Vining, 1999). Even within this model different approaches coexist together. The rational model itself is not one version. There are the economic models which are derived from welfare and microeconomics (Gruber, 2011; Friedman, 2002; Levy, 1995; Stokey, and Zeckhauser, 1978). Others models base themselves on the rational choice version of public finance (Cullis and Jones, 1998). Still, others utilize a political economy approach (Gupta, 2001; Bickers and Williams, 2001; Weimer and Vining, 1999; Hogwood and Gunn,1990). Despite these differences, all of them perform policy analysis within a general framework that start by defining the public problem, identify and describe the most important stakeholders, analyze the problem at hand, select relevant evaluation criteria, choose relevant alternative policies that may solve the problem and use decision choice tools to select the best policy option that scores high in different evaluation criteria. With the help of foreign experts, mostly Americans and Europeans, the rational model logic has proliferated in many problem areas in the GCC, especially in the UAE and Qatar. These areas include budgeting reform efforts, financial management, and labor issues.

 Generally, the methods of decision making and tools of collecting data, some of them are shared also by the descriptive approach, especially the methods of collecting data, include survey research, Delphi, nominal group technique, scenario writing, simulation, technology assessments, cost-benefit analysis, decision analysis and many others (Bingham and Ethridge, 1982). Our review of the descriptive and rational models should not imply the two approaches are autonomously antithetical models because the users of the normative models may utilize the descriptive models to identify important variable in building their model of the problem and predict the future impact of policies on the problem (Dye, 2013). Likewise, descriptive models may at times, produce useful information and practical recommendations to policymakers as byproducts of their analysis. For example, the Multigoal Analysis belongs to the normative models, but it uses the predictive capacities of the descriptive models to evaluate different criteria.

The Context of Public Policy in the Gulf Cooperation Council

The GCC includes the United Arab Emirates, Sultanate of Oman, the Kingdom of Bahrain, the State of Qatar and the State of Kuwait. The reasons that make us choose these countries as possible targets for the use of rationality in general and the rationalistic Goal/Matrix tool in policy-making, in particular, are several. First, these countries have systems of rules that are similar in their elite-base legitimacy. This legitimacy depended on some tribal legacy (patron-client relationships) which evolved into modern elite-masses relationships partially knit together by the old traditional norms and values. Nevertheless, at present, the composition of this elite exhibit similarities as well as differences. For example, the elite status in Saudi Arabia brings together the traditional religious clergy, modern-educated groups as well as the tribal leaders; the latter is presently highly educated and reign supreme over both the modern non-royal educated elite and the religious clergy. The ascendancy of the present crown prince to power is expected to weaken the grip of the religious clergy, which used to dictate social behavior and enhance the role of modernly educated elites. The recent decisions to permit women to drive cars together with promoting modern entertainments tourist facilities, matters that the clergy ruled in the recent past as religious taboos (*haram*), are a stark indication of this trend.

By contrast, the political tribally-based political elite in the UAE and Qatar are highly educated and use non-royal educated skilled local elites and international expats to help in their incessant drives for modernization

and economic development. However, in Qatar, the tribally-based elite (emir) associates himself with the international Muslim Brotherhood and other extremist Muslims organizations. This position differentiates him from the Saudi, Bahrain, and the UAE development-oriented moderate elites and has led to the current crises between Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and the UAE on the one hand and Qatar on the other. The three countries, supported by Egypt, accused Qatar of using their enemies, the Islamite organizations and the belligerent citizens from the four states, to destabilize their regimes. Kuwait and Oman, with similar elite composition, have adopted a neutral stand with Kuwait playing the role of the mediator in the crises. The crises, if not solved, threaten the very existence of the GCC. The elite composition in Kuwait is not different from that of the other GCC. The development orientation of the GCC elite, though varied, is one consideration in proposing the use of the rational multigoal tools in policy making.

The similarity of the composition of the GCC ruling elites hides substantial differences in their formal political systems and their political organizations. This similarity has misled scholars of comparative politics and the now-defunct comparative public administration to classify the GCC political systems into the groups of "Traditional Autocratic" (Heady, 1984; Sharkansky, 1978), or "Personal Rule", "Dictatorial Monarchies", (Caramani, 2008;) and "Sultanism" (Linz, 1975). These categorizations ignore the differences between the GCC political systems as well as masks the deep transformations undergone by them.

Whereas Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Oman are unitary states, the UAE adopted a federal system of government. However, differences do not stop here. Saudi Arabia and Bahrain are kingdoms with the latter having an elected advisory council and face mounting demands for turning the monarchy into a constitutional one. Qatar and the UAE present themselves officially as "states" rather than monarchies. Both held partial elections to choose representatives for their national councils. Kuwait, though effectively ruled by the Emir, holds regular genuine competitive elections to choose representatives for the Nation Council whose Islamist elected members cause real headaches to government ministers appointed by the Emir and usually headed by a senior member of the royal family. Oman is ruled by the Sultan aided by educated elites and an elected advisory council (Khodr. 2014; Mansour. 2016, 2015, 2010. 2008)

Second, these countries exhibit differential homogeneity in term of their population and economic resources and indicators. Table 1 below compares the GCC countries in term of basic indicators. As the table shows, all the GCC rely heavily on oil exports. Together they possess about 40% of the world oil reserves; a fact that gives them a staunch power in the international political economy through their strong status in the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) (Balaam and Veseth, 2005). However, they differ in term of their oil-derived wealth. As table 1 illustrates Bahrain and Oman are the poorest in oil reserves while Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar (the later is the second exporter of gas after Russia). Their nominal GDP and per Capita GDP income locate the UAE, Qatar, Kuwait in the top layer of the wealthiest countries in the whole world; a fact that reflects the small size of their population. In term of population size, the KSA and the UAE occupy the first and second ranks. The most underpopulated among the GCC are Bahrain, Qatar, Oman, and Kuwait.

The oil wealth and the drive for economic development, in the face of small-size population and the unavailability of skilled and unskilled labor, attract millions of expats from the five continents to the GCC. Except for Saudi Arabia, this situation renders the indigenous national (local) population a minority in their country and creates problems of population imbalance (Mansour, 2016). The table also unveils the dependence of the GCC governments on oil, in slightly varying degrees, for their direct revenues. This situation, coupled with the rising defense expenses and the fluctuating oil prices in the international market, alerted the GCC to the dangers of depending on oil exports and they started to adopt policies of diversification of their economic resources by promoting the tourism industry among others (Mansour, 2016). It is because of this that they started to adopt rational, comprehensive planning and strategies especially after the year 2000. For example, the UAE, Qatar, and, as of late, Suadi Arabia have adopted very ambitious macro rational planning strategies. The UAE and Qatar have embarked on very serious reforms of their administrative systems along modern concepts of new public management (NPM), new governance and micro rational techniques (Mansour, 2015). This factor, among others,

is what propels this paper to recommend the Multigoal Analysis techniques as one possible tool to be employed in their public policies making.

Table 1 GCC Economic Snapshot – the key numbers

2016	UAE	KSA	Oman	Kuwait	Qatar	Bahrain	GCC
Population Total (Millions)	10.37	32.13	4.26	4.34	2.58	1.40	55.9
Population Local (Millions)	1.55	21.47	2.34	1.43	0.25	0,65	28.25
Expat (Millions)	8.81	10.71	1.92	2.91	2.34	0.76	26.83
Nominal GDP (US$ Billion)	366.00	640.18	68.20	112.72	171.23	31.90	1390.23
Per Capita GDP (US$ Thousand)	35.98	19.64	13.65	28.91	66.27	22.73	25.38
Nom GDP from Oil Sector (% share)	19.43	25.08	25.37	40.21	33.62	31.10	26.18
Export from Oil Sector (% Share)	18.11	70.79	47.70	89.68	81.30	49.69	57.96
Direct Gov. Revenue from Oil Sector (% Share)	46.03	86.01	68.30	57.76	35.22	66.80	64.40
Net Foreign Assets 2016 ($ Billion)	795.21	1.007.18	26.33	444.66	211.31	23.76	2.508.45

Adapted from NBAD Market Insights & Strategy | NBAD Global Markets 2017.

The Rationalist Model and the Multigoal Analysis Tool

The rationalist model falls into two sub-categories: the macro and the micro levels. Whereas the former, rooted in development and macroeconomics economics theories and reflect comprehensive national long-term and medium-term economic planning as practiced in the five-year economic plans in developing countries during the two UN development decades, the latter is rooted in welfare economics and public or rational choice theory. Public choice theory is a highly sophisticated, theory that sprawled from a specific view of human nature as guided by self-interest or utility maximization, and usually employ elaborates mathematical modeling and adopts deep anti-government expansive roles. The micro model has been extensively applied to the analysis of different types of policies and political issues such as voting behavior (Ostrom, 1998 and 2014; Schneider and Ingram, 1997; Downs,1985; Niskanen, 1971). The Multigoal Analysis belongs to the micro rational model because it is utilized to analyze and find solutions to a single public policy problem.

The fundamental underpinning assumption shared by both subcategories, the macro, and micro rationalistic models, is that there are clearly defined and agreed upon policy goals. This assumption may be relatively easy to articulate at small organizational contexts but is rarely satisfied in politically open systems especially at national level policy settings where controversy on goals between different interest groups, elected officials and bureaucracy abound. As such the model presupposes the existence of a centralized dictatorial governmental system where a central ruler or a political body has a monopoly over all social groups and can dictate societal goals and policy agenda. The previous Soviet system approximated this situation lending support to Aron

Wildavsky (1978, 1979, 1980) vehement argument that the rational model is not conceivable as a tool of public policy in pluralist open systems because it requires the centralization of political power. It is for this reason that the macro rational model applies to the GCC. The elitist nature and the relatively centralized decision-making processes of the GCC systems of government may represent fertile lands for macro rational experiments but not necessary for their successful implementation. For example, the Qatari, Saudi, and the UAE federal government, as well as the Emirates of Abu Dhabi and Dubai, have developed long terms strategic rational plans covering the periods until 2020 and 2030 respectively.

The guiding principle of the micro rational model is that rational policies are plans and policies that achieve maximum social gain. Maximum social gain is measured in term of the ratio between policy cost and benefits. The micro rational model, based on microeconomics and public choice theory, is concerned more with domestic single policy problem issues and the achievement of social maximum benefits to society. It tends to concentrate on market operations as more efficient than government policy and considers the intervention of government by public policy as justifiable only in cases of market failures (public goods, information asymmetry, externalities, and monopoly). In its pure economic form, it emphasizes "efficiency" as the sole criteria to select the best policy. Therefore, cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and microeconomics tools occupy central positions in its analysis (Freedman, 2002; Levy, 1995). For example, guided by foreign experts, the UAE government introduced in 2001 the techniques of rational budgeting by introducing zero-based budgeting despite the fact that the budgetary styles of decision-making in the federal government did not change significantly from the previous methods of incremental allocations (Mansour, 2010).

The major criticism of this version of the rational approach is that it ignores unquantifiable and noneconomic factors in policymaking. Several scholars try to address this problem by developing political, economic approaches to include other noneconomic criteria such as political feasibility and equity (Hausman et al., 2017; Bardach, 2005; Weimer and Vining, 1999). For example, Weimer and Vining (1999) develop the Multigoal Analysis approach to admit non-economic criteria besides efficiency. Bardach (2005) build and eightfold-steps approach to broaden the scope of evaluation criteria to be considered in policymaking. Hausman et al. (2017) emphasize the role of ethics, justice, liberty, and equality.

Encouraged by foreign experts and the departure from state-led development to free market economy dictated by neoliberalism and globalization, the UAE government has just started to utilize this micro rational model in policymaking. For example, Abu Dhabi Executive Council adopts a manual for public policy to be utilized by policy makers, public administrators and Dubai adopt similar far-reaching ventures. The most evident impacts of this approach in the GCC consist of extensive privatization schemes, the use of market-oriented solutions to influence citizens' behavior to rationalize the use of government services, such as health services, parking lots, and street congestion and many other similar services previously provided for free and led to costly abuses in the past. The elitist-business-technocratic national policy style, rooted in tribal legacy, provides fertile grounds for adopting both versions of the rational model. The is largely because major policy changes associated with overt political strife in pluralist democracies is inadmissible and mitigated by the ruler-ruled (patron-client) smooth and trustful relationship.

The Nature of Public Problems in the GCC: Why the Rational Multigoal Analysis-Model?

Because all the GCC are integrated into the global economy, therefore they adopt its economic side of its neoliberalism creed: the free market economy. They all have some free market economy though they differ in the degree of the efficiency and the freedom of that market. Hence it is pertinent to discuss in this section the nature of public problems in the GCC as a prelude to our recommendation of the rational approach as exemplified by the Multigoal Analysis tool. Since the Multigoal Analysis tool is derived from the new political economy of the rational choice theory and welfare economics, it is pertinent to use their tools for diagnosing and studying the nature of public problems the GCC encounter. Economists generally consider the free market as more efficient in allocating society sources than the government. Therefore they justify the intervention of government by public policies in the free operation of market forces (supply and demand) in certain cases in

which the free market fails to allocate resources efficiently. These cases are summed up under the general term "market failure." These instances of market failure include the provision of public goods, positive and negative externalities, information asymmetry, and monopoly.

Public goods may be classified as pure and quasi-public goods. Pure public goods are indivisible and non-excludable and therefore once provided for one user are provided for everyone. Hence they give rise to the problem of the "free rider" which prevents the market from providing them efficiently (Birkland, 2005). In the GCC these goods belong to the traditional functions of government and include internal security, national defense, fighting terrorism, and air pollution and many others. The tensions with Iran and the Arab Spring make the first three incendiary issues critical for the policymakers in the GCC. The second category of quasi- public-goods have some of the characteristics of private goods, and therefore can be provided by the private sector. Because of the positive externality involved in some of these goods and services such as education and therefore if left to the private sector they will be provided in quantities less than society needs. The GCC governments provide them in plentiful amounts to maintain the patron-client relationships underlying their political legitimacy and to produce efficient national workforce. This category includes the following sectors: social services, infrastructure, and management of economic affairs. The two categories of public goods are not completely independent and exclusive because within each category the two types of goods are produced. Qatar and the UAE, compared to other GCC, are remarkable for the provision of these services.

Externality problems abound in the GCC. They are considered among the most polluters in the World. This fact is an outcome of their lavish lifestyles, which depend on their high average of consumption of oil in automobiles and air conditioning, high use of electronic home devices and the production and excessive consumption of electricity. Local externality problems include high speed in highway roads resulting in high levels of accidents. Information asymmetry, which means imperfect information for consumers, bring many problems to the GCC. Being very rich with an open market, they suffer mainly from commercial cheating in many imported and local mercantile activities. Monopoly problems are not very salient in the open markets of the GCC because sometimes the government itself create monopolies to benefit persons closely allied to the political elite. The political system encourages rent seeking.

To show the relative complexity of these problems we use William Dunn (2004) classification of public problems. Dunn provides a general classification of the incidence of market failure from within the tradition of policy analysis to explore the level of their complexity "that is the degree to which this problem is an interdependent system of problems" (Dunn, 2004, 79). He classifies public problems in three categories: well structured, moderately structured, and ill-structured. He differentiates between these three classes using four elements: decision makers, alternatives, utilities (values), outcomes, and probabilities. Whereas decision making in well-structured and moderately structured problems involves one or few decision makers, ill-structured problems involve many decision makers. There are limited sets of alternative and consensus about values in the first two which makes possible the ranking of their goals in term of priorities. Whereas, the outcomes of each alternative in well-structured problems are certain or risky and allows calculation of the level of risk, the outcomes of policy alternatives in moderately structured problems are uncertain. Probabilities of outcomes in well-structured problems are calculable, by contrast, they are not amenable to calculation in moderately structured problems. Examples of well-structured problems and moderately structured problems include simple problems of maintenance in government institutions and negotiating deals in OPEC about the share of each GCC country which often involves the so-called game of the 'Prisoners' dilemma".

By contrast, the ill-structured problems are way different from the first two set of problems. The number of decision makers involved in these problems is many, and there are unlimited potential alternatives to solve them. There is conflict about the goal of policymakers, and their outcomes are unknown. Consequently, it is very difficult to calculate the probability of the possible outcomes of the policy alternatives. The author of this paper adds two more elements to differentiate between these classes of policies to build table 2 below. These elements, (which are compiled with Dunn classification, to build table 2 below), include the nature of the

problem, possible decision-making tools, and stakeholders. Whereas the well-structured and moderately structured problems are technical and partly technical, the ill-structured problems are messy and fuzzy.

The messiness of ill-structured problems arises from the number of stakeholders involved. Whereas stakeholders are very few in well-structured problems and relatively few in moderately structured, they are many and often involve local and international stakeholders. The nature of well-structured problems allows for the use of certain decision tools such as operation research and operation research tools together with economic tools such as CBA. The technical nature of well-structured and to some extent the moderately structured fits into Bohrs and Bartlett's (1993) category of what they term "analycentric problems" in which efficiency is the sole criteria. The complexity of ill-structured problems made them solvable only by political means and policy analysis tools. This is why that Dunn concludes that all policy problems addressed by policy analysts fall within this group.

Ill-structured problems encountered by the GCC include among other things the problems of national security, drug abuse and related crimes, human and drug trafficking, infrastructure, education, healthcare, immigration, pollution, terrorism and many others. These problems cannot be addressed by traditional single-criteria economic and operational research methods. This is because the solutions to these problems require the admission of multiple criteria because their impacts traverse the borders of the problems to affect other public policy issue areas. One of the tools that may prove helpful in these messy problems is the Multigoal Analysis admitting multiple criteria to which we move now to discuss.

Table 2 *Classification of Public Problems*

Type of policy ⟋ Elements	Well-Structured (Maintenance)	Moderately-Structured (OPEC Negotiations)	Ill-Structured (Terrorism)
Nature of the problem	Technical	Partly Technical	Messy-Fuzzy
Decision-Makers	One or Few	One or Few	Many
Decision Tools	Operation Research	Limited	Politics and Policy Analysis
Stakeholders	Very Few	Few	Many
Alternative Policies	Limited	Limited	Unlimited
Utilities (values)	Consensus	Consensus	Conflict
Outcomes	Certain and Risky	Uncertain	Unknown
Probabilities	Calculable	Incalculable	Incalculable

The Multigoal Analysis and the Ill-Structured Public Policy Problems

It is our contention in this paper that the Multigoal Analysis tool, though not the only one, presents a feasible tool to deal with complex ill-structured problems. The most evident impacts of using rational models of public policy making in the GCC is evident in the extensive privatization schemes, the use of market-oriented solutions to influence citizens' behavior to rationalize the use of government services, such as health services, parking lots, and street congestion and many other similar services previously provided for free and led to costly abuses in the past. These ventures have created a good milieu that encourages us to recommend the use of the

Multigoal Analysis tool for the GCC policy-makers. The Multigoal Analysis approach goes under many labels though underpinning the same rationale. These include Policy-Goal, Multigoal Analysis, Multi-Attributes, Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA. For example, Huey-Tsyh Chen and Peter H. Rossi (1980) label it as" Multigoal Analysis approach," and Irwin (2003) describes it as the "Multi-Attributes" approach. It is not confined to traditional functions of government, but it is used to analyze Ill-Structured problems in other technical areas such engineering, medicine, and agriculture. For example, Mendoza and Martins (2006, 1), applies it to forest resource management. They argue that the …

Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is an umbrella approach that has been applied to a wide range of natural resource management situations. This paper has two purposes. First, it aims to provide a critical review of MCDA methods applied to forest and other natural resource management. The review seeks to lay out the nature of the models, their inherent strengths, and limitations. Models are categorized based on different classification schemes and are reviewed by describing their general characteristics, approaches, and fundamental properties. The review goes beyond traditional MCDA techniques; it describes new modeling approaches to forest management. The second purpose is to describe new MCDA paradigms aimed at addressing the inherent complexity of managing forest ecosystems, particularly concerning multiple criteria, multi-stakeholders, and lack of information. Comments about, and critical analysis of, the limitations of traditional models are made to point out the need for, and propose a call to, a new way of thinking about MCDA as they are applied to forest and natural resource management planning. These new perspectives do not undermine the value of traditional methods; rather they point to a shift in emphasis—from methods for problem-solving to methods for problem structuring.

Weimer and Vining (1999) develop the most articulate scheme of Multigoal Analysis tool for analyzing, diagnosing, framing, and developing solutions for public problems in government settings. The two authors categorize the process of dealing with public problems into two main interrelated activities: problem analysis and solution analysis. In the problem analysis part, the analysis contextualizes the problem by understanding the problem through performing certain activities such as assessing the problem symptoms, framing the problem in term of market or government failures, and developing a model to identify the salient variables that are related to the problem. The analyst also explains in this part the relevant goals and constraints and select a solution method. The Multigoal analysis must be his choice when other tools are not applicable.

To contextualize the problem, the analysts need the tools of policy studies and political science and other social sciences to develop a model of the problem showing the most important variables that should be targeted by the public policy. However, the most important step in this activity is the definition of the problem because it affects all other activities in the analysis. This is so because the definition of the problem usually suggests certain possible courses of action. One error the policy analysis wants to avoid in this regard is mistaking the symptoms of the problem for its real causes, therefore targeting the wrong problem (Dunn, 2004). This may happen because of stakeholders and clients (the government officials who commissioned the study (i.e., presidents, ministers, and other government officials and policymakers) usually describe the problem in term of some symptoms which they consider undesirable.

Moreover, some types of *rhetorical* information accompany almost all public problems, and these usually emanate from the stakeholders and clients' political environments and newspapers articles. Therefore, policy analysts must deal cautiously with these rhetorical beliefs because they usually involve the interests and subjective views of the stakeholders. Of course, the analyst is not recommended to discard them altogether but only to filter them thoroughly because they may help to arrive at a reasonable definition that objectively reflects the interest of all or at least the majority of the stakeholders. Bardach (2005) suggests that in defining problems, we may use what he called "deficit and access" methods. For example, the demand for water in GCC countries is growing faster than the supply of it. The definition suggests an excess of demand and points towards policies that reduce this demand.

This kind of "excess and deficit definitions" may be useful in some cases of the well and moderately structured public problems such as transportation problems. The definitions of public problems are not always ostensibly technical as our review may suggest, but in many cases, they involve hot political debates because each definition adopted may create certain winners and losers. Consider for example the conflict around the definition of the problem of terrorism in the international arena. In any case in domestic matters in the GCC, the importance of this conflict about definitions of ill-structured problems, if it arises at all, is minimal because the political system does not allow it to ventilate. One possible exception to this situation is Kuwait where the opposition enjoys wide latitudes for movement.

Framing the problem is one of the important tenets in the first part of the analysis. Policy analysts usually argue that markets are more efficient than governments in allocating societal resources. Thus, the justification for government intervention to correct market problems is justified only in cases of the called "market failures." The solution method is the tool which the rational policy analyst may choose from the toolbox of policy analysis and may include, depending on the type of goals he is seeking to achieve, any of the various tools of rational policy analysis such as CBA, CE or the Multigoal Analysis. It is noteworthy that single or two goals (or single or two criteria) dominates policy analysis undertaken under the rational model; i.e., efficiency and effectiveness. To that extent, several microeconomic tools were applied to government policy making (Sharp, Register, Grimes, 2008). These include cost-benefit analysis (CBA), modified cost-benefit analysis, qualitative cost-benefit analysis, and cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA).

The CBA, which is widely used in policy analysis, emphasizes the use of efficiency as the sole criteria in making policy decisions and as such deserves all the criticisms raised by the critics of the rationalist approach in general. This is because in government, "efficiency" is not the only criteria sought by policymakers. In the GCC, where the elite seeks to stabilize elite-mass relationships, other criteria might be more important. Essentially, the CBA is a tool for deciding on the policy alternatives that achieve an optimal level of economic activity. In principle, an alternative should be adopted so long as the benefits of the activity exceed its costs (Sharp, Register, and Grimes, 2008). CBA requires that all expected negative and positive impacts of policy alternatives be classified regarding benefits and costs. If people are willing to pay for something, then this is a benefit. However, if they are willing to pay to avoid something, this is considered a cost. CBA requires also that all costs and benefits are monetized. In this venture, analysts use the market to estimate the monetary value of costs and benefits, yet in many cases, the distortions arising from market failures hinder the proper estimations of actual marginal social costs (Pearce, 1983).

Once all impacts have been monetized they can be aggregated, and the choice between different alternatives is relatively simple: choose the alternative that accrues the largest amount of benefits (Weimer and Vining, 2008; Friedman, 2002; Stokey and Zeckhauser,1978). The shortcoming of CBA in addressing ill-structured public problems should be self-evident now since these ill-structured problems involve many and messy impacts that cannot easily lend themselves to monetization. Moreover, efficiency, as the paramount criterion in CBA, is seldom the most important criterion for policymakers in the GCC. Policy makers may be interested in other non-efficiency criteria such as equity, administrative ease, and political feasibility, tribal feasibility, and even enhancing loyalty to the regime.

Attempts to modify traditional CBA include qualitative CBA and modified CBA. Analysts employ qualitative CBA when there are some impacts (costs or benefits) that do not lend themselves easily to monetization. In this case, the analysts perform standard CBA to the quantifiable impacts and assess other non-quantifiable impacts qualitatively. On the other hand, modified CBA presents similar difficulties related to problems of quantifications. Unlike standard CBA and qualitative CBA, modified CBA is usually utilized when a problem involves another unquantifiable impact, such as equity, besides the goal of efficiency. The modified CBA is utilized when the analyst can assign quantifiable measurements, not necessarily monetary terms, to both goals. For example, if the other goal, besides efficiency, is the provision of equitable services, modified CBA requires that assessment or weighting costs and benefits, resulting from different possible alternatives to different income groups, should be performed. Weimer and Vining (1999) call this version of modified CBA *distributionally* weighted cost-benefit

analysis. The benefit of this approach is that it allows analysts to develop a single metric whereby we can rank alternatives as we do in the standard CBA. However, its drawbacks are also evident in that this metric is only possible by forcing efficiency and equity or any non-economic criteria to be quantifiable (Weimer and Vining 1999).

The other tool utilized in the rationalistic model is *cost-effectiveness*. Cost-effectiveness is used when there is another goal besides efficiency and when the other goal is quantifiable but, unlike efficiency, cannot be monetized. In contrast with modified CBA, where the two goals are quantifiable and therefore commensurable, however, in Cost-Effectiveness the two goals are treated as non-commensurable. Weimer and Vining (1999) distinguish two approaches CE: the fixed budget and the fixed effectiveness approaches. On the one hand, the fixed budget method determines in advance a certain amount of money (e.g., a budget of million Dirhams), and the analyst chooses the best alternative that achieves the greatest returns in the non-efficiency goal. On the other hand, the fixed effectiveness method starts with stipulating a certain level of expected outcome and then choose the best alternative that realizes that level of achievement. The difference between standard CBA and Cost-Effectiveness is that whereas CBA allows us to rank and choose among different policy alternatives, cost-effectiveness cannot answer the question whether a certain alternative is worth doing or not. However, if the level of achievement is determined beforehand, then cost-effectiveness helps decide the alternative that can perform the task most efficiently "with minimum losses of social surplus" (Weimer and Vining 1999, 274; Stokey, and Zeckhauser, 1978).

It is for these reasons that CBA is the preferred method of rationalistic policy analysis. However, the previous discussion illustrates the limitations of all the above methods reviewed when the analysis deals with public sector ill-structured problems where policymakers are concerned with many goals and different criteria. The Multigoal Analysis developed to address these limitations of the conventional tools used in policy analysis. Whereas these tools concentrate on efficiency as the only criterion (e.g., standard CBA) and at times allow one additional criterion (e.g., qualitative and modified CBA), the Multigoal Analysis tool admits in more than three criteria. Table 3 below depicts the Goal/Policy matrix which registers the scores of different policy alternatives against different evaluation criteria (goals).

Table 3 Goal/Policy Matrix

Criteria / Policy	Net Benefit (CBA)	Political Feasibility	Equity	Technical Feasibility
A	Score	Score	Score	Score
B	Score	Score	Score	Score
C	Score	Score	Score	Score
D	Score	Score	Score	Score

It is evident that the Multigoal Analysis is more appropriate when policymakers address ill-structured and some complex moderately structured public problems. It also permits the use of other CBAs and Cost-Effectiveness techniques the slot of efficiency or effectiveness in the matrix where they appropriate. However, its usefulness to address ill-structured problems, such as arms race in the Gulf region or foreign policy problem, maybe a little bit more complex, because the variables involved are more entangled. Nevertheless, even in these problems it provides a useful way of structuring the problem, filters the relevant from irrelevant in the multitude of data and information arrived at the policymakers' desk. The GCC countries adopted many times some domestic and foreign policy issues without considering their impacts on different criteria. For example, religious education curricula inadvertently produce and breed terrorist groups. Some of their immigration policies have negative impacts on their economy and society.

Some of the generic criticisms directed towards rationality, in general, apply to the Multigoal Analysis tool. For example, it requires extensive and costly studies to identify the scores of each alternatives targeting the problem. Therefore, it takes a long time to complete, and many problems in the GCC arise as urgent crises rather chronic problems. Therefore, policymakers cannot wait patiently for policy analysts to figure out solutions to problems that arrive as crises requiring immediate actions. Moreover, even mundane public policy problems are dynamic and changing, and solutions to them become obsolete even if they are not. Nevertheless, many public problems which are not characterized by such an urgency, such as health, education, trade, and many others, can benefit from the logic and structure of the Multigoal Analysis Tool. At least it may help policymakers in the GCC to facilitate its logic to address problems in a structured manner. Unfortunately, at present policy advisor in the GCC in different areas of ill-structured problems are drawn from economists and business administration specialists who, by their very training, do not consider any criteria beyond efficiency and effectiveness.

Conclusion

In this conclusion, we address briefly the question of whether the GCC countries can or cannot benefit from the Multigoal Analysis tool? The questions we raise here: Do they need it? Do they have the institutional capabilities and professional skills to perform it? The answer to the first question is in the affirmative though they don't feel its urgency in the light if their diminishing economic resources. In the period before the 2007-2008 world financial crises, when money and wealth galore, they only need to through money at public problems to provide a solution for them. The drop in the oil prices in the 1980s and after the 2007-2008 crises together with the tremendous costs of the first and the second Gulf wars have alerted the GCC to the unfeasibility of their previous easy-going attitudes. The ongoing War in Yamen adds immense burden on their fluctuating oil revenues. New problems of terrorism coupled with the serious problems of drug and human trafficking and problems of urbanization mean that new ways of allocating resources have to be sought for. For example, currently the UAE and Saudi Arabia have schemes for raising prices on inelastic goods, such as gas tobacco, and products, to raise their oil revenues depleted by the costly warfare in Yamen. The Saudis, who pay dearly for their war in Yamen, adopt a poll tax on the non-national dependents accompanying their families. But the negative impacts of these policies on their markets and labor forces may have far-reaching consequences. The grip of this situation is also felt by other GCC and ideas about adopting income taxes surfaces for the first time in the GCC modern history, and this illustrates the toll of political instability that may arise.

Unfortunately, the GCC policymakers have adopted these policies without consideration of their negative side effects on the economy and society. In Multigoal Analysis terms, this fact means that these policies were adopted without subjecting them to the different important criteria associated with them. These criteria include their economic impacts on different sectors of the economy, the revenue expected from them, and their social repercussions and many others. This fact calls for the application of the Multigoal Analysis tool, or least its rational logic because it permits the comparison of different alternative policies against criteria of concern and thereby it facilitates the discovery of possible negative impacts on other areas of public policy. The tool can also be applied even when there is only one policy alternative under consideration.

The second question relating to the availability of institutional capabilities and professional skills to perform it could be safely answered in the negative. Nevertheless, their capabilities in this regard vary among the GCC. It is evident that institutional capability is relatively higher in the UAE and Qatar but relatively insufficient in other GCC. Both these countries, and as of late Saudi Arabia, adopt sophisticated strategic plans visions and missions that provide the ground for a rational structure to guide policy analysis and design at the micro level (single policies) guided by their strategic visionary goals and strategies. The UAE and Qatar, more than others, have embarked on reforming their public sectors management by developing rational performance indicators, establish highly developed electronic government systems and introduce new management techniques, away from classical routine-based bureaucracies, such as total quality government, and invest a lot in IT and computer education. This partially bright picture is a little bit depressed by the lack of descriptive public policy and professional policy analysis education; both are important for training professional policy analyst. This task is the responsibly of higher education institutions. In the GCC generally, public policy education is not in high

vogue. Public policy courses appear in university curricula as single courses in political science and public administration departments using the outdated policy cycle approach.

The UAE is more advanced in this regard. For example, the debarment of political science houses two tracks: international relations and government policy. The capstone for the department uses the logic and steps of Multigoal Analysis in a team-spirit address and find solutions for certain public problem chosen by the students. The course specifically requires the students to imagine themselves as policy advisors to a government official (Client). The client, who may be, a president, a minister, or ahead of a government corporation, ask the team to design a policy to solve a certain problem that is faced by his institution. The course then urges the students to use the tools and concepts of rationalistic Multigoal models to analyze the problem at hand. They are asked to select relevant evaluation criteria, choose relevant alternative policies that the team thinks that they may solve the problem and use decision choice tools to select the best policy option that scores high in the evaluation criteria. The team uses the skills of presentation to sell the selected policy options to the client. Of course, this simple single course is not enough to train professional policy analysts.

In the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU), under the sponsorship of the graduate college, the department of political science delivers a Master of Governance and Public policy. The UAEU also has a Center for Public Policy and Leadership geared to provide advice and training to government institutions. The Emirate of Dubai, one of the constituent Emirates of the UAE, has also established the Mohammed Bin Rashid Institute of Government with a clear focus on public policy. The institute offers courses in public policy and sponsors a Public Policy Forum for debating openly public policy issues. The UAE has also established the Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research (ECSSR) and Policy Center in Abu Dhabi. Despite these achievements, actual policy advising is dominated by national and expat economists and business administration specialists because there is no acknowledgment of the importance of policy analysis as a professional discipline based on applied policy analysis tools. Moreover, competent policy analysists are still in short supply and the efforts above, though significant, fall short of training full-fledged professional policy analysts.

In Qatar, public policy education has just started to be established as a subfield in the Department of International Relations at the University of Qatar. The newly established (in 2010) Hamad Bin Khalifa University, which is located in the Education City which is dominated by branches from American and other English speaking universities in Europe and Canada, has recently established a Faculty of Law and Public Policy. The Faculty claims that it offers doctorate programs that intend to "prepare leaders who can manage multi-faceted relationships that span across different legal systems and who have a command of a wide range of skills" (Hamad Bin Khalifa University, 2017). However, these programs whether in the UAE and Qatar are not fully equipped to produce professional policy analyst to provide advice on public policy to policymakers. The content of most of their public policy programs, with the possible exception of the UAE Master of Governance and Public Policy offered by the United Arab Emirates University, concentrates on the public policy political stream, and especially the policy cycle approach, rather than policy analysis as a professional discipline.

The state of Qatar is known for its utilization of world-class private, public policy institutions such as the Rand Corporation. The relationship between the RAND Corporation and Qatar started early at the beginning of the new millennium in the 2000s, when the RAND worked with the Qatari government on some projects and advised the Qatar's government on a range of public policy issues. In 2003 the RAND and the Qatar Foundation established the RAND-Qatar Policy Institute (RQPI). The institute has two grand goals. First to make the Rand reservoir of analytic resources accessible to Qatari institutions and also to make it accessible to policymakers in the Middle East, North Africa, and parts of South Asia. Second, to enhance the ability of Qataris by training them in RAND's style of policy analysis. The Qatari RQPI assists the government, nonprofit, and private sector institutions in the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia. Its activities include projects to assist in strategic planning, program evaluation, risk, and technology assessment, cost-benefit analysis and choice modeling (RAND-Qatar Policy Institute, 2003-2013).

It may be appropriate to conclude this paper by offering a few general recommendations geared towards the theme and purpose of this paper. The GCC needs to:

1- Establish strong undergraduate programs in public policy analysis in interdisciplinary separate departments with special emphasis on research methodology, quantitative statistical techniques, policy studies and rational approaches such as the Multigoal Analysis approach.

2- Establish specialized master programs based on the public policy undergraduate programs and offer advanced curricular on the subject matters of public policy analysis. The master programs should opt to train professional policy analysts well-versed in their local cultures and able to provide practical recommendations on specialized policy issue areas such as education, health, terrorism, healthcare. They should play the role of active social and economic change catalysts.

3- Establish government-sponsored centers for policy analysis to provide specialized recommendations for policy-makers. The present centers in some GCC universities and government are manned solely by specialist trained in one discipline such as water resources, environment, and healthcare and are prone to look at these issues from their narrowly specialized perspective ignoring other socio-political impacts (criteria) the neglect of which may lead to unwanted negative impacts.

4- Train the existing policymakers and decision-makers in government institutions in the art and craft of policy analysis. Public Policy manuals like the Australian Policy Handbook may prove helpful as a training device as well as a guide for looking at problems in a comprehensive manner

References

1. Bardach, E., 2018. A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving. Los Angeles CQ Press

2. Balaam, David N., and Veseth, Michael, 2005. Introduction to International Political Economy. Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Pearson Hall.

3. Beckman, N. 1977. "Policy Analysis in Government: Alternatives to Muddling Through." Public Administration Review 37(2). pp. 221-227.

4. Bickers, Kenneth and Williams, John, T. .2001. Public Policy Analysis: A Political Economy Approach. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company.

5. Bingham, Richard, D., and Ethridge, Marcus, E. 1982. Reaching Decision in Public Policy and Administration: Methods and Applications. New York and London: Longman

6. Bohrs, Ton, and Bartlett, Robert V., 1993. Environmental Policy in New Zealand. The Politics of Clean and Green. Oxford University Press.

7. Birkland, T. 2016, An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy, Abingdon, Oxon: Taylor and Francis

8. Caramani, Daniele, 2008 Comparative Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Cullis, John and Jones, Philip. 1998. Public Finance and Public Choice. Oxford: Oxford University Press

10. deleon, P., 2008. "The Historical Roots of the Field," in Morgan, M., Rein, M. & Goodwin R., (2008), Oxford: The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy, Oxford University Press

11. deleon, P. and Vogenbeck, M. 2007. "The Policy Sciences at the Crossroads." Fischer, F., Grand J. Miller and Mara S. Sidney (eds.). Handbook of Policy Analysis: Theories, Politics, and Methods. Boca Raton, London, New York: CRC Press.

12. Downs, Anthony, 1985. An Economic Theory of Democracy. Boston: Addison Wesley.

13. Dunn, William, N., 2018. Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction. New York: Routledge

14. Dye, Thomas R. (2013). Understanding Public Policy. Boston: Pearson

15. Elhussein, Ahmed M. 1989. "Policy Analysis and Public Administration: A Theoretical Perspective," The Indian Journal of Public Administration, 35 (2)

16. Elhussein, Ahmed M. 2002. Introduction to Policy Analysis (In Arabic). The Academic Centre for Political Studies.

17. Fischer, F. 2007. "Deliberative Policy Analysis As Practical Reason: Integrating Empirical And Normative Arguments." in Fischer, F., Miller, G. & Sidney M. (2007). Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theories, Politics, and Methods, London: CRC Press, Taylor, and Francis Group

18. Friedman, L. S. 2002. The Microeconomics of Public Policy Analysis, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

19. Gruber, Jonathan. 2011. Public Finance and Public Policy. New York: Worth Publisher

20. Gupta, Dipak, K. 2001. Analyzing Public Policy: Concepts, Tools, and Techniques. Washington D. C.: CQPress

21. Hamad Bin Khalifa University (2017). Retrieved from http://www.hbku.edu.qa/en/admissions#tab257,

22. Hausman, Daniel, McPherson, Satz, Debra, 2017. Economic Analysis, Moral Philosophy, and Public Policy. New York: Cambridge University Press.

23. Heady, Ferrel 2001. Public Administration: A Comprehensive Perspective (6th ed.). New York and Basel: Marcel Dekker, INC.

24. Heinemann, Robert, A., Bluhm, William, T. Peterson, Steven, A., and Kearny, Edward. N. 2002. The World of the Policy Analyst: Rationality, Values, and Politic. New York and London: Chatham House Publishers

25. Hogwood, Brian W., and Gunn, Lewis, A. 1990. Policy Analysis for the Real World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

26. Huey-Tsyh Chen and Peter H. Rossi, 1980. "The Multigoal Analysis, Theory-Driven Approach to Evaluation: A Model Linking Basic and Applied Social Science." Social ForcesVol. 59, No. 1 (Sep. 1980), pp. 106-122

27. Ilchman and Uphoff, 1971. The Political Economy of Change. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

28. Khodr, Hiba, 2014. "A Preliminary Comparative Study of Policy-making in Two GCC Countries—Qatar and Kuwait: Processes, Politics, and Participants." Politics and Policy, 42 (2), 271-310.

29. Kraft, Michael and Furlong, Scott R. 2018. Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives. Los Angeles: CQ Press, Sage

30. Lasswell, H., 2011. Politics: Who Gets What, When, How? Literary Licensing, LLC

31. Lerner, D, Lasswell, H., Lerner, Harold D. (1951) The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method, Stanford University Press

32. Levy, J.M. 1995. Essential Microeconomics for Public Policy Analysis. London: Praeger.

33. Linz, J., 1975. "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes," in. Greenstein, F.and Polsby, N. (eds.), Handbook of Political Science iii: Macropolitical Theory. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

34. Mansour, Ahmed M.E, 2008. The Impact of Privatization on the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Federal Public Sector, International Public Management Review (IPMR) 9 (2)

35. Mansour, Ahmed M. E., 2016. "Population Imbalance as a Public Policy Problem in the United Arab Emirates," "in Douglas J. Besharov and Mark Lopez (eds.) Adjusting to a World in Motion: Trends in Global Migration and Migration Policy, Oxford University Press

36. Mansour, Ahmed M. E. 2010. "The Style of Decision-Making in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Federal Budgetary Process. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting, and Financial Management. 22, (3).

37. Mansour, Ahmed M. E. (forthcoming). "Has the United Arab Emirates Federal Government Succeeded to Transform Its Federal Bureaucracy into A New Public Management System?". Accepted for publication in the International Public Management Review (IPMR)

38. Mansour, Ahmed M. E., 2015. "Wiki-Government as Coproduction of Public Policies and Services: Feasibility Study for the United Arab Emirates," Australian Journal of Sustainable Business and Society. 1 (1), March 2015.

39. Mendoza, G.A. and Martins, H. 2006. Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis in Natural Resource Management: A Critical Review Of Methods And New Modelling Paradigms. Forest Ecology and Management Volume, 15 July 2006, Pages 1–22

40. Moran, Michael, Rein, Martin, and Goodin, Robert 2006. The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy. Oxford: Oxford University Press

41. Ostrom, Elinor, 1998. "A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Theory of Collective Action." American Political Science Review 92 March (1)1-22.

42. Ostrom, Elinor, Cox, Michael, and Schlager, Edela, 2014. "Institutional Analysis and Development." in Sabatier, Paul B., and Weible, Christopher M. (Eds.) (2014). Theories of the Policy Process. Boulder, Colorado.

43. Pearce, D.W., 1983. Cost-Benefit Analysis, London: Macmillan.

44. RAND-Qatar Policy Institute (2003-2013). Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/international/qatar.html, on Friday, 12, 2017, 5::15 pm

45. Sharkansky, Ira, 1978. Public Administration: Policy-making in Government Agencies. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

46. Sharp, A. M., Register, C. A, Grimes, P. W. 2008. Economics of Social Issues. Boston: McGraw- Hill Irwin.

47. Sidney S. M. 2007. "Policy Formulation: Design and Tools." In Fischer, F., Grand J. Miller and Mara S. Sidney (eds.). Handbook of Policy Analysis: Theories, Politics, and Methods. Boca Raton, London, New York: CRC Press.79-87

48. Stokey, E. and Zeckhauser, R. 1978. A Primer for Policy Analysis. New York: W. W. Norton & Company

49. Theodoulou, S. Z., and Cahn, M. A.1995. Public Policy: The Essential Readings. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall

50. Torgerson, Douglas. 2007. "Promoting the Policy Orientation: Lasswell in Context. In Frank Fisher, Gerald J. Miller and Mara S. Sidney, Handbook of Policy Analysis: Theory, Methods, and Politics

51. Uphoff and Ilchman 1972. The Political Economy of Development. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

52. Wagner, P. 2007. "Public Policy, Social Science, and the State: A Historical Perspective."

53. In Fischer, F., Grand J. Miller and Mara S. Sidney (eds.). Handbook of Policy Analysis: Theories, Politics, and Methods. Boca Raton, London, New York: CRC Press. 29-40

54. Weimer, D., and Vining A. 2017. Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice. New York Routledge l.

55. Wildavsky, A., 1979. The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

56. Wildavsky, A., 1980. The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis. London: Macmillan.

57. Wildavsky, Aron, B., 1986. Budgeting: A Comparative Theory of the Budgeting Process. New York: Transaction Publishers.