

Half a Century of “Muddling”: Are We There Yet?¹

Christine Rothmayr Allison

Department of Political Science
Université de Montréal

Christine.Rothmayr.Allison@umontreal.ca

Denis Saint-Martin

Department of Political Science
Université de Montréal

Denis.Saint-Martin@umontreal.ca

Code de champ modifié

Abstract:

Half a century after the publication of Lindblom’s seminal article “The Science of Muddling Through”, we revisit the heritage of incrementalism in this special issue, analyzing its legacy in public policy and public administration. The articles discuss the extent to which recent theoretical developments have transformed the original idea, reinforced it, or possibly rendered it obsolete. In this introductory article, we provide a short overview over the core elements of incrementalism and assess how the concept is used in scholarly publications and research today. We thereby focus on incrementalism as an analytical concept rather than a prescriptive theory. We argue that even after a half a century of “muddling”, we are not yet through with incrementalism. Some of the ideas that underpin the concept of incrementalism continue to drive research, often in combination with more recent theoretical approaches to the policy process. After half a century, incrementalism is still part of the policy scholar’s tool kit.

Keywords: incrementalism, muddling through, path dependency, punctuated equilibrium, historical institutionalism, Charles Lindblom

¹ We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their highly appreciated comments and helpful suggestions, which significantly contributed to improving the quality of the contributions in this special issue. Our thanks also go to Audrey L’Espérance, Raoul Tamekou and Christian Bordeleau for their help in finalizing the manuscripts and assisting with the research for the introduction.

50 years of Incrementalism

In 1959, Charles Lindblom published his seminal article "The Science of Muddling Through", in *Public Administration Review* (Lindblom 1959). The article proposed an alternative to the then dominant "synoptic" model of decision-making. The concept of incrementalism suggests that decision making is, and ought to take place through, a process of successive limited comparison. As a model of and for decision making, Incrementalism and later on disjointed incrementalism (Lindblom 1979), spurred decades of animated debate among public policy scholars and political scientists about their meaning, empirical application and normative underpinnings of these concepts. Indeed, a quick citation research in Google Scholar turns up 5,382 citations of the 1959 article, and 723 for the 1979 articles.² Lindblom himself expressed his surprise about the prominence incrementalism quickly gained in the policy-making literature (1979, p. 524):

"I always thought that, although some purpose was served by clarifying incremental strategies of policy analysis and policy making, to do so was only to add a touch of articulation and organization to ideas already in wide circulation."

The articles in this issue assess and review the importance, relevance and applicability of incrementalism today, discussing the extent to which recent theoretical developments have transformed the original idea, reinforced it, or possibly rendered it obsolete. Public administration and public policy has evolved over the last 50 years and recent theoretical developments, such as historical and rational choice institutionalism, punctuated

² Source: Harzing, A.W. 2010, Publish or Perish, version 3.0.3813, available at www.harzing.com/pop.htm; results as of August 14, 2010. If taking into account different spellings/errors in spelling the title of the article, the numbers are slightly higher. The 1959 article can not be searched in the ISI database, which only starts in 1979.

equilibrium theory, policy network approaches and the argumentative turn in policy analysis, have provided new insights about policy-making and have proposed alternative ways of understanding and analysing public policies. The articles also address the question of whether radical changes and developments in the social and political context of the past 50 years, such as globalisation and new social and transnational movements, pose a challenge to incrementalism and disjointed incrementalism.

Given the multifaceted theoretical aspects of incrementalism this themed issue covers the range of meanings of incrementalism as developed in the literature over time, by looking at incrementalism as decision-making theory (Michael Atkinson), incrementalism as policy-making in general (Leslie Pal) and in budgeting (David Good), incrementalism as policy change (Michel Howlett and Andrea Mignone) and incrementalism as politics (Denis Saint-Martin and Christine Rothmayr). Incrementalism, much like its competing theories, has had analytical as well as prescriptive aspirations. As Smith and May (Smith & May, 1980, p.155) and others have argued, the two do not a priori correlate. In this issue, we focus on the analytical power of incrementalism for explaining policy processes, and not on its validity as a normative model for decision-making.

The idea of incrementalism has produced a vast and contested body of literature (e.g. Dror, 1964; Etzioni, 1967, 1986; Schulman, 1975; Lustick, 1980; Gregory, 1989; Weiss & Woodhouse, 1992). It has been criticized for its conceptual slipperiness (Berry, 1990) and the supposed underlying conservatism. It has been tested through formalized models (Bendor, 1995) and experiments (Knott, Miller, & Verkuilen, 2003), applied in numerous qualitative case studies, or was rejected in favour of other theories (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). Wildavsky and others applied the notion to budgetary studies (see David Good in this issue). In these introductory remarks, we do not wish to reopen the debate about incrementalism's "alleged lack of goal orientation, conservatism, limited range of applicability, and negative stance toward analysis." (Weiss & Woodhouse,

1992). But rather, we just intend to provide a concise introduction to the principal ideas of incrementalism. An empirical analysis of textbooks and journal articles provides an overview over the use of incrementalism in today's scholarly world.

The notion of incrementalism: a brief and incomplete introduction

The concept of incrementalism developed across several publications and in collaboration with other prominent scholars, such as Robert Dahl, David Braybrooke, and David K. Cohen. Even though the term was employed by Lindblom in earlier publications, it was the articles published in 1959 on "The science of muddling through" and a year earlier in the American Economic Review (Lindblom, 1958) that introduced the basic ideas of incrementalism to scholars and practitioners in public administration and public policy. Lindblom further developed his ideas in several books (Lindblom, 1965, 1977, 1980; Braybrooke & Lindblom, 1963; Lindblom & Cohen, 1979), and defended his basic ideas against his critics in his 1979 article.

The 1959 article was a response to both the idea that the rational-comprehensive model of decision-making accurately described reality and that decision-making ought to follow this model. Lindblom criticised both the normative and descriptive models of rational-comprehensive analysis and thereby distinguished between two models of decision-making: the 'rational comprehensive' or 'root model' and the 'successive limited comparison' or 'branch model'. The latter model, so Lindblom argued, more adequately describes real world policy analysis and decision-making than the former. The non-comprehensive model takes into account the limited cognitive capacities of decision-makers and the profoundly political nature of public policy making, which should not be perceived as a neutral and essentially technical activity (Gregory 1989, p. 147). Policy practitioners are not matching means to ends on the basis of a comprehensive analysis

of all possible options, thereby distinguishing between facts and values. The reality is much messier and characterized by "muddling through". The first characteristic of Lindblom's model is that the fact-value dichotomy is an illusion. Here Lindblom anticipates the epistemological debates that came to dominate much of the social sciences from the mid-70s onwards, and more specifically shares one of the basic assumptions of post-positivist policy-analysis. Secondly, he emphasised the limits of human cognition, putting him, once again, at the forefront of theoretical developments, alongside Simon's concept of bounded rationality (Simon, 1945, 1985), decades before approaches put the limits of human cognition into center stage for explaining agenda-setting processes (e.g. Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; Jones, 2003) and before behavioural economics emerged (see Michael Atkinson in this issue). A third argument for non-comprehensive analysis is the impact of past experience and practice on the solutions considered, which differ only gradually from those in place. The underpinning idea here is different from how path-dependency conceptualizes the impact of the past. The 1979 article makes it clear that Lindblom had a system of trial and error in mind, where solutions that vary slightly from past experience and practice come with little costs, politically speaking, and are also easily reversible. This conceptualisation is much closer to ideas of policy inheritance and lesson-drawing based on practical experience, similar to the ideas proposed by Rose (Rose, 1991; Rose, 1993). Empirical research on policy inheritance effectively points to the possibility of such patterns of trial and error policy-making in specific subfields (Rose & Davies, 1993). The last element defining incrementalism is that the test for good policy is a general agreement among a majority of stakeholders on specific solutions, which once again points to the political character of policy-making. Multiple stakeholders are involved; they don't necessarily agree on the goals to be pursued or the details of analysis. But based on their practical experience they can agree on what might constitute a good solution and thus enhance its viability.

Contemporary theories of the policy-process provide additional or alternative tools for analysing actor constellations such as policy-subsystems and policy networks (see Leslie Pal and Michael Howlett & Andrea Mignone in this issue) in order to analyse how social, governmental and bureaucratic actors interact across levels of governments and across national borders.

In his 1979 article Lindblom refined his conceptualization of incrementalism and also addressed some of his critics. The 1979 article continued to reject the synoptic or comprehensive model of analysis as a viable prescriptive or descriptive model, and in addition pointed to the need "...even formal analytic techniques – systems analysis, operations research, management by objectives, PERT – need to be developed around strategies rather than as attempts at synopsis."³ (Lindblom 1979, p. 518). The essence of his initial idea of incrementalism is reformulated as "disjointed incrementalism", a term introduced in 1963 (Braybrooke & Lindblom 1963), and which builds on the five basic elements of incrementalism proposed in the 1959 article, supplemented by several stratagems of analysis:

- a. limitation of analysis to a few somewhat familiar policy alternatives;
- b. an intertwining of analysis of policy goals and other values with the empirical aspects of the problem;
- c. a greater analytical preoccupation with ills to be remedied than positive goals to be sought;
- d. a sequence of trials, errors, and revised trials;
- e. analysis that explores only some, not all, of the important possible consequences of a considered alternative;

³ PERT: programme evaluation and review technique.

f. fragmentation of analytical work to many (partisan) participants in policy making.” (Lindblom 1979, p. 517)

Between his 1959 and 1979 articles, Lindblom elaborated in more detail the idea of partisan mutual adjustment (Lindblom 1965). Policy-making is not a hierarchical and centrally controlled process, but rather involves ‘partisan mutual adjustment’, i.e. a process of negotiation and bargaining where decision-makers make compromises and adjust to one another. Hence, disjointed incrementalism is a better method than central planning for coordinating policy-making within a fragmented political system with diverging interests. Punctuated equilibrium theory proposes an alternative but related view on ‘mutual adjustment’, by assuming that a policy image shared by a majority of actors within a subsystem contributes to policy stability and phases of incremental change.

An additional clarification of the 1979 article consisted in the distinction between incrementalism as *policy analysis* from incrementalism as *politics* and *pattern of policy change*. Incremental politics has several advantages according to Lindblom, in so far as small changes can reduce the risk of large controversies and blockage, limit the losses of those who preferred another policy solution, and help to maintain a working majority. Lindblom also assumes that incremental politics can result in fundamental change through a sequence of small, but speedy steps, which is why Lindblom rejects the critique that incrementalist politics are inherently conservative. In fact, the inadequacy and slowness of policy responses to crises is not the result of incrementalism as politics, but rather results from the structure of the U.S. political system and its multiple veto-points -- an argument that is currently under empirical scrutiny through comparative analysis of budgetary and policy-making processes across the globe (Jones, True, & Baumgartner, 1997; Baumgartner et al., 2009).

Are we all incrementalists now? – An empirical analysis of textbooks and journal articles

Bendor stated in 1995 that “Old theories in political science rarely die; they usually just fade away. This has been incrementalism’s fate.” (1995, p. 819) To the contrary, after fifty years of debate and attempts to clarify, rescue or discard incrementalism, the following empirical analysis of textbooks and journal articles points to the continuing interest in incrementalism within public administration and public policy.

Textbooks on Public Policy and Public Administration

We began by analysing 10 textbooks commonly used in courses on public policy and public administration at Canadian universities. Five of them address primarily public policy (Archer, Gibbins, Knopff, & Pal, 1995; Dobuzinskis, Howlett, & Laycock, 2007; Doern & Phidd, 1992; M. Howlett & Ramesh, 2003; Michael Howlett, Ramesh, & Perl, 2009; Miljan, 2008; Pal, 2006, 2010), and five focus principally on public administration (Barker, 2007; Dunn, 2002; Inwood, 2008; Johnson, 2006; Kernaghan, Marson, & Sandford, 2000). We were interested in whether and how these textbooks would use and discuss incrementalism and its rivals.

Eight out of ten books discuss the concept of incrementalism; a result of little surprise given the importance of Lindblom’s work for public administration and public policy analysis.. The overall focus of discussion is on incrementalism as *decision-making*. Only one publication discusses in detail incrementalism as pattern of policy change, while four others at least refer to this aspect. Thereby, books oriented towards public policy more often mention incrementalism as a pattern of change than do those on public administration.

The more important question is, however, what stance these publications take towards incrementalism and its opposing model of rational-comprehensive decision making.⁴ The majority of the textbooks described the explanatory power of *both* models for decision-making, but also presented their limits; thus neither favouring one approach over the other. Hence, the great majority of the books still consider Lindblom's concept of incrementalism an essential component to students' education in public policy.

Two of the most recent textbooks explicitly point towards the theory's limits and propose to add additional explanatory factors in order to understand and analyse decision-making in today's (Canadian) world. They propose to go beyond the traditional dichotomy between the two models, either by proposing alternative concepts (decision-style, see Michael Howlett et al., 2009) or pointing towards the changing national and international context of policy making (Pal, 2010). In sum, our brief analysis of textbooks does not confirm Bendor's verdict of incrementalism as a theory that has faded away. In fact, the following analysis of journal articles clearly speaks to the continuing engagement of scholars with incrementalism over the last two decades.

Analysis of journal articles

We selected 13 journals in the subfield of public policy and public administration and analysed incrementalism's legacy over the last 20 years (1990-2010). The selection of journals was based on the journals listed under the category of public administration in the Social Science Citation Index. We retained all Canadian, American and international journals with a general focus on public policy and public management, but excluded all

⁴ This analysis excludes edited volumes.

journals with only a subfield specialisation, for example in social policy, European public policy or public management.⁵

Our analysis was guided by some basic questions about the use of incrementalism as a concept in current research, as well as research over the last two decades. In our first round of analysis, we identified all the articles that cited central keywords pertaining to Lindblom's approach in the article title, abstract or text.⁶ This research resulted in a total of 344 articles.⁷ Already the number of articles identified, indicates the ongoing relevance of the notion of incrementalism for research in the last two decades within public policy and public administration. Scholars still engage substantially with the notion of incrementalism and the interest has not diminished in the last decade, as almost half of the articles have been published since the year 2000.

We first identified all articles in which incrementalism was mobilised for the elaboration of the theoretical framework in the case of an empirical article or, in the case of a theoretical article, that contributed to answering the research questions (N=59). From the articles substantially engaging with incrementalism, we distinguished those citing Lindblom and his ideas without engaging in a substantive discussion of incrementalism (N=152) and those articles that used one or several of the keywords underpinning the notion of incrementalism, yet without explicitly referring to Lindblom's⁸ work in the text

⁵ Journals analysed from 1.1.1990 to 15.8. 2010: Canadian Public Policy; Canadian Public Administration/Administration publique du Canada; Policy Sciences; American Review of Public Administration; Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory; Governance; Policy Studies Journal; Journal of Policy Analysis and Management; Public Administration; Public Administration Review; Administration and Society; International Review of Administrative Science; Policy and Politics (only since 2010).

⁶ Key words: Lindblom, Incrementalism, incremental change, mutual adjustment, non-comprehensive analysis, muddling through, successive limited comparison.

⁷ All book reviews, research notes, editorials etc. were excluded from this set of results.

⁸ Five articles substantially engaging in discussing incrementalism did not cite Lindblom's work directly, but cited Wildavsky (3) or Graham Allison's work (2). We left these articles in the substantial category,

(references), footnotes or the bibliography (N=133). The total number of articles citing Lindblom's work on incrementalism (N=211) comes as no surprise. As the data from Google Scholar mentioned above already indicated, his work, particularly the 1959 article, has long become a classic. The considerable number of articles referring to some of the key concepts of incrementalism⁹, yet without citing Lindblom, can be interpreted as a sign of how well established certain concepts are within the discipline. They have entered everyday analytical vocabulary in public policy and public administration. Critics of incrementalism might, however, interpret the 133 articles using central concepts without referring explicitly to Lindblom as a sign of the slipperiness and multiple possible understandings of incrementalism.

For the 59 articles that substantially discuss incrementalism, we conducted a more detailed analysis. First of all, we were interested in how the authors position themselves regarding incrementalism. Do they accept the basic assumptions? Do they critically engage with the concept and try to develop it further, while combining it with other theories and concepts? Or do they reject incrementalism and base their argument on alternative approaches?

Two thirds of the articles (N=39) discuss incrementalism critically and either combine some of its insights with other theories, add additional explanatory factors or then empirically compare the explanatory power of incrementalism to other theories. Among the 39 articles, nine mobilise punctuated equilibrium theory, six use concepts from the literature on ideas, policy learning, diffusion and transfer. Three articles are based on the notion of path-dependency and historical institutionalism, two on policy networks, and

because the articles just citing central concepts of Lindblom, but not citing his work, don't engage in more substantive discussion of incrementalism.

⁹ Incrementalism, incremental change, mutual adjustment, non-comprehensive analysis, muddling through, successive limited comparison.

two on theories of democratic participation. Finally, three articles are interested in budget theories, two in management theories and three in organizational theories. Ten of the 39 articles were not easy assignable to a specific category of theories or approaches, because they mobilised various explanatory factors or variables in addition to incrementalism.

Furthermore, among the 39 articles, only six discussed incrementalism in order to reject it as a valid prescriptive or normative approach and mobilised some other theoretical perspective in order to address their research question. Another 14 articles accepted the basic assumptions and essentially worked with incrementalism in their analysis, of which 10 have been published between 1990 and 1999.

Hence, 90% (N=53) of the articles engaging in discussing incrementalism substantially, do not do so in order to reject its basic assumptions, but rather use it as leverage for further developing theories of decision-making (23 articles) and policy change (27 articles) or incrementalism as politics (3 articles).

Overall, our analysis indicates that the notion of incrementalism still engages today's scholars in public policy and public administration. However, the fact that most of the articles that discuss incrementalism, go beyond the initial concept and apply more recently developed theories to the object of their study, also indicate the limits of incrementalism in today's research. The results of our analysis confirm the main arguments made by the contributions in this special issue, although they do so with greater analytical depth and eloquence, that incrementalism is still part of our tool kit but that public policy and public administration scholars have moved forward building their analysis on more recent theoretical debates.

The contributions in this special issue

The five contributions in this special issue arrive at different conclusions in terms of the relevance of incrementalism for understanding policy-making processes and policy change today. But none of the articles conclude that the notion of incrementalism has become obsolete. To the contrary, all five articles reveal how crucial and influential Lindblom's work has been for current empirical research and theoretical debates on various aspects of policy-making processes, even though some of the contributions take a critical stance towards some of the basic assumptions of simple and disjointed incrementalism. Nevertheless, it seems fair to say that in terms of incrementalism as a descriptive concept for decision-making, policy-making processes and policy change the discipline has moved on and gone beyond what Lindblom had in mind when writing his 1959 and 1979 articles.

Michael Howlett and Andrea Mignone argue that incrementalism was the dominant orthodoxy in analysing policy change up to the 1980s, when the concept was replaced by new theories accounting for paradigmatic and fundamental policy change as well as policy change by small increments (punctuated equilibrium, policy paradigm). In fact the new orthodoxy, as they argue, has not rendered incrementalism obsolete but rather complemented it with a second mode of policy change. Therefore Lindblom's intellectual heritage lives on in the new orthodoxy, which assumes that processes of policy stability through institutionalization and path dependency are interrupted by fundamental change (punctuations). Fundamental change results from changes external to policy subsystems that impact the currently dominant actors and their beliefs. Their critique of the new orthodoxy points to reinforcing the heritage of incrementalism: they suggest integrating Lindblom's idea that small increments might add up to larger change into the new orthodoxy. They also contend that recent theories on policy change should take into account agency, i.e. the actors that seek change and their strategies, and analyse more closely the directionality of change.

In his contribution on budgeting theory and budgeting practice in Canada, David Good argues that incrementalism remains highly relevant for understanding decision-making and analysing budgeting processes for the federal government of Canada, but also across other political systems. Despite occasional large shifts, the routine of budgeting is incremental. Budgeting constitutes a particularly interesting case for decision-making because of its nature: budgets have to be decided yearly; a budget consists of thousands of decisions and is highly political because it mirrors policy priorities and determines who gets what. David Good discusses in detail how Wildavsky adopted the concept of incrementalism to budgeting. As much as incrementalism is a powerful tool for explaining budgeting decisions, according to David Good it also has its limits. As Wildavsky pointed out there are 'shift points', where the common assumptions of incrementalism no longer hold, because the 'existing reality is clearly undesirable'. David Good argues that for Canada, alteration in the 'spenders and guardians framework' and the emergence of 'central priority setters' account best for fundamental shifts in budgeting. The Prime Minister's Office and the Privy Council Office have become much more directly involved over the last two decades in budgeting than was the case before. The PMO and PCO are more attentive to the political and policy messages of budgeting in order to successfully convey their policy and spending priorities to voters. Nevertheless, as David Good argues, the arrival of new priority setters has not fundamentally changed the incremental character of budgeting in the Canadian federal government.

Leslie Pal offers a novel and among the contributions in this issue most critical assessment of incrementalism by testing whether the basic assumptions of simple incrementalism still hold from today's point of view. He evaluates the five basic assumptions of simple incrementalism, i.e. limited rationality and cognitive capacity, emphasis on practical reason and applied knowledge; partisan mutual adjustment; the

reversibility of incremental policy change and the United States political system as a model. Leslie Pal argues that historical institutionalism points to the fact that policies understood as institutions have an impact on actor constellation and coalitions: also small changes can generate support coalitions rendering policy reversal extremely costly, thus questioning Lindblom and Dahl's assertion that reversibility constitutes one of the advantages of incrementalism (Dahl & Lindblom, 1953, pp.82-85). The literature on policy networks has convincingly demonstrated that actors are interconnected and, in addition, they are connected on the global level across nation-states. Lindblom's vision of mutual adjustment does not allow for the analysis of this phenomenon. Incrementalism as a descriptive theory also has its limits when it comes to political systems that function differently from the U.S. context, where power is less fragmented and societies might be less pluralistic. Nevertheless, on two accounts, Lindblom's basis assumptions have remained valid: the limited cognitive capacity and the emphasis on practical reason have been confirmed through further research. Therefore, in his conclusion, Leslie Pal, calls for alternative or additional tools to incrementalism for analysing policy processes on a global scale.

Michael Atkinson returns to the roots of Lindblom's theorizing by looking at how economists today conceptualise rationality and decision-making. Atkinson's contribution discusses incrementalism from the perspective of two theoretical developments, the institutional turn in political science, and research in behavioural economics. His article demonstrates that there is more continuity than discontinuity between Lindblom and these later approaches. Both approaches point to the fact that the status quo constitutes an important variable impacting decision-making. In the case of institutions, they structure the actor constellations, provide for more or less veto-points, possibly impose needs for negotiation and compromise and therefore constitute important contextual variables for the operation of incrementalism. In fact, Atkinson argues incrementalism as

analysis can not be separated from incrementalism practiced within political institutions. The Behavioral turn in economics points to the importance of the decisional context. For Lindblom, the status quo is the starting point for incremental changes; for behavioural economists, it constitutes an explanatory variable impacting how we evaluate risks and benefits. One of the principal reasons is the “status quo bias”, i.e. we evaluate items that are in our possession and that we are familiar with comparably more favourably. It also has the effect that we evaluate negative effects differently depending on whether they result from sticking to the status quo or are the result of changing actions.

Finally, Denis Saint-Martin and Christine Rothmayr turn to the idea of incrementalism as politics, which is the one application of incrementalism that has been the least discussed and analysed than other aspects of the concept. In their article, they argue that rationalism as symbolic politics is still very much alive, by focusing on the example of “supreme audit institutions”. Over the last four decades, supreme audit institutions have shifted their activities from classical financial auditing to performance auditing. Performance auditing is politically speaking a much less safe terrain than financial auditing. Performance auditing, much like the act of evaluation, “judges” policy outcomes and thus touches upon the fundamental question of how well the government governs. Rationalist politics is a mean for supreme audit institutions to legitimize performance auditing. The rise of the “regulatory state”, and processes of “agencification” or “quangoisation” in which decision-making powers are increasingly delegated to independent bureaucracies, have created an important legitimacy deficit for non-majoritarian institutions that exercise political authority without enjoying any direct link to the electoral process. In comparison to other independent bureaucracies, supreme audit institutions are particularly prone to rationalist politics, not just because of their institutional independence, but because of the tradition of financial auditing and the rise of new public management. The tradition of financial auditing nurtures a rational vision of

decision-making, while the shift to performance auditing demands to judge government performance, a much more value-laden activity than traditional financial auditing. Because of the lack of direct democratic legitimacy, independent audit institutions cannot recognize the fundamentally incrementalist – and thus value-laden – nature of their decision-making processes, but rather engage in rational politics, presenting their decisions as comprehensively rational and value neutral.

Overall the five contributions and our brief analysis of journal articles point in the same direction: we are not yet through with muddling, but have moved forward in our theoretical understanding of public policy making. Incrementalism still guides new research and continues to capture some of the important features of policy-making, but only in combination with other more recent theoretical frameworks can incrementalism be rendered adequate for understanding and explaining today's policy processes.

References

- Archer, K., Gibbins, R., Knopff, R., & Pal, L. A. (1995). *Parameters of Power : Canada's Political Institutions*. Toronto: Nelson Canada.
- Baumgartner, F.R., Breunig, Ch., Green-Pedersen, Ch., Jones. B.D., Mortensen. P.B., Nuytemans, M. & Walgrave, S. (2009). Punctuated Equilibrium in Comparative Perspective. *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (3), 603-620.
- Barker, P. (2007). *Public Administration in Canada*. Toronto: Nelson College Indigenous.
- Baumgartner, F., & Jones, B. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bendor, J. (1995). A Model of Muddling Through. *American Political Science Review*, 89(4), 819-840.
- Berry, W. T. (1990). The Confusing Case of Budgetary Incrementalism: Too many Meanings for a Single Concept. *Journal of Politics*, 52, 167-196.
- Braybrooke, D., & Lindblom, C. E. (1963). *A strategy of decision: policy evaluation as a social process*. New York: Free Press.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17 (1), 1-25.
- Dobuzinskis, L., Howlett, M., & Laycock, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Doern, B. G., & Phidd, R. W. (1992). *Canadian Public Policy. Ideas, Structure, Process*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Dror, Y. (1964). Muddling through - "science" or inertia? *Public Administration Review*, 24 (3), 153-157

- Dunn, C. (2002). *The Handbook of Canadian Public Administration* (2nd ed.). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1967). Mixed Scanning: A "Third" Approach To Decision-Making. *Public Administration Review*, 27 (5), 385-392.
- Etzioni, A. (1986). Mixed Scanning Revisited. *Public Administration Review*, 46 (1), 8-14.
- Gregory, R. (1989). Political Rationality or 'Incrementalism'? Charles E. Lindblom's enduring contribution to public policy making theory. *Policy and Politics*, 17 (2), 139-153.
- Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying Public Policy. Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles & Subsystems* (3rd ed.). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Inwood, G. J. (2008). *Understanding Canadian Public Administration* (3rd ed.). Scarborough: Pearson Education Canada.
- Johnson, D. (2006). *Thinking Government: Public Sector Management in Canada* (2nd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jones, B. D. (2003). Bounded Rationality and Political Science: Lessons from Public Administration and Public Policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13 (4), 395-412.
- Jones, B. D., True, J. L., & Baumgartner, F. R. (1997). Does Incrementalism Stem from Political Consensus or from Institutional Gridlock? *American Journal of Political Science*, 41 (4), 1319-1339.

- Kernaghan, K., Marson, B., & Sandford, B. (2000). *The new public organization* (Vol. Monographs on Canadian public administration). Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada.
- Knott, J. H., Miller, G. J., & Verkuilen, J. (2003). Adaptive Incrementalism and Complexity: Experiments with Two-Person Cooperative Signaling Games. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1958). Policy Analysis. *American Economic Review*, 48, 298-312.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1965). *The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making Through Mutual Adjustment*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1977). *Politics and Markets: The World's Political Economic Systems*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1979). Still Muddling, Not Yet Through. *Public Administration Review* 39 (6): 517-525.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1980). *The Policy Making Process*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Lindblom, C. E., & Cohen, D. K. (1979). *Usable knowledge: social science and social problem solving*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lustick, I. (1980). Explaining the Variability Utility of Disjointed Incrementalism: Four Propositions. *American Political Science Review*, 74 (2), 342-353.
- Miljan, L. (2008). *Public Policy in Canada: An Introduction* (5th ed.). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Pal, L. A. (2006). *Beyond Policy Analysis. Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times* (3rd ed.). Toronto: Thomson.

- Pal, L. A. (2010). *Beyond Policy Analysis. Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times* (4th ed.). Toronto: Thomson.
- Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy*, 11 (1), 3-30.
- Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-drawing in public policy. A guide to learning across time and space*. Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.
- Rose, R., & Davies, P. L. (1993). *Inheritance in Public Policy. Change without Choice in Britain*. Yale University Press.
- Schulman, P. R. (1975). Non-Incremental Policy-Making: Notes toward an Alternative Paradigm. *American Political Science Review*, 69 (4), 1354-1370.
- Simon, H. A. (1945). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: McMillan.
- Simon, H. A. (1985). Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review*, 79 (2), 293-304.
- Smith, G., & May, D. (1980). The Artificial Debate Between Rationalist and Incrementalist Models of Decision Making. *Policy and Politics*, 8 (2), 147-161.
- Weiss, A., & Woodhouse, E. (1992). Reframing Incrementalism: A constructive response to the critics. *Policy Sciences*, 25 (3), 255-273.