Rational and Incremental Models of Public Policy Decision Making

Posted on September 8, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/rational-and-incremental-models-of-public-policy-decision-making/

Introduction

Public policy decisions are made under conditions of competing values, incomplete information, limited time, political disagreement, and uncertainty about future consequences. Two influential models help explain how governments respond to these conditions: rational decision making and incremental decision making. The rational model imagines a structured process in which policymakers define goals, identify alternatives, estimate consequences, and select the option that performs best according to explicit criteria. The incremental model, associated especially with Charles E. Lindblom, argues that actual policymaking often proceeds through limited comparisons and small modifications to existing arrangements because decision-makers cannot examine every possibility and because political agreement is easier to achieve around narrower changes. Neither model should be treated as universally superior. Rational analysis can improve transparency and systematic comparison, but it can demand unrealistic levels of information and agreement. Incrementalism can promote learning and adaptability, but it may also preserve weak or unjust arrangements by giving the status quo a built-in advantage. The models are most useful when understood as different approaches to uncertainty, scale, and institutional capacity.

The Rational Model and Systematic Comparison

The rational model begins by defining the policy problem and identifying the objectives that public action is intended to achieve. Policymakers then develop a range of alternatives, estimate likely consequences, compare costs and benefits or other criteria, and choose the option judged most suitable. The model is attractive because it requires reasons to be made explicit and reduces dependence on habit, intuition, or political pressure alone. It can incorporate values such as equity, safety, liberty, environmental protection, administrative feasibility, and economic efficiency rather than limiting analysis to financial cost. The quality of the process, however, depends strongly on problem definition. If traffic congestion is framed only as insufficient road capacity, highway expansion may dominate the alternatives; if it is framed as excessive dependence on private vehicles, transit, land use, pricing, cycling, and remote work become relevant. Rational analysis therefore does not remove politics from policymaking. Deciding which outcomes matter, how they are measured, and whose experiences count is itself a normative and institutional choice.

Bounded Rationality and the Limits of Comprehensive Analysis

Herbert Simon’s concept of bounded rationality explains why complete rational analysis is rarely possible. Decision-makers possess limited time, attention, information, and computational capacity, while public problems often contain uncertain causal relationships and interacting systems. Future behavior may also change in response to a policy, making forecasts less reliable than they appear. Cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, scenario planning, and other analytical tools can organize evidence, but they still depend on assumptions. A technically precise estimate may hide uncertainty or distribute benefits and burdens unevenly across populations. Rational analysis can also become slow and expensive, especially when decision-makers wait for information that cannot realistically become complete. In emergencies, the cost of delay may exceed the value of additional analysis. Expert-driven processes may further exclude citizens whose concerns are difficult to translate into numerical models. These limitations do not make rationality undesirable. They show why systematic evidence should be combined with transparency about uncertainty, sensitivity analysis, public participation, and recognition that some values—such as rights or irreversible cultural loss—cannot always be reduced credibly to one common monetary measure.

The Incremental Model and Successive Limited Comparisons

Charles Lindblom described policymaking as a process of “successive limited comparisons,” often summarized as “muddling through.” Rather than beginning from zero and evaluating every theoretically possible alternative, incremental decision-makers compare a small number of feasible changes to existing policy. Goals and means may develop together because political actors can sometimes agree on a practical step even when they disagree about the ultimate purpose. A city might expand one bus corridor without resolving every disagreement about climate policy, land use, congestion, and urban equality. Smaller changes reduce information demands, make consequences easier to observe, and allow governments to learn through implementation. Pilot programs, phased regulations, and annual budget adjustments often follow this logic. Incrementalism is particularly useful when uncertainty is high and errors can be corrected. Its realism, however, should not be confused with a moral justification for gradualism in every situation. When existing arrangements produce severe injustice or when delay creates irreversible harm, comparing only small changes may exclude necessary transformation before it is seriously considered.

Participation, Power, and the Status Quo

Public participation is not automatically guaranteed by either the rational or incremental model. Rational analysis can include affected communities when defining goals, generating alternatives, and evaluating consequences, while an incremental process can remain highly centralized. Lindblom's pluralist account emphasizes bargaining and mutual adjustment among officials, interest groups, experts, and organizations, but political resources are distributed unequally. Wealthy organizations may possess more staff, legal expertise, campaign access, and data than marginalized groups, allowing incremental bargaining to preserve existing power. The rational model can face a different version of the same problem if experts define the variables and treat contested values as technical questions. Institutional design therefore matters more than the abstract label attached to the model. Meaningful participation requires accessible information, opportunities for consultation, transparent criteria, representation of affected populations, and mechanisms for explaining how public input changed or did not change the decision. Both models should also confront the status quo explicitly. Existing policy is not neutral merely because it already exists; it reflects earlier choices that may have created benefits for some groups and burdens for others.

When Each Model Is Most Useful

Rational analysis is particularly valuable when a decision has major long-term consequences, the relevant objectives can be defined reasonably well, data are available, and alternative strategies can be modeled. Infrastructure investment, public-health planning, environmental standards, and major budgeting decisions benefit from systematic comparison because the cost of a poorly evaluated commitment can persist for decades. Incrementalism is more useful when institutions need to learn, technologies are changing quickly, political agreement is limited, and mistakes are reversible. A new public service can begin as a pilot, collect evidence, and expand if outcomes justify it. Regulations can be adjusted as experience reveals unintended effects. The crucial question is not whether a policy is "rational" or "incremental" in the abstract, but whether the scale of analysis matches the urgency, reversibility, uncertainty, ethical stakes, and administrative capacity of the problem. Incremental steps also need review dates and outcome measures; otherwise temporary experiments can become permanent by inertia rather than by demonstrated success.

Combining Strategic Direction with Incremental Learning

Many policy processes combine the strengths of both models. A government may use broad rational analysis to establish a long-term objective and compare major strategic pathways, then implement the selected direction through smaller phases that generate evidence and permit revision. Urban transport illustrates the approach. A comprehensive plan might evaluate travel time, emissions,

affordability, safety, access, and land use across highways, rail, bus rapid transit, cycling, pricing, and zoning. Implementation could then proceed through a limited set of bus corridors, parking reforms, or intersection redesigns whose effects are measured before expansion. Comprehensive analysis prevents disconnected projects from drifting without a system-level purpose, while incremental implementation prevents a strategy from becoming rigid when forecasts prove inaccurate. Evaluation links the two approaches by comparing predicted and actual outcomes, examining costs, equity, implementation, and unintended consequences. Failure should then prompt a diagnosis of whether the underlying theory was wrong, execution was weak, or circumstances changed rather than an automatic decision either to abandon or preserve the policy.

Conclusion

The rational and incremental models illuminate different dimensions of public policy decision making. Rational analysis emphasizes explicit goals, systematic alternatives, forecasting, and transparent criteria, making it valuable for complex decisions where long-term commitments justify substantial analysis. Its limitations arise from bounded information, uncertainty, contested values, and the danger of presenting political choices as purely technical. Incrementalism begins from existing arrangements and compares smaller changes, making it practical when uncertainty is high, institutional learning is important, and political agreement is limited. Its main weakness is conservatism because the status quo can restrict which alternatives are considered and whose interests remain protected. Neither model inherently guarantees or excludes public participation, and neither should be selected as a universal formula. In practice, policymakers can combine rational strategic direction with incremental experimentation, review, and adaptation. The appropriate balance depends on the urgency of the problem, the reversibility of mistakes, the availability of evidence, the distribution of power, and the moral consequences of delaying or accelerating change.

References

Dror, Y. (1964). Muddling through—"Science" or inertia? *Public Administration Review, 24*(3), 153–157.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of "muddling through." *Public Administration Review, 19*(2), 79–88.

Lindblom, C. E. (1979). Still muddling, not yet through. *Public Administration Review, 39*(6), 517–526.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative Behavior* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Stone, D. (2012). *Policy Paradox* (3rd ed.). W. W. Norton.